

Kentfield Planning Advisory Board

P.O. Box 304, Kentfield, California 94914

Minutes of April 11, 2018

Anne Petersen called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. in the COM Student Center's Deedy Lounge. Other board members also present: Bitsa Freeman, John Mann, Ross McKenna, Neil Park, Pam Scott. Guests: by project.

Minutes of March 28, 2018. M/S (Neil/Bitsa) and unanimously approved as submitted.

28 Wolfe Canyon Design Review & Tree Removal (Weiss)

(Guests for project: Amy Anderson, owner and project designer; Michael Watkins, consulting engineer; Scott Douglas, project manager; and neighbors of project Allan and Joanna Berland, Bob Betette, Barbara Johnson, Sarah Mansbach, Kathleen McKenna)

The design review was limited to tree removal and construction of several retaining walls associated with the new home at this location. The residence is less than 3,500 s.f. in size, meets setback and other requirements, so is exempt from this review. The walls in the original application were scaled back in consultation with the county planner and Mr. Watkins described the revised proposal of the residence and driveway, including new photo simulations.

The revised application includes four walls exceeding four feet in height and these are subject to review. Two walls, one behind the carport, would be almost 14 feet high. Walls along the driveway had been modified and reduced in height, with some portions higher than four feet, and segments, on either side of the driveway, would extend into the road right-of-way. The portion of the walls in the right-of-way would be under four feet in height.

Neighbor comments and concerns about the project included the following:

- Construction parking and traffic flow blocking or parking in residents' driveways. A resident at 1 Wolfe Canyon said that due to the narrow road entrance from Wolfe Grade vehicles sometimes veer onto the homeowner's property, or use that driveway to enable a turnaround.
- Traffic safety for residents and also for students who walk Wolfe Grade to and from Bacich School, due to construction vehicles, including trucks, entering and leaving site.
- Damage to the privately-owned road from the construction.
- Questioned if the proposed project (walls and tree removal) could meet the required findings for approval. One resident specified concern that 22.20.090 general requirements would be applicable to wall extensions into the right-of-way, and could preclude that use.
- Extension of the retaining walls into county road right-of-way and possibility that the extensions could be implicated in an accident. The right-of-way is wider than the paved road and the walls would extend into a portion of the unpaved area.
- How construction equipment blocking road could affect ability of emergency vehicles, such as fire trucks, to access the neighborhood.
- Amount of water in canyon sides and how construction activity, and displacement of natural hillside with impervious surfaces, could alter drainage.
- Whether required encroachment permits have been issued.
- There was some confusion about tree markings so not clear what removal was planned.
- Location of project near ridge would make the project highly visible.
- A plaster finish shown on earlier plans seems to have been changed to a rock veneer.

Mr. Watkins and Ms. Anderson responded to some issues, including the following:

- Described the retaining work currently proposed.
- Applicant will post a bond for repair of any road damage due to project construction.
- There is a construction mitigation plan, as required by the county, and it includes measures for erosion control, construction parking, and other matters.
- An encroachment permit will be required.
- Walls would be concrete, mostly on piers or a T-footing; most would be in bedrock.
- There is a geotechnical report and plans are consistent with that report. Runoff would either be absorbed into the soil on site or be collected in two main retention basins as part of the plan to accommodate hill drainage.
- Agreed the tree marks that were done might not be accurate but an arborist has been called to review this and a plan for replacement planting will be done.

Recommendation. M/S (Pam/Bitsa) and unanimously approved to accept the 28 Wolfe Canyon plans for tree removal and retaining walls with the following conditions included.

1. All required findings must be made.
2. There will be a construction mitigation plan that includes, as required, the following: erosion control measures; drainage provisions; construction parking and traffic management to insure construction activity does not infringe on neighbors' ability to access or exit their properties or the street, and to provide safe passage for residents and students; monetary arrangement in the form of a bond that will compensate for any repair that is needed due to road damage resulting from construction.
3. Planner will review the code provisions related to tree removal, retaining walls, and right-of-way encroachment to verify plans are consistent with county code requirements.
4. Construction vehicles will not park on, or turn around on, neighbors' property. Construction vehicles that must drive on Wolfe Canyon will turn around on the construction site, or at the end of the road.
5. Planner should consider if changing the driveway from concrete to a pervious surface would improve site drainage.
6. Applicant will review tree removal and replacement plans with adjacent neighbors. Tree replacement should be done on a 3 to 1 ratio, or else the vegetation and landscaping should provide comparable benefits.

The meeting was adjourned at 9 p.m.

Minutes: Ann Thomas