

**MILL VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF MONDAY, APRIL 08, 2013
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL, 7:00PM
26 CORTE MADERA AVENUE**

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS:	Heidi Richardson – Co-Chair John McCauley – Co-Chair Steve Geiszler – Vice-Chair Chris Skelton Ricardo Capretta	ABSENT
------------------------------------	---	---------------

CALL TO ORDER

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: Time for comments from members of the public on issues not on this Planning Commission agenda. (Limited to 3 minutes per person.)

PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR'S ORAL REPORT: Report on items being considered by the City Council.

LIAISON REPORTS: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MARCH 11, & MARCH 25, 2013

It was **M/s** by Commissioner Geiszler/Commissioner Skelton to approve the minutes of March 11, 2013. The motion was carried 4/0.

It was **M/s** by Commissioner Skelton/Commissioner Capretta to approve the minutes of March 25, 2013. The motion was carried 4/0.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

It was **M/s** by Commissioner Geiszler/Commissioner Skelton to approve the agenda and move Item 4 to the beginning of the meeting. The motion was carried 4/0.

PUBLIC HEARING:

REVISED DISCUSSION:

1. [Discussion and Direction to Staff Regarding a Referral from the City Council to Review and Address Proposed Revisions to the Zoning Ordinance \(Title 20 of the](#)

[Mill Valley Municipal Code\) Regarding the Calculation of Allowable Floor Area. \(Moore\). At its meeting of April 1, 2013, the City Council referred certain portions of the Planning Commission's recommended amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinance back to the Planning Commission for further review and discussion. The City Council has asked the Commission to clarify proposed language regarding the calculation of allowable floor area, including "large volume" spaces. The City Council will consider the Planning Commission's recommendations at a continued public hearing on this matter on Monday, May 6, 2013.](#)

[City Council 4/1/13 report & Floor Area Maps doc.](#)

[Comment letter 1 doc.](#)

[Comment letter 2 doc.](#)

[Comment 3 doc.](#)

- [2. 575 Summit Avenue - Design Review & Variance - White - File No. 4064 \(Zanarini\) A STUDY SESSION to construct a new 3,815 square foot 3 level single-family residence with a 565 square foot attached garage.](#)

[575 Summit doc.](#)

Staff Presentation from Associate Planner Zanarini

Applicant presentation from architect, William

Public Comment

Commission Deliberation

Commissioner Geiszler says he has mixed feelings about the project. He likes the split parking and access strategy on the site. He would like to see a really good grading plan so he can evaluate the project more clearly. He is concerned about the amount of off haul as 550 cubic yards is a large amount. He couldn't tell that was a swimming pool and would like to know if it impacts neighbors regarding privacy and noise. He does appreciate the fact that the house is pushed down into the hillside but feels it will loom over Myrtle. He wants to know if that could be mitigated. He is wondering if the location for the garage for back out and turn in strategies is the right one. He considered other driveway approaches from Summit but would be tough with the slope. He feels the whole project hinges on a variance and he feels there is not enough information to decide right now. He is very concerned about the Oaks on site and protecting them during construction. He explained seeing different scenarios that don't require a variance. He feels that he didn't have enough information to give proper feedback. He likes the look and style of the house, supports the green efforts and the low impact to the neighbors.

Commissioner Capretta echoes Commissioner Geiszler's comments. He would like to see more information such as grading plans, heights, orientations, vicinity map, sections, roof plans, tree

removal and elevations. He feels the lot is buildable but is very concerned about the amount of off haul. He would like to see colors that blend in more with the hillside and would like to know cross canyon view impacts. He agrees that the square footage might be too much and suggested looking at other ways to handle the easements and break up the mass. He stated from a height, bulk and mass perspective he feels the impact to Myrtle is too much. He agrees this is a very irregular site but feels this is a good start.

Commissioner Richardson agrees with Commissioner Geiszler regarding the concerns about the height and mass from Myrtle. She stated the colors are an issue and needs more clarification on the heights via site sections. She feels the site benefits the owner and handcuffs a more creative solution for the house. She feels the house fits without a variance but the decks would have to disappear. She feels there is land to the west that could be used if the swimming pool wasn't there. She agrees with needed a grading plan and that 550 cubic yards of off haul is too much. She feels there is no substitute for mature landscaping and would like to be comfortable with the cross canyon views. She feels the garage location on Myrtle is incredibly impactful and feels the existing location is the best.

Commissioner Skelton echoes Commissioner Richardson's sentiments and would like to see what the projects looks like with a shared driveway. He agrees that the driveway cut off Myrtle is very impactful. He has concerns about the Oak tree, easements on the property and the pool fitting in with the overall design.

- [3. 315 Hillside Avenue - Design Review & Variance - Parquet - File No. 4066 \(Zanarini\) A STUDY SESSION of the demolition of an existing residence and the construction of a new 2,091 square foot residence and an 495 square foot detached garage with a 150 square foot studio above the garage.](#)

[315 Hillside doc.](#)

[Applicant presentation from owner David Parquet](#)

[Public Comment](#)

[Commission Deliberation](#)

Commissioner Capretta stated he would have liked to see a site section cut horizontally compared to the new site. He feels there is an extra four feet in the garage that could lower the structure and the amount of off haul. He likes the spirit of the design but feels the façade is much too impactful on Hillside. He would like to see creative ways to lower the house. He discussed location options for the house. He agrees that the retaining wall looks massive. He likes the scale of the house. He inquired how FAR is distributed between structures, basements and the main house.

Commissioner Skelton likes the site plan and that it's seeded into the hillside. He stated he likes that the house is not maxed out on FAR and the careful attention to preserving the trees. He would like the drainage studied. He is sensitive to the skylights and views on this property. Commissioner Geiszler echoes the comments about the nice complete set of plans. He feels the garage needs to be as small as possible as it's in the setback. He feels the studio needs to be within the setbacks and stated he doesn't support the skylights to minimize light to the street. He would like to see the walkway more developed. He has concerns about the courtyard bench area in relation to the Oak tree roots. He likes the site approach and works well for the streetscape but would like to see the house dropped down a bit to minimize impacts to the neighbors. He stated that the utility closet needs to be counted in FAR. He is not a huge fan of all those skylights down that ridge as he feels it will be pretty disruptive to the neighbors. He wants to make sure any work done on this project doesn't affect the neighbors Oak tree roots.

Commissioner Richardson agrees with everything the Commission has said and feels the garage/studio needs work. She suggested lowering the house down as it is two stories with very narrow setbacks. She agrees that the trees are important and especially since the walkways being more developed.

- [4. 49 Cornelia - Design Review & Second Unit Permit - Deitch - File No. 4068 \(Zanarini\) A STUDY SESSION to conduct a preliminary Study Session for determination of the proposed driveway and residence location on a steep sloping lot.](#)

[49 Cornelia doc.](#)

[Applicant presentation from architect Joel Turkel](#)

[Public Comment - None](#)

[Commission Deliberation](#)

Commissioner Capretta thanked the applicant for the well thought out application and the green aspects. He likes using the stock piled dirt to back fill. He likes the driveway solution and minimizing the retaining walls to 4 or 5 feet. He supports the flat roof and scale of the project.

Commissioner Geiszler stated he would have liked to have seen a grading plan. He would like to see the mass of the driveway retaining walls broken down. He stated the hillside might have some soil stability issues. He wants to maintain the look and integrity of the street and will be looking at the walls closely. He agrees about stock piling the dirt. He supports the site strategy and likes that the impact to the street is minimal. He supports the materials but feels the landscaping will be important.

Commissioner Skelton agrees with reducing the size of the retaining walls. He would like to see it broken up and lots of care and thought into the plantings. He wonders about how the pool will be perceived from the street.

Commissioner Richardson echoes everyone's comments. She would like real numbers and a plan on how you plan on retaining the dirt on site. She is concerned about the height of the driveway walls, swimming pool walls and if that is where the pool should be located. She would like to see a more detailed landscape plan, grading plan and site sections early on.

It was M/s Commissioner Geiszler/Commissioner Capretta to adjourn the meeting. The motion was approved 4/0.

Any decision made by the Planning Commission on the above items may be appealed to the City Council by filing a letter with the Planning Department within 10 calendar days describing the basis for the appeal accompanied by the \$250 appeal fee.