Kentfield Planning Advisory Board

P.O. Box 304, Kentfield, California 94914

Minutes of July 26, 2017

Anne Petersen called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. in the Deedy Lounge, COM Student Center and at 10891 Sunshine Coast Hwy, Powell River, BC, Canada. Other board members also present: Bitsa Freeman, Neil Park (via Skype), Pamela Scott, Ross McKenna

Minutes of June 28, 2017 M/S (Ross/Bitsa) and unanimously approved as submitted.

Update: Report from James Chayka, Marin County Parks and Open Space Superintendent

Anne requested Mr. Chayka to attend the meeting to give the Board an overview of the purpose, history, and the future of CSA17. The monies administered by the CSA are collected from property tax revenues of residents within the Kentfield School District and Hillview Gardens, and from the ERAF, and are to be used for the maintenance of Hal Brown Park. Jim outlined the current projects. Other ideas for the use of these funds were discussed, for example, the removal of potentially flammable material west of Berens Drives adjacent to the Corte Madera Creek. It was suggested by Neil Park that KPAB become an informal conduit to CSA for the discussion and distribution of funding for future projects. There is currently no formal process for local public involvement in the overall oversite of the expenditure of the CSA17 monies. Jim agreed to report to KPAB quarterly to advise and seek input. The next report will be at our October meeting.

Recommendation. M/S (Neil/Bitsa) unanimously approved to support role of KPAB as an oversight Board to CSA17.

Adamson Design Review, 28 Wolfe Canyon Road (Garcia)

(Guests: Amy Adamson, property owner, and architect, plus approximately 30+ interested parties. Twenty-eight email addresses were submitted for notification of future meetings, attached.)

KPAB reviewed the Design Review request to construct a new 4,241 square foot single family residence, with a 694-square foot garage on an improved lot in unincorporated Kentfield. The proposed development would result in a building area of 4,935 square feet and a floor area of 4,395 square feet. Therefore, the proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 30 percent on the 14,654-square foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of approximately 24 feet above surrounding grade and would have the following setbacks: 25 feet from the western front property line; 20 feet from the northern side property line; 28 feet from the eastern rear side property line; 10 feet from the southern side property line.

Design Review approval is required because the project would exceed a floor area of 3,500 square feet.

Project plans are online at:

 $http://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/projects/kentfield/28-wolfe-\ canyonlp_dr_p1736_kf$

The applicant described the project, focusing on its south facing orientation. She acknowledged that it is a difficult site due to the existing slope of the property. She indicated that it is planned

Kentfield Planning Advisory Board/September 14, 2016/Page 2

to construct an elevator from the garage to the third level of the property, but not to the master suite, which would be the highest level.

There were significant questions, discussion and concerns about the project from the Board and the audience. These are the major points addressed:

1. Proposed project is incompatible with neighborhood due to its proposed size. The design needs to be sympathetic with the neighborhood. The neighbors would like a smaller house with less mass and bulk.

2. Height of project blocks views from 32 Wolfe Canyon. The Master suite at the top level looks down into the yard of #32.

3. Road. This is a private road with no formal maintenance agreement between the owners. The road is single lane and there are no sidewalks. There is concern regarding the effect of construction vehicles on the road and who would repair resulting damage.

4. Onsite parking. There is concern that construction vehicles and equipment would block the single lane road. Where will workers park? There needs to be a construction management plan in place.

5. Drainage. Project employs a French drain system with all drainage directed to the road. All neighbors were concerned with drainage in the area. Lack of sidewalks and gutters make this critical. Is there a connection to a storm drain system or is drainage directed to this single lane road only? Because this is new construction, we would recommend keeping all runoff on the property in cisterns. All hardscape should be permeable.

6. It would have been helpful to have more collaboration with the neighbors prior to the meeting.

7. The addition of 2 parking spaces near the garage would seem to be in pedestrian right of way.

8. The soils report should be further reviewed for possible erosion issues and slides. According to the neighbors, there is water draining from this site for at least 10 months of the year.

9. Story poles should be required prior to further review.

Recommendation. M/S (Ross/Bitsa) unanimously approved to recommend this project as **incomplete.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 pm

Minutes: Pamela Scott