

Kentfield Planning Advisory Board

P.O. Box 304, Kentfield, California 94914

Minutes of October 12, 2016

Anne Petersen called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. in the COM Student Union and at 10891 Sunshine Coast Hwy, Powell River, BC, Canada. Other board members also present: Bitsa Freeman, Dale Hansen, John Mann, Neil Park (via Facebook), Pam Scott.

Minutes of September 28, 2016. M/S (Dale) and unanimously approved as submitted.

Robino Land Division, 127 Hill Drive, Kentfield. (Drake)

(Guests for project: Chris Robino, applicant; Scott Hochstrasser, planning consultant; neighbors Peter and Zoe Daffern, Bruce and Karin Reeves, Peter and Claudia Brown, Sally and Jim Lindsey, David Pearce)

This was the second review of this application to divide a developed 83,900 square foot lot into two lots. Lot 1, with an average lot slope of 29.3%, is proposed to consist of 40,340 square feet and the existing residence would be retained. Lot 2, with an average lot slope of 47%, is proposed to consist of 43,560 square feet.

Project planner Scott Hochstrasser distributed copies of the tentative map ad record of survey and reviewed the project and new information compiled since the July 13 KPAB meeting:

- Six trees would be removed for the driveway, including three oak and three bay.
- Two retaining walls would be constructed along the driveway in a tier: one in front averaging 5.5 feet but up to 11 feet in height, behind it a second wall three to four feet high.
- There would be grading to remove about 800 cubic yards of soil, about 700 to be exported from the site.
- The parcel proposed for subdivision is the largest of 32 lots in the immediate area.
- The specific home site was removed from the earlier plans as it was only conceptual and provided to demonstrate that the new parcel would be a buildable lot. A potential building envelope, shown respecting required setbacks, is outlined instead. There are 10 oaks inside the envelope and 10 outside.
- The County has determined that an Initial Study will be required due to slope.

There were a number of questions and comments from neighbors and board members.

- There was speculation that the retaining and construction work on trees that are not in the building envelope but are close to the work could be affected by construction, and that actual tree loss could be higher than the applicant had estimated.
- Several neighbors stated that runoff from the hillside is heavy, wondering if there are springs in the hillside.
- Neil asked if any consideration had been given to the impact on privacy of adjacent residents. Mr. Pearce said that a house, if built in the designated envelope, could tower over his home.
- Anne said she could not recall a similar lot configuration in her time on the KPAB. It was noted that parcel 2 is designed to meet the minimum square footage needed to meet hillside requirements, but to do so includes a tail that seems unrelated to the remainder of the lot.
- Several stated concerns that the project could negatively impact the character of the neighborhood and is not in keeping with spirit of the Kentfield community plan.

Recommendation. M/S (John/Neil) and unanimously approved to recommend denial of project, including the following considerations:

- Proposed parcel 2 would not comply with criteria in Title 22's 22.82.050.C.3 and 22.82.070. Title 22 does not specifically define the terms "unconventional lot design" or "irregular lot configuration" but it is the judgement of board members that these terms describe the proposed project. Board members reviewed project plans and also conducted a site visit to observe the property, note views to neighboring properties, and walk the area.
- Code states that lots be reasonably accessible with easily understood boundaries and that "irregular lot configurations...designed solely to meet minimum lot area standards based on the lot-slope requirements...shall not be permitted." This is the case with this application where the handle of the hammer design is included solely to meet minimum size standards.
- There would be a high tree loss.
- In the event of an emergency such as a fire, evacuation would be difficult.

The meeting was adjourned at 8 p.m.

Minutes: Ann Thomas