

Kentfield Planning Advisory Board

P.O. Box 304, Kentfield, California 94914

Minutes of July 13, 2016

Anne Petersen called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. in the COM Student Union. Other board members also present: Bitsa Freeman, Neil Park (via Skype), Pam Scott.

Minutes of June 29, 2016. Unanimously approved as presented.

Robino Land Division, 127 Hill Drive (Drake)

(Guests for this project: Chris Robino, applicant; Scott Hochstrasser, IPA Associates, planning consultant for project; Stephanie Robinson, 36 Hill Drive; David Pearce, 11 Hotaling Court; Claudia and Peter Brown, 10 Madrone Avenue)

The application requests permission to divide a developed 83,900 square foot lot into two legal building lots. Lot 1, with an average slope of 29.3% is proposed to consist of 40,340 square feet. The existing residence would be retained on Lot 1. Lot 2, with an average lot slope of 42.7%, is proposed to consist of 43,560 square feet and is vacant.

Scott reviewed the project, noting that the residence drawn on the proposed new parcel is not part of this application, which solely concerns the lot division into two new parcels. The drawing is an example of a building that could be proposed if the application is approved, and is included to demonstrate that the proposed lot would be a developable parcel. Other points included:

- Lot 2 is larger than the 20,000 s.f. minimum required by the R1B3 zoning because of the slope, which increases the lot size that is needed. Likewise, the driveway was designed to meet slope and width requirements for emergency access, and to follow land contours.
- The side setbacks for residences under R1B3 zoning is 15 feet. The schematic reviewed at showed a smaller setback for the conceptual Lot 2 house, but this is a drawing error.
- If a building proposed on the new parcel would be 4,000 s.f or larger it would be automatically subject to design review. He believes that, because of the slope and configuration of the second lot, the County could require design review regardless of the house size. The design review process, however, can also result in a narrower setback than is standard if the Planner believes that to do so results in a preferable design.
- A review of parcel and home sizes of 32 properties in the immediate area indicates about half the homes are 4,000.s.f. or larger.
- If the land division is approved neither of the two lots could be split again per the County zoning code requirements.

Mrs. Brown said that several years ago there was an incident in which land beneath their house and pool, which lie directly beneath the conceptual house drawn in on Lot 2, experienced subsidence causing major damage that had to be rectified.

Neighbors' comments also included these: 1) Conceptual house and pool shown are directly above 10 Madrone yard/patio; it would eliminate their view of the hillside and create concern about drainage. 2) Why is Lot 2 in an unusual semi-circular configuration? 3) Could a home be sited on Lot 2 that is less visible from neighboring properties than the example used? 4) Location of property lines with adjacent parcels are not clear. 5) Could Lot 2 be accessed from Hill Drive?

Recommendation. KPAB board unanimously recommends that the 127 Hill Drive Land Division application is incomplete pending provision of the following:

1. A drawing that shows property lines of lots proposed in the subject application and also for adjoining properties, and indicating building envelopes on those properties and an extension of topographical lines onto adjoining properties to better reflect overall slope.
2. Staking to indicate the proposed location of the driveway/road, existing and proposed property lines, and location of the hypothetical residence used on the plans as an example. Stakes should be of sufficient size/height that neighbors can use them to get a good picture of what is proposed.
3. Depiction of the property's drainage patterns and route of runoff from the new parcel.
4. Feasibility study of the proposed new parcel including geology, soils, hydrology, biological resources including wildlife corridors, etc.
5. Relocation of the pool used as an example to a site that is not directly above a neighboring home. A pool should be in an area such that if there were any slippage the water would not flow toward another home.
6. Any building envelope proposed should be compliant, including setbacks, with County zoning codes and this should be consistent with what is shown on drawings.

Added Note: The KPAB unanimously recommends that, due to slope and configuration of the proposed modified parcels, any residence that is proposed for Lot 2 should be subject to Design Review, regardless of size.

Reports/Other Business

Magnolia Avenue Roadway Meeting. Anne reported that she briefly attended a meeting this evening in Larkspur regarding changes approved for the section of Magnolia Avenue from Bon Air to Hillview. The project had elicited resident controversy.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Minutes: Ann Thomas