

MILL VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION

DRAFT MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF Monday, August 12, 2013

COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL, 7:00 PM

26 CORTE MADERA AVENUE

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

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: NONE

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

It was M/s by Commissioner Capretta/Commissioner McCauley to approve the agenda. The motion was carried 5/0.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. 21 Ryan - Goltermann - Design Review - File No. 3987 (Zanarini) The applicant proposes to demolish the existing home and construct a new 2,142 square foot residence and a 446 square foot attached garage. The proposed project at 21 Ryan has been determined to be exempt from further environmental review under Section 15303(a) the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

21 Ryan.doc

Staff Presentation from Director of Building and Planning Mike Moore

Presentation from Applicant Casey Goltermann

Presentation from Architect Merle Avila

Public Comment

Commission Deliberation

Commissioner Geiszler began by discussing how the home fits into the neighborhood. He stated there are taller homes on Ryan and second-story homes are allowed in the code. He noted since the last proposal the plans have gone in the right direction. He said the reason the home looks so naked is the lack of street vegetation. He suggested the applicant enhance the planting plan to have the home fit/blend in. He said he can get behind the massing, and was not bothered by the garage size. He stated at the study session he made a suggestion to vary the second-story roof line by dropping the house into the garage to create a step down and he still thinks that should be considered.

Commissioner McCauley questioned the idea of having 2 windows and a case-door in the garage when the garage door already has windows for natural light. He thought the design has improved significantly from the designs the Commission has seen in the past. He continued by proposing questions to deal with the mass. Ideas were brought up such as moving some bedrooms from the second floor to the first. He was unhappy to see that the story poles did not have strings or tape for roof line and asked for it to not happen again.

Commissioner Skelton generally supports the project. He shared most of the same concerns and conditions Commissioner Geiszler mentioned. He stated he does not think that the windows on the side of the garage are completely necessary and he supports either removal or relocation. He does not find the proposed plan out of character from the neighborhood. He appreciated the length the applicant went to in lowering the house. His maximum height number for the proposed home would be 26 feet. He stated he does not see much benefit in spreading the mass of the home out on the lot. He mentioned he likes the wedding cake style as it allows light and air to flow into the yard and hopes the fruit trees thrive.

Commissioner Capretta stated the design has come a long way but he thinks it has a long way to go. He agreed with Commissioner McCauley on the story poles and thinks the next time that happens the Commission should postpone the hearing. ~~He noted the drawings do not match, there are different roof pitches and d~~Drawing dimensions are missing which he stated are a concern to him. He said the site layout, setbacks, square footage, and garage are all fine. He is concerned with neighborhood fit and massing. He stated he would like more scale massing reductions ~~and he would like to see more~~ on the front of the house and not the back. He referenced Design Review Guideline 17 and recommended that the materials on the east side of the home should be broken up to create a less monotonous look. He recommended the removal of the garage windows or. ~~He~~ asked the applicant to work with the neighbors in order to figure out where ~~certain features~~the garage windows should be placed. Finally, he stated he would like to see more effort in the “green area.”

Commissioner Richardson said she is in agreement with Rick and Steve. She noted there were a lack of dimensions on the model and the drawings do not match. She would like to see the Redwood trees in the diagrams to help demonstrate scale. She would like the applicant to reduce the height and work with neighbors. She agreed with the Commissioners about the removal of the garage windows.

The Commissioners wrapped up their deliberation with definitive comments for the applicant to work with: There should be landscaping in the front. Do not have unified plates on the second floor, opt for breaking plates or dormers. The garage roof needs to be lowered. Keep the home compact in order to create open space. Show scaling with and without the trees.

2. 511 Lovell - Hatfield - Design Review - File No. 4058 (Zanarini) The applicant proposes a 6,370 square foot residence and a 1,044 square foot detached garage with a 468 square foot second unit below the garage. The proposed project at 511 Lovell Avenue has been determined to be exempt from further environmental review under Section 15303(a) the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

[511 Lovell.doc](#)

[Staff Presentation from Building and Planning Director Mike Moore](#)

[Presentation from Applicant, Architect Bob Hatfield](#)

[Presentation from Landscape Architect Jim Bradanini](#)

[Public Comment](#)

[Commission Deliberation](#)

Commissioner Geiszler began there are some tweaks that need to be done and some clarifications to be made but overall he is in support of the project. He noted there is over half an acre of lot coverage which is a lot of hardscape. He said looking down a big broad driveway would not be ideal. The grading needs to be looked at for the recreation court. He would like the use of story poles to mark the court. He stated the planting palate seems very suburban to him and is concerned about the feel. He is bothered by the magnolias. The use of such tall trees on the front of the house is confusing to him because the upper floor of the house facing the street is a closet. Minimal screening would lift the eye to the ridge and not the home.

Commissioner McCauley agreed with Commissioner Geiszler, especially with the trees in front. He stated he is concerned about how high up the sport court sits. He liked the layout. The width of large overhangs and a large tree area helped mitigate his concerns about cross canyon light. He stated he was thrilled with the proposed north elevation but is concerned with the floor area. He is also concerned about the two heritage trees and he would like to see something done to save them.

Commissioner Skelton stated he thought the applicant presented an amazing proposal; he absolutely supports everything about the house. He said he echoed sentiments of the other Commissioners and is having difficulty with the site strategy and the landscaping. He stated he cannot support the project because of the removal of the two heritage trees. There is too much land to work with to remove them in order to build a swimming pool. He agreed that the trees fronting Lovell Avenue should be lowered, as presented they create a fence. He noted the trees would not replace in kind the other trees slated for removal to open up the view corridor. He thought the driveway was too wide. He loved the pickle ball

court. He stated he does not have an issue with the recreational court; it is far enough away so the noise would not be an issue with the neighbors. He said he was glad that the applicant worked so well with the neighbors.

Commissioner Capretta stated the massing of the house is enormous. The home has too ~~large of an~~ much impervious surface. A lot of the impervious surface should be eliminated through the use of other pervious materials throughout the project. He said the 7,000 square foot home feels like an 11,000 square foot home, while it should feel like 6,000 square feet. He said the heritage tree removal should not be considered. He noted the grading and off-haul are alright. An eight foot retaining wall is too high. The driveway is too large. He mentioned the solar panels are good but, they are negated by the large amount of impervious surface. He stated that the trees ~~in front on~~ Lovell should be between six and seven feet. He also noted there are too many stairs on the property and the residential second unit is missing a kitchen unit. He would like the applicant to update the arborist map showing all removed trees. Since so many large trees are being removed on the south. He would also like the applicant to address down valley visibility with a down valley rendering or analysis.

Commissioner Richardson echoed many of her fellow Commissioners' thoughts. She said it was a lovely house but there is too much hardscape. She also said there is too much rigid geometry on the site geography along the perimeter which results in high retaining walls, high visibility, removal of heritage trees, and too much impermeable surface. She would like the applicant to consider a more integrated landscape design into canyon like materials sensitive to the canyon and redwood forest setting because at the moment it does not fit into the topography of the ~~site~~.

3. 315 Hillside - Parquet - Design Review - File No. 4066 (Zanarini) The applicant proposes a 1971 square foot residence and a 495 square foot detached garage with a 249 square foot studio above the garage. The applicant is requesting a variance in the front and side setbacks in order to construct the garage. The proposed project at 315 Hillside has been determined to be exempt from further environmental review under Section 15303(a) the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. CITY COUNCIL REFERRAL (information only):

[315 Hillside.doc](#)

[Staff Presentation from Building and Planning Director Mike Moore](#)

[Presentation from Applicant, Architect David Parquet](#)

[Public Comment](#)

[Commission Deliberation](#)

Commissioner Skelton began by stating he was originally a big supporter of the site strategy because of the effort the applicant took in considering the locations where the home could sit. He stated he is not in favor of lowering the house at the expense of off-haul/fill. He proposed raising the house one foot to help with the off-haul. He did not believe that the raising of the home would have a substantial negative impact

of the neighboring home. He stated the work bench located in the garage would have to be eliminated because of the amount of off-haul it would produce. He appreciated the applicant's removal of half of the skylights, yet he is concerned that the kitchen skylights have remained. He said he supports the project and location, and he appreciated the lengths taken to maintain the redwood tree.

Commissioner Geiszler said the applicant proposed commendable work. He stated he is not a fan of skylights. There is not a room in the house that is far away from a window, because of this he does not see the need for skylights. He said the FAR is in question. There are discrepancies in the square footage. The work bend area equals sixty yards of off-haul. He mentioned he was prepared to approve the project if FAR is worked out with staff and would be in favor of keeping the house as is.

Commissioner Capretta stated the site layout is tough, but the proposed home is the best solution. He is okay with the massing. He proposed the front roof elevation could be less garage roof, more glass railing. His biggest problem with the house is the grading off-haul. He noted the big change from the original plan to this one. He requested accurate numbers of off-haul and FAR. He suggested the removal of the skylights on the side effecting neighbors.

Commissioner McCauley said he is very troubled by the amount of off-haul and cannot think of a worse road to have that much off-haul. He agreed the work bench will have to go. He is alright with the studio space. He would like the project to come back to confirm solid FAR and off-haul calculations.

Commissioner Richardson agrees with the Commissioners. She stated any off-haul that could be avoided should be avoided. Together with the Commissioners, a total of 250 cubic yards of off-haul was established as the ~~eCommission's guideline~~ limit.

ADJOURN

It was M/s by Commissioner Skelton/Commissioner Richardson to adjourn the meeting. The motion was carried 5/0.

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.