RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Marin County (County) is the lead agency for the proposed Rogers Design Review and Tree Removal Permit Project (Project), meaning the County is the agency that has primary discretionary approval authority over portions of the Project and will certify the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) during Project consideration. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a responsible agency (i.e., agencies that have more limited discretionary approval authority than the lead agency) and will use the information contained in this IS/MND in their environmental review.

During circulation of the IS/MND from November 13, 2018, to December 10, 2018, the County received 15 comment letters on the IS/MND. The County received comments on the Draft MND from a state agency, a local government, and 13 individuals.

To finalize the IS/MND for the proposed Project, County staff prepared the following responses to comments (RTC) that were received during the public review period. These responses are included as an attachment to the Administrative Decision for the Project.

RTC.1 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE (CDFW)

Karen Weiss of the CDFW submitted the following two informal comments in response to their review of the Draft MND:

1. CDFW expressed concern that the mitigation proposed to address the loss of canopy cover and habitat provided by the mature trees (tree replacement ratio of 2:1) was inadequate. Their comment (attached as Comment Letter 1) recommended replacement of all native trees between 3 and 6 inches in diameter (at breast height) removed as a result of proposed work activities at a 3:1 ratio with a combination of native trees and/or appropriate understory and lower canopy plantings. Further, they recommended that native trees greater than 6 inches in diameter be replaced with native trees at a 6:1 ratio and non-native trees greater than 18 inches in diameter be replaced at a 1:1 ratio. Finally they recommended that individual oak trees be replanted at a minimum 10:1 ratio.

The County and applicant will take this comment under advisement; however, the mitigation proposed in the Draft IS/MND was developed in accordance with the Ross Valley Fire Department standards and the standards identified in Marin County Code Section 22.26.040. Replanting at the high ratios suggested by CDFW could create a fire hazard due to a high forest density not recommended in close proximity to housing.

2. CDFW also expressed concerns that the planned location for the Project driveway and retaining wall will result in stream constriction and loss of riparian habitat. The comment notes (as also described in the IS/MND) that the Project will require a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq. for activities
within any 1600-jurisdictional waters. As noted in Mitigation 8.a-4 of the Draft IS/MND, a habitat mitigation and monitoring plan shall be prepared by the applicant as part of the Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement with CDFW. This plan will describe tree replacement (as required by the County) and final Project design requirements. As part of this mitigation, the applicant shall demonstrate to the County that they have met CDFW's permitting requirements, as determined by that agency.

RTC.2 TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO

Elise Semonian from the Town of San Anselmo (Town) commented regarding the potential for landslides in the Project area, particularly noting a source from 1976 not noted in the bibliography of the Geotechnical Report for the Project. As described in the Draft IS/MND, the site is located on moderate-to-steep slopes with potential for a seismically induced landslide. In a 1998 publication by the U.S. Geological Survey, the area of the Project site was characterized as having “many” or “mostly” landslides. Given this categorization, geologic reconnaissance was conducted as part of the site-specific geotechnical investigation for this specific Project, and no evidence of landslide was observed at the site. Exploratory borings reveal the presence of 2 feet of residual soils underlain by weathered bedrock composed of interbedded sandstone and shale. The bedrock generally grades harder, stronger, and less weathered with depth.

The 40-year-old source mentioned by the Town was not readily available, and Project analysis was based on more recent assessments performed for the specific Project. On this basis, the Draft IS/MND concluded that design and construction of the Project in accordance with the site grading and drainage recommendations provided in the geotechnical report is adequate to address the potential for seismic and non-seismic slope stability (landslide) concerns.

Master Responses

The 13 comment letters received from individuals (attached as Comment Letters 3 – 15) were focused on the following eight similar issues; thus, responses are provided below as Master Responses.

Master Response 1: Tree Removal

Comment Summary: Similar to the comment expressed above by CDFW in RTC.1, several individuals expressed concern regarding the plan to remove 39 mature trees as part of Project development.

Response: The County and applicant will take these comments under advisement; however, the mitigation proposed in the Draft IS/MND was developed in accordance with the Ross Valley Fire Department standards and the standards identified in Marin County Code Section 22.26.040. Mitigating tree removal is important and will be carried out in accordance with these standards, with particular attention to minimizing fire hazards through control of high forest density in close proximity to housing. Significant impacts will not occur due to planned tree removal.
Master Response 2: Riparian Habitat

Comment Summary: Several individuals expressed concerns regarding potential damage to Sorich Creek and in particular to riparian areas adjacent to the creek. A question was also raised as to whether the property is designated as a Stream Conservation Area (SCA).

Response: To clarify the IS/MND discussion regarding Sorich Creek, although the Creek meets many of the criteria of a SCA, because it is ephemeral (does not run at all times) it is not formally classified as a SCA. However Marin Countywide Plan Policy BIO-4.1 was designed to regulate land uses in stream conservation areas and establishes upland buffers to protect riparian resources, and specifically notes that Best Management Practices (BMPs) should be used in ephemeral streams. Paramount in these BMPs is the establishment of development setbacks or buffer zones from the top of the stream bank. For SCAs a 50-foot buffer would typically be established for lots between 2 and .5 acres in size, however, Countywide Plan Policy BIO-4.1 allows for a smaller buffer when “Development on the parcel entirely outside the SCA either is infeasible or would have greater impacts on water quality, wildlife habitat, other sensitive biological resources, or other environmental constraints than development within the SCA.” In the case of this property constraints such as densely vegetated areas and steep slopes make development either infeasible and/or more environmentally impactful. Policy BIO-4.1 also contains allowances for cases where driveways and other utility connections are allowed to encroach within SCA corridors if no other access on the property is available for development. The Project site is not feasibly accessible through any other egress due to site topography, existing protected open areas, and existing development and a private road that borders the western frontage of the property. Pursuant to BIO-4.1, the work associated with the main house would maintain the required 20-foot buffer from the delineated top of bank and Project construction and development would adhere to other relevant BMPs. Proposed development on the property would adhere to all Countywide Plan policies that protect riparian habitat and significant impacts would not occur.

In addition, Mitigation Measure 8.a-4 focuses on riparian resources and requires that the applicant provide evidence to the County that permitting requirements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the CDFW have been met. These permitting programs are all designed to enforce measures that would protect riparian resources and reduce any impacts to a less than significant level.

Master Response 3: Traffic and Access

Comment Summary: Commenters expressed concern regarding added vehicular and construction traffic on Sacramento Avenue and on the proposed driveway. Some stated the driveway and proposed bridge is too narrow and not adequately supported for increased traffic or construction.

Response: Section IV.7 of the Draft IS/MND, Transportation/Circulation, evaluates the impact of the Project with regards to vehicle trips, traffic congestion, and traffic hazards. There would
be minimal added operational trips associated with the development of a single-family home. On average, single-family homes produce approximately 10 vehicle trips per day.\(^1\) This would not negatively affect Sacramento Avenue or surrounding local or arterial roads in any significant way.

As described in Section I. of the Draft IS/MND, Description of the Project, the proposed driveway would be approximately 285 feet long and 12 feet wide, and would include an 85-foot-long vehicle bridge. The average grade would be an 8% slope. The Project applicant has obtained written verification from the Ross Valley Fire Department that the Project plans meet the minimum requirements needed for emergency vehicle access and turnaround. These requirements include the minimum horizontal and vertical roadway clearance, turnaround dimensions, and roadway and bridge design standards. The driveway and bridge would also incorporate recommendations included in the Geotechnical Investigation to ensure stability. In addition, the County Department of Public Works (DPW) reviewed the Geotechnical report and the Project plans including the proposed driveway and bridge and found the proposed Project met their requirements. As described in the IS/MND, there are no significant impacts from road or driveway development.

**Master Response 4: Steep Slope Construction and Erosion**

**Comment Summary:** Many individuals expressed concerns regarding construction of the Project stating that the steep slope is dangerous and/or susceptible to erosion. Several commenters stated such slopes may not be conducive to construction and may be susceptible to landslides.

**Response:** Section IV.3 of the Draft IS/MND describes geophysical resources and addresses the steep slope located on the Project site and the potential for a seismically-induced landslide. Project design and construction would be in accordance with the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Miller Pacific Engineering.\(^2\) The Geotechnical Investigation provided site-specific and Project-specific grading and drainage recommendations to address the potential for seismic and non-seismic slope stability concerns. Grading on slopes would require that residual soils be removed, fill placed on slopes greater than 10:1 (horizontal:vertical) be keyed into firm bedrock, and fill be drained to avoid the buildup of hydro-static and seepage forces behind the fill. As noted in Section IV.3, because the Project is designed with retaining walls to buttress the hillslope, and subdrainage would be provided to avoid seepage accumulation, the Project would not result in increased risks from landslides for the site or off-site properties. As stated above, DPW has reviewed the Geotechnical Investigation developed for this Project. Final plans will be reviewed and approved by a County soils engineer. Certification shall be either by his/her stamp and original signature on the plans or by a stamped/signed letter. This review will ensure and verify that the applicant’s grading and building plans have incorporated the appropriate recommendations from the Geotechnical Report and that no significant impacts will occur.

---


As described in Section 1V.1, Land Use Planning, construction of the proposed residence, driveway, and associated infrastructure would result in grading of the Project site that could result in erosion of on-site soils. However, in order to receive a building permit, the Project would require an erosion and sediment control plan, and compliance with standard measures for minimizing erosion: Marin County Code Section 24.04.625, Erosion and Sediment Control, and Section 23.08, Excavation, Grading, and Filling. The Project would also comply with Best Management Practices required by DPW, which may include installation of erosion-control blankets, timely revegetation of graded areas, cover of exposed soil with straw mulch, preservation of existing vegetation, and use of fiber rolls. Additionally, erosion would be avoided with the collection and dispersal of runoff through appropriate drainage systems and erosion-control measures that would be reviewed and approved by DPW and required to comply with County standards. Significant impacts will thus be avoided.

Master Response 5: Cultural Resources

Comment Summary: Several individuals expressed concerns regarding whether an adequate search for cultural resources, particularly Native American artifacts, was performed on and around the property site.

Response: Section IV.15 of the Draft IS/MND analyzed Cultural Resources and in particular the Project’s potential to disturb paleontological, archaeological, or historical sites, objects, and structures. The Anthropological Studies Center conducted an archaeological resources study of the Project site that included an archaeological records and literature search, contact with the Native American Heritage Commission, and pedestrian archaeological survey of the Project site. The records search was conducted at the Northwest Information Center, an affiliate of the State of California Office of Historic Preservation, the official state repository for records and reports on archaeological and historical resources. The records search identified no previously recorded cultural resources within the Project area.

Although there are no previously recorded resources, the possibility that buried cultural resources could be found on the property does exist. Marin County Code, Section 22.20.040(d), addresses potential accidental discovery of archaeological and historical resources during construction. In the event that archaeological or historical resources are discovered during any construction, construction activities shall cease, and the Community Development Agency shall be notified so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist and disposition of artifacts may occur in compliance with state and federal law. The disturbance of an Indian midden may require the issuance of an Excavation Permit by DPW, in compliance with Chapter 5.32 (Excavating Indian Middens) of the Marin County Code. Adherence to these codes will ensure that significant impacts do not occur.

The Marin County Planning Department staff initiated contact under Assembly Bill 52 with the two potentially affected tribes that have requested tribal cultural resource notification on projects that occur within their areas of interest in Marin County. Of the two tribes that requested to receive
Assembly Bill 52 notification, only the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR) responded and requested formal consultation on the Project. The tribal cultural consultation was completed with two phone calls between FIGR tribal members and County staff.

FIGR representatives provided no additional information or evidence regarding the presence or potential presence of unique ethnic cultural resources or religious or sacred uses within the Project area, but asked that FIGR be notified should any cultural materials be discovered during construction.

**Master Response 6: Cumulative Impacts of Development**

**Comment Summary:** Several individuals expressed concerns regarding potential plans to develop six homes on a property near the Project site. In particular, several concerns were expressed that the Project would impact Sacramento Avenue, and these potential new homes would also be accessed and visible from Sacramento Avenue, adding to a cumulative effect not previously discussed.

**Response:** Although not named in the individual comments, it is assumed the comments make reference to the Karuna Project, which proposed to subdivide an 11-acre lot into six lots for residential development (with one remainder lot). The Karuna property lies northeast of the proposed Project, at 1 Sacramento Avenue, on the adjacent hillside from the proposed Project (although not directly adjacent as there is a small lot that divides the two properties). The proposed Karuna Project was approved in January 2014, but as of this writing no specific construction date has been established.

However, as a reasonably foreseeable project, cumulative effects have been considered. The most likely impacts might be seen from increased traffic, although as discussed above under Master Response 3 addressing Traffic and Access, one single-family home is not expected to add significant traffic to the Project area. In addition, unlike the Karuna Project, this Project would be accessed from Los Angeles Boulevard, not Sacramento Avenue.

In terms of aesthetic and visual resources, impacts would be reduced in both projects through compliance with Chapter 22.26.040 of the Marin County Code, the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines, and the mandatory findings for design review approval. The planting plan and approval for removed trees was designed to provide visual screening as well.

Development for both proposed projects would entail upgrades to drainage on both sites reducing impacts from stormwater flows and controlling erosion.

As described in the IS/MND no significant project-related impacts would occur as a result of the Project as described, thus the Project will not contribute to a cumulative impact. In other words, the Project is not cumulatively considerable.
Master Response 7: Project Size

Comment Summary: Several individuals stated that the mass, bulk, and scale of the proposed residential structure is out of character with the existing homes in the neighborhood. Commenters expressed concern about the visibility of the home from the street and from nearby ridges. Commenters also note the potential light impacts.

Response: As noted in Section IV.1 of the Draft IS/MND, Land Use and Planning, the Project site is split-zoned into two different residential zoning districts, Residential Single-Family (R1) and Residential Multiple Planned (RMP-0.75). The surrounding neighborhood is Residential Single-Family (R1); this district is intended for “areas suitable for single-family residential neighborhood development in a suburban setting, along with similar and related compatible uses.” However, the majority of the lot is zoned Residential Multiple Planned (RMP-0.75), which is intended for “a full range of residential development types within the unincorporated urban areas of the County, including single-family, two-family dwellings, multi-family residential development, and limited commercial uses in suburban settings, along with similar and related compatible uses.” Both zoning districts recommend or require a maximum height for the main building not to exceed 30 feet above surrounding grade. The maximum height of the proposed residence would be 26 feet. The single-family residence would be compliant with both R1 and RMP-0.75 zoning districts.

Under the Marin Countywide Plan, the Project site is split into land use designations of Single-Family 6 (SF6) and Planned Residential (PR). Areas designated SF6 have lot sizes of 10,000 square feet or less, a density range of four to seven dwelling units per acre, and a floor area ratio of 10% to 30%. While larger than many of the surrounding homes, the proposed 4,306 square feet of total building area on a 76,827-square-foot (1.76-acre) lot represents a floor area ratio of 5%, significantly below the allowed floor area ratio and would be in conformance with the Marin Countywide Plan land use designations.

The Marin Countywide Plan included maps of the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt Areas. These areas are identified as scenic resources. The Marin Countywide Plan requires development near or on these ridgelines to be located in the least visually prominent areas possible. However, the Project site is not located within a Ridge and Upland Greenbelt Area. Any further potential visual impacts to the Project site would be reduced through compliance with Chapter 22.26.040 of the Marin County Code, the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines, and the mandatory findings for design review approval. Therefore project impacts would be less than significant.

Footnote:
Master Response 8: Wildlife

Comment Summary: Several individuals expressed concerns that the proposed Project could create adverse effects on wildlife. Concerns focused on loss of habitat and/or wildlife corridors. Specific species mentioned included bats, deer, raccoons, squirrels, coyotes, skunks, quail, turkeys, owls, red-tail hawks, owls, snakes, and salmonids.

Response: The Draft IS/MND addresses all these species and many not mentioned in individual comments. Mitigation Measures 8.a-1, 8.a-2, 8.a-3, and 8.a-4 are designed to minimize any potential impacts to wildlife. In particular Mitigation Measure 8.a-1 is designed to protect nesting passerines and raptors. The mitigation has strict requirements for activities before and during construction, and prior to grading, tree removal, or issuance of a building permit to avoid or minimize impacts to passerines and raptors that may potentially nest in the trees.

Mitigation Measure 8.a-2 provides an extremely detailed course of action that must be taken prior to and during construction to protect bats, with particular consideration for protecting colonies during the maternity roosting season.

The Project site is located within an existing developed residential neighborhood. Thus, domesticated pets, such as cats and dogs have been associated with the Project site and surrounding neighborhood. Although vacant properties are often used as refuge areas by feral animals and wildlife species, construction and inhabitance of the new residence would not serve as a significant barrier to the dispersal, migration, or movement of animal species. The openness of the neighborhood to wildlife movement would remain the same. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant.
December 11, 2018

Rachel Reid
Marin County
3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 308
San Rafael, CA 94903

Subject: Rogers Design Review and Tree Removal Permit
SCH#: 2018112029

Dear Rachel Reid:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on December 10, 2018, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse
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Dear Ms. Taylor,

Thank you for giving CDFW the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Rodgers Design Review and Tree Removal Permit (Project).

CDFW is submitting the following informal comments to be incorporated into the MND:

**Section 1, Environmental Setting: Landscaping**

**Comment 1:** The Project would result in the removal of 39 mature trees, including 4 Oregon white oak trees (*Quercus garryana*), 13 coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), 15 bay-laurel trees (*Umbellularia californica*), and 4 California buckeye (*Aesculus californica*), and 3 nonnative plum-cherry trees (*Prunus cerasifera*).

Mitigation measure 8.a-4 proposed tree replacement ratio of 2:1 is inadequate to address the loss of canopy cover and habitat provided by the mature trees.

**Recommended Mitigation:** To reduce impacts to less-than-significant, CDFW recommends replacement of all native trees between 3 and 6 inches in diameter (at breast height) removed as a result of proposed work activities at a 3:1 ratio with a combination of native trees and/or appropriate understory and lower canopy plantings. Native trees greater than 6 inches in diameter shall be replaced with native trees at a 6:1 ratio. Non-native trees greater than 18 inches in diameter shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio. Replacement plantings should consist of 5-gallon saplings and locally-collected seeds, stakes, or other suitable nursery stock as appropriate, and be native species to the area adapted to the lighting, soil, and hydrological conditions at the replanting site. Due to the high-quality habitat provided by oaks, individual oak trees that will be removed should be replanted at a minimum 10:1 ratio.

**Section 1, Figure 3 & 4**

**Comment 2:** Planned location for driveway and retaining wall will result in stream constriction and loss of riparian habitat.

The placement of the proposed retaining wall next to Sorich creek shown in Figure 3 of the site plan, particularly the north facing section placed directly on the top of the bank, would result in restriction of the natural hydrological processes of creek meandering. Creek channelization could lead to the increased velocity of water and the transfer of erosive forces during high flow events.

Figure 4 shows vegetation clearing for the construction of the temporary access road, and placement of the driveway will require removal of 8 live trees (#14, #15, and #52-57) within the riparian corridor. Replacement of riparian vegetation with a concrete driveway would result in loss of habitat and canopy cover that cannot be restored. These impacts are significant and long lasting.

**Recommended Mitigation:** To reduce impacts to less-than-significant, the driveway and retaining wall should be sited to avoid as many trees as possible and pushed as far from Sorich Creek and surrounding riparian area as possible.
As designed, CDFW will require a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA), pursuant to Fish and Game Code §§ 1600 et. seq. for Project-related activities within any 1600-jurisdictional waters within the proposed Project area. Notification is required for any activity that will substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow; change or use material from the bed, channel, or bank including associated riparian or wetland resources; or deposit or dispose of material where it may pass into a river, lake or stream. Work within ephemeral streams, washes, watercourses with a subsurface flow, and floodplains are subject to notification requirements. CDFW, as a Responsible Agency under CEQA, will consider the CEQA document for the Project. CDFW may not execute the final LSAA until it has complied with CEQA (Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq.) as the responsible agency.

Please contact myself or Deborah Waller if you have any additional questions.

Thanks in advance, Karen

Karen Weiss
North Bay Supervisor
Thank you for sending the Geotechnical report. I am concerned that it does not appear that they reviewed the regional mapping by Rice, Smith and Strand (Geology for Planning: Central and Southeast Marin County, 1976). Unfortunately, our copy of that map has vanished, so I can’t see if there is anything noted for this area. There was a slide relatively recently in the area of 240-256 Los Angeles. Our public works engineer believes the slides are common in the area, but not very significant in scale.

-Elise

Elise H. Semonian
Planning Director
(415) 258-4636
esemonian@townofsananselmo.org

Hi Elise,

Yes, please see the attached Geotechnical report as you requested. Yes, the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria requested and received an AB52 consultation on this project. The results are documented in the Tribal Cultural Resources section of the initial study. If you have further questions, please let me know.

Thank you,

Tammy Taylor
PLANNER
County of Marin
Community Development Agency
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 308
San Rafael, CA 94903
415 473 7873 T
415 473 7880 F
CRS Dial 711
ttaylor@marincounty.org

From: esemonian@townofsananselmo.org <esemonian@townofsananselmo.org>
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2018 11:03 AM
To: Taylor, Tammy <TTaylor@marincounty.org>
Subject: Los Angeles Ave neg dec
Elise Semonian would like information about:
Thanks, Elise Semonian Town of San Anselmo
Email Disclaimer: https://www.marincounty.org/main/disclaimers
Taylor, Tammy

From: Elise Semonian <esemonian@townofsananselmo.org>
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2018 12:22 PM
To: Taylor, Tammy
Subject: RE: Los Angeles Ave neg dec
Attachments: OFR_76-02_Plate1B Rice Map.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I knew I had a pdf of it somewhere. Here's the map, in case they want to consider the debris flow/slump/landsliding references in the area.
-Elise

From: Taylor, Tammy <TTaylor@marincounty.org>
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2018 12:07 PM
To: Elise Semonian <esemonian@townofsananselmo.org>
Subject: RE: Los Angeles Ave neg dec

Thank you Elise. I will take these comments under consideration and also forward them on to the applicant.

Thank you,

Tammy Taylor
PLANNER

County of Marin
Community Development Agency
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 308
San Rafael, CA 94903
415 473 7873 T
415 473 7880 F
CRS Dial 711
ttaylor@marincounty.org

From: Elise Semonian <esemonian@townofsananselmo.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2018 5:40 PM
To: Taylor, Tammy <TTaylor@marincounty.org>
Subject: RE: Los Angeles Ave neg dec

Thank you for sending the Geotechnical report. I am concerned that it does not appear that they reviewed the regional mapping by Rice, Smith and Strand (Geology for Planning: Central and Southeast Marin County, 1976). Unfortunately, our copy of that map has vanished, so I can't see if there is anything noted for this area. There was a slide relatively recently in the area of 240-256 Los Angeles. Our public works engineer believes the slides are common in the area, but not very significant in scale.

-Elise

Elise H. Semonian
Planning Director
(415) 258-4636
esemonian@townofsananselmo.org
From: Taylor, Tammy <TTaylor@marincounty.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 2:52 PM
To: Elise Semonian <esemonian@townofsananselmo.org>
Subject: RE: Los Angeles Ave neg dec

Hi Elise,

Yes, please see the attached Geotechnical report as you requested. Yes, the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria requested and received an AB52 consultation on this project. The results are documented in the Tribal Cultural Resources section of the initial study. If you have further questions, please let me know.

Thank you,

Tammy Taylor
PLANNER

County of Marin
Community Development Agency
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 308
San Rafael, CA 94903
415 473 7873 T
415 473 7880 F
CRS Dial 711
ttaylor@marincounty.org

From: esemonian@townofsananselmo.org <esemonian@townofsananselmo.org>
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2018 11:03 AM
To: Taylor, Tammy <TTaylor@marincounty.org>
Subject: Los Angeles Ave neg dec

Elise Semonian would like information about:
Hello, Could we receive a scan of the: Miller Pacific Engineering. 2016. Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Single-Family Residence and Private Vehicular Bridge, 308 Los Angeles Boulevard, San Anselmo, California. Prepared for Mela Construction Company. May 5, 2016 I’m also curious if the native americans requested consultation about the project. Thanks, Elise Semonian Town of San Anselmo
Email Disclaimer: https://www.marincounty.org/main/disclaimers
Email Disclaimer: https://www.marincounty.org/main/disclaimers
Hello Rachel,

Regarding the Rogers proposal for a 4,000 square foot home at 308 Los Angeles Blvd. my neighbors and I have serious objections regarding the subsequently significant impact to the following:

Added traffic to Sacramento Ave.
Damage to riparian area on both sides of creek.
Wildlife corridor providing access from creek to ridge.

Proposed home is too large and out of character with existing homes in the neighborhood.
(Proposed home is approx. 4,000 square feet. 25 closest homes to the proposed home average 1,600 square feet.)
There are several heritage oaks on that driveway, in addition to numerous other grandfather trees on the property that would be destroyed.
I object 100% to this development as the damage to this environment and neighborhood would be significant.
Taylor, Tammy

From: Rachael Adler <rachaeladler@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 12:04 AM
To: EnvPlanning
Subject: Strong Objection

Hello Rachel,

Regarding the Rogers proposal for a 4,000 square foot home at 308 Los Angeles Blvd, my neighbors and I have serious objections regarding the subsequently significant impact to the following:

- Added traffic to Sacramento Ave.
- Damage to riparian area on both sides of creek.
- Wildlife corridor providing access from creek to ridge.

Proposed home is too large and out of character with existing homes in the neighborhood.
(Proposed home is approx. 4,000 square feet. 25 closest homes to the proposed home average 1,600 square feet.)
There are several heritage oaks on that driveway, in addition to numerous other grandfather trees on the property that would be destroyed.

I object 100% to this development as the damage to this environment and neighborhood would be significant.

Respectfully,

Rachael Adler
415-819-6522
Dear Tammy Taylor,

We have the following concerns or objections to the project.

1. I object to the removal of 17 heritage trees.
2. I object to the Damage to the creek and the riparian areas adjacent to the creek and Adverse effects on wildlife.
3. The steep slope is not conducive to building and may be susceptible to landslides.
4. A search needs to be conducted for more Indian artifacts on this property.

5. Access.
   The very narrow driveway is not adequately supported for increased traffic or construction.
   There exists a swimming pool just a few feet from the driveway.

6. the planned bridge is too large and environmentally impactful.

7. The adjacent property owner plans on developing 6 new homes, all of which will be accessed via Sacramento Ave. Those 6 homes, plus this very large home, will place an undue burden on Sacramento Ave.

8. The proposed home is 4,306 square feet, The average area of the 25 closest homes is 1,610 square feet. This excessive size would be out of character with the neighborhood homes.

thank you
steve schreibman
404 san francisco blvd
san anselmo 94960
Dear Tammy Taylor / County of Marin

I am a resident of the Sorich Park Neighborhood at the end of San Francisco Blvd in unincorporated San Anselmo, and have deep concerns about the Rogers Design Review and Tree Removal Permit at 308 Los Angeles Blvd.

I object to the removal of 17 heritage trees. 17!! That is just going too far. I really feel that this would never happen if this were a neighborhood occupied by wealthy individuals. It’s like a slap in the face. Seventeen trees? The design couldn’t have been modified in the slightest? The removal of one or two heritage trees is enough to kill some projects in Marin, I believe. I would prevail upon you to make these developers go back to the drawing board and come up with a design that spares most of these trees. The loss of one or two, I can fathom. Even three. Seventeen is just absurd. This is Marin!!

I do not support building on steep slopes like this. It is more environmentally destructive, and creates houses that are visible from far and wide. This is not the Hollywood Hills or Tiburon. I don’t know the exact details of the property, but a house on a steep incline is a bad idea.

The access road to this property was gravel a few years ago. When the house at the corner was developed, the developer put a thin coat of macadam down – transparently this was merely window dressing to be able to sell the house for a bit more. The road was clearly not re-engineered in any way. It isn’t up to the task of handling the heavy equipment necessary for the massive engineering project needed to create this monstrous monument to someone’s ego. The developer must take on the expense of building a road that meets the specs for heavy eqpt.

The house is more than twice as big as the average house in our neighborhood. How about cutting it down to twice as big? Is there no one who wants a 3200 square foot house? Too little room? Unlivable? Maybe the developer should take his/her plans to Ross or another part of San Anselmo where enormous homes are par for the course.

Please cancel or change this project. Do not cut down 17 old large trees. It will take decades to grow trees this majestic. Do not let this massive structure be built on a steep incline, on a crappy little road that was never meant to handle much of anything.

This is a bad idea for everyone but the developer, and the county which can collect a bunch of taxes from it. All at the cost of destroying so much, and altering this neighborhood for the worse.

Daniel Heller
357A San Francisco Blvd.
San Anselmo, CA 94960
Dear Tammy Taylor,

Re: Rogers Design Review and Tree Removal Permit at 308 Los Angeles Bv., San Anselmo.

We have the following concerns or objections to the project.

1. The removal of 17 heritage trees. The property is immediately adjacent to open space that our community has been trying to preserve for years. The loss of so many heritage trees will be a setback to those efforts.

2. Damage to the creek and the riparian areas adjacent to the creek.

3. Adverse effects on wildlife, particularly a colony of tiny bats that may be threatened. Other species include deer, raccoons, squirrels, coyotes, skunks, quail, turkeys, owls, red-tail hawks, snakes, and more. The frogs that formerly lived in the creek have already disappeared.

4. The steep slope is not conducive to building and may be susceptible to landslides.

5. Indian artifacts. At least three Indian artifacts have been discovered on the adjacent property. A search needs to be conducted for more artifacts on this property.

   The very narrow driveway that will serve the property has only a thin cover of asphalt that is not adequately supported; it is already cracking and will not support increased traffic or construction equipment.
   There exists a swimming pool just a few feet from the driveway.
   Two heritage trees above the driveway will inhibit trucks and machinery taller than 11 feet.
   The driveway will need to serve three properties, yet two vehicles going in opposite directions will not be able to pass each other.

7. Bridge.
   A. Must the bridge be so large and environmentally impactfull? The bridge on the adjacent property (Sacramento) is simply a very short culvert. It has been approved by the Fire Dept.
   B. Must there be both a temporary and a permanent bridge? Construction time and cost -- and impact on neighbors -- could be reduced by building a permanent bridge to begin with.

8. Traffic. The adjacent property owner is already developing 6 new homes, all of which will be accessed via Sacramento Ave. Those 6 homes, plus this very large home, will place an undue burden on Sacramento Ave.

9. Out of character with the neighborhood. I have surveyed the closest 25 residences to this property. The average area of the 25 closest homes is 1,610 square feet. The proposed home is 4,306 square feet, about 2.5 times the average area of all the other homes in the neighborhood.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>304 Los Angeles Bv.</td>
<td>2,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 Los Angeles Bv.</td>
<td>2,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Los Angeles Bv.</td>
<td>2,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295 Los Angeles Bv.</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283 Los Angeles Bv.</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281 Los Angeles Bv.</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 Los Angeles Bv.</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 Los Angeles Bv.</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275 Los Angeles Bv.</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273 Los Angeles Bv.</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348 San Francisco Bv.</td>
<td>1,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 San Francisco Bv.</td>
<td>2,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352 San Francisco Bv.</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354 San Francisco Bv.</td>
<td>1,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356 San Francisco Bv.</td>
<td>2,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Sacramento Ave.</td>
<td>5,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Sacramento Ave.</td>
<td>1,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Sacramento Ave.</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Sacramento Ave.</td>
<td>1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Sacramento Ave.</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Sacramento Ave.</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 San Francisco Bv.</td>
<td>2,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402A San Francisco Bv.</td>
<td>2,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 San Francisco Bv.</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Square Footage</td>
<td>40,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Square Footage: 1,610

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,

Michael Anderson  
Suellen Miller  
402 San Francisco Bv.  
San Anselmo, CA 94960  

415-454-8099
Dear Tammy,

This is an addendum to our email to you on Dec. 6, 2018.

1. I wonder if the folks who submitted the Rogers proposal are aware that there is a good deal of interest in the community in purchasing the property for open space. It would be a valuable addition to the local open space, help to preserve the character of the neighborhood, and preserve natural habitat for the many species that live and thrive from Sorich Creek up the hillside to the ridge.

2. The driveway. IF -- and this is only an "if" -- the project gains approval, I hope that you will require that any wear and tear, any damage, done to the existing driveway will be fully repaired by the developer.

Thank you,

Michael Anderson
Suellen Miller
402 San Francisco Bv.
San Anselmo, CA 94960
To: Rachel Reid, Environmental Planning Manager

I reside at 300 Los Angeles Blvd., San Anselmo, CA 94960 and I object to the Rogers' presented proposal. This plan is entirely too large for the site and would have too large an environmental impact on the neighbors, neighborhood, wildlife, creek, and natural habitat.

Specifically,
1. The proposed home is too large and out of character with existing homes in the neighborhood. Proposed home is approx. 4,000 square feet. 25 closest homes to the proposed home average 1,600 square feet. My home is approximately 2600 square feet and it seems large (I didn’t build it).
2. The proposed “bridge” over the creek seems problematic especially since the creek frequently overflows.
3. Impact, damage, erosion to riparian area on both sides of creek.
4. Added vehicular traffic to an otherwise quiet non-urban site
5. Wildlife frequents the creek and up to the ridge.
6. Negative impact on several heritage oak trees and other older trees that make our neighborhood special.

No one person’s home should affect the rest of our neighborhood in these ways.

Thank you for considering mine and my neighbors strong feelings against this current plan. They need to downsize!

Sincerely,

Ellen Karpay-Brody
300 Los Angeles Blvd.
San Anselmo, CA 94960

karpaybrodyellen@gmail.com
(415) 306-3605
Attached please find our comments.

Do you need a physical copy?

Regards,

Jerry

--

Jerome Draper, Draper Planning Group
Land Use and Environmental Planning Services
415 457-3431 opt-3  . www.draaperplangroup.com
Draper Planning Group  
11 Sacramento Avenue  
San Anselmo, Ca. 94960  
415 457-3431  
www.draperplangroup.com

December 11, 2018

Tammy Taylor  
County of Marin  
Community Development Agency  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 308  
San Rafael, CA 94903

Re: Rogers Design Review and Tree Removal Permit P1396 and P1821

Dear Tammy:

We have reviewed the Dudek Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the above referenced project in San Anselmo. We have the following comments:

In the habitat description section we see that Dudek describes the site in part as follows:

The Project site is surrounded by developed properties, although the site itself is undeveloped. There are two distinct vegetation community types within the Project site. The area bordering Sorich Creek is mixed willow series and riparian vegetation with corresponding habitat. Upland of the riparian habitat is a stand of coast live oak and other native tree species.

The Dudek report correctly states that the Sorich Creek is a riparian habitat and in the RMP zoning district this qualifies the property to be designated as a Streamside Conservation Area (SCA). The SCA setback requirement in an RMP district where the lot size is ½ to 2 acres is 50LF.


In the Dudek report we have the following comments:

Page 3, para 1: There are many observed patches of French broom in addition to Scotch broom.
Sorich Creek is riparian; not riverine. This is important because riparian vegetation one of the factors that defines a Streamside Conservation Area.

Page 19, Site plan: Showing top of bank and 20LF creek setback where 50LF is required because the property is within an SCA. It appears that the top of bank is not accurately shown on the plan set.

Page 23, Planting legend: buckeye is toxic to honeybees and should be avoided.

Page 27 - 1A: Should be significant as the project conflicts with designation of Sorich Creek as an SCA in the Countywide Plan because it meets the definition of an SCA.

Page 27 – 1B: Should be significant as the project adversely impacts riparian vegetation in the Sorich Creek SCA. The Balcerak Design report states that the property in not an SCA without providing any credible evidence. The Dudek report classifies the Sorich Creek habitat area as riparian which fits the definition of an SCA. The cantilevered parking area encroaches on the riparian creek habitat and, by eliminating all sun over the creek bank, adversely affects the plants and wildlife that depend on the riparian habitat for survival.

Page 28, para 1 – setback from northerly property line is six feet as depicted in plans and not twenty feet as specified in this paragraph. Twenty feet would be a more realistic setback that would allow for planting of trees to screen the proposed home.

Page 30, para 4 – The SCA in RMP zoning requires a 50LF setback from the top of bank and not the twenty feet noted in this paragraph. The delineated top of bank is not the actual top of bank and needs to be reassessed. Photos submitted to the Marin County CDA show survey stakes for the parking area are under water in a recent winter storm.

Page 34, Well Designed Housing and Page 35, para 3 - The proposed home is out of character with homes in the immediately area as it is two to three times larger than homes in the immediate area. The mass, bulk, and size of the proposed home does not fit into the context of the area.

Page 50, The Balcerak Design prepared Vegetation Assessment and Arborist Report is incomplete as to its assessment of riparian vegetation in the SCA.

Page 55 Riparian Habitat – The creek setback of twenty feet described in MCC 24.04.560 is not the applicable setback in this RMP zoning district. The applicable setback is 50LF for developments subject to the Streamside Conservation Area (SCA) such as this project.

Page 65, para 2: Given the significant size, bulk, and mass of the proposed home and the proximity to three adjacent homes there will be a significant impact to the views, light, and privacy of adjoining properties.

Page 66, para 1: Give its size, bulk, and mass there would be significant impact to the existing visual resources as the new residence is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The
proposed home would be directly on and projecting (cantilevered) over the creek bank with no screening from existing trees or vegetation so the new residence is not screened from view by neighbors.

Page 69, MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: a) The project does have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment because it is located directly on and is cantilevered over Sorich Creek and is within the Streamside Conservation Area.

Comments on the Balcerak Vegetation Assessment:

Page 3: The subject property consists of two vegetation community types: Coast Live Oak Alliance and Mixed Willow series. The riparian Mixed Willow series is a sensitive vegetation community with a S3 state ranking, indicating that there are only 21 to 100 viable occurrences statewide (Sawyer, et. al. 2009).

Here the report establishes that the Sorich Creek area is a sensitive riparian environment.

Page 4, para 4: Additionally Marin County regulates all natural watercourses shown as a solid or dashed blue lines, or along watercourses that support riparian vegetation for a length of 100' or more, under the Stream Conservation Area identified in the Marin Countywide Plan. The subject property is not a part of the Stream Conservation Area.

Here the report incorrectly states that the property is not part of the SCA after correctly stating that Sorich Creek is a sensitive riparian environment. The Dudek Initial Study peer review of the Balcerak report classifies Sorich Creek as a riparian habitat and not a riverine habitat.

Page 5, para 1: Marin County has established minimum setbacks from all drainage areas. The Marin County minimum creek setbacks are indicated in Figure 3, see Appendix A for more discussion.

This is in error as the SCA setback is 50LF.

Page 5, table: The 1,952 sq ft cantilevered driveway will adversely affect the riparian habitat by eliminating sunlight necessary for life on the bank of Sorich Creek. No building is allowed in an SCA.

Page 10, last para:
There are two distinct plant communities within the project area. The area bordering Sorich Creek is Mixed Willow Series (Barbour and Keeler-Wolf 2007). Upland of the riparian habitat is Coast Live Oak Alliance (Barbour and Keeler-Wolf 2007).

Here the report again establishes that the Sorich Creek area is a sensitive riparian environment.

Page 28: MARIN COUNTY DRAINAGE SETBACKS
The County of Marin has established Ordinance No. 3181 within the Marin County Development Code to establish setbacks from major waterways, specifically Section 24.04.560 which reads:
all structures shall be set back from creeks, channels or other major waterways at least twenty feet from the top of bank or twenty feet plus twice the channel depth measured from the toe of the near embankment, whichever is greater.

This paragraph ignores that the property is within the SCA and that no building is allowed withing the 50LF SCA.

In conclusion we believe that the proposed project bulk, mass, and size is out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. The entire proposed project is within the Streamside Conservation area where NO BUILDING IS ALLOWED.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the CEQA Initial Study.

Regards,

/s Jerry Draper

Jerry Draper
Planer
To: Tammy Taylor, Environmental Planning Officer

Re: Rogers Design Review and Tree Removal Permit at 308 Los Angeles Blvd., San Anselmo.

Dear Tammy Taylor,

Please give this proposal your in-depth consideration because it appears to be extremely disruptive due to the necessity of building access roads and bridges for the transit of the amount and scope of supplies needed for the structure, which is not at all in keeping with the surrounding established homes.

Thank you,
Nancy Lyle Bennett

--
Nancy Lyle Bennett
Feng Shui/Energy Worker
Pianist, We Three Trio
(415) 456-7989
Dear Tammy Taylor,

Re: Rogers Design Review and Tree Removal Permit at 308 Los Angeles Bv., San Anselmo.

I join many of my neighbors in expressing concerns about the proposed building at 308 Los Angeles Blvd. Certainly the removal of the heritage trees is of great concern. The threat of landslides during this era of bizarre weather and potential heavy rains is another concern. I live very close to this proposed area and am concerned about the width of the driveway currently serving the property. This building, which would not be in keeping with the sizes of the other buildings in the neighborhood, might also have an adverse effect on wild life in the area.

Warm Regards
Dr. Suellen Miller, Professor
Director, Safe Motherhood Programs
Dept. Obstetrics, Gynecology & Reproductive Sciences
Bixby Center for Global Reproductive Health and Policy
University of California, San Francisco (UCSF)
suellenmiller@gmail.com
suellen.miller@ucsf.edu

www.safemotherhood.ucsf.edu
Greetings Tammy Taylor,

I have lived just around the corner from the proposed site for 20+ years. I have been hiking these Open Space hills, with dogs and neighbors and friends almost twice a day. I have lived through and watched the traffic up and down San Francisco Blvd, Town of SA trucks, garbage/recycle trucks/fire trucks/ tree trimming machines.... all of the street construction, etc... move down this narrow end of SFB for many years.

I cannot understand the addition of such a structure, being added to this particular location. I note, that the size of the development is much larger than preceding "uninvasive" structures.

The destruction and forced death and relocation of the diverse wildlife in this untouched land— the devastation of local and native plants and trees, the beauty, the open spaces, for People, Deer, Native Animals, Hawks & Owls(Great Horned), fish ... would be a mistake beyond repair. It does not make any sense, to Marin’s Integrity to safeguard our natural gifts here -which is one of our greatest assets, to let this, (or any building proposal) to go through.

I join my neighbors, and many others, in expressing huge concern about this proposal- for the proposed site of "308 Los Angeles Blvd. San Anselmo".

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Briggs... I am behind the comments from the following neighbors:

Brian Crawford, Nancy Bennett, Michael Anderson, & Suellen Miller...
Comment regarding the Rogers Design Review and Tree Removal Permit Mitigated Negative Declaration (P1821)

Ms. Taylor,

I am writing in opposition to this proposed development. I am a member of the San Anselmo Open Space Committee, but I am commenting as an individual.

When our Committee was formed more than 30 years ago, one of our first tasks was to create an inventory of properties in and around San Anselmo that we hoped to save from development. The parcel in question has been high on that list from the very beginning, for a number of very good reasons. First, it is a highly-visible hillside that can be seen from many hundreds of homes throughout the Sorich Valley (including mine). Second, it serves as a wildlife corridor between the conservation easement on the adjoining Draper property to the north and private undeveloped lands to the south. Third, it contains a section of Sorich Creek, long considered a prime candidate for “daylighting” to improve water quality for salmonids in San Anselmo Creek. For all these reasons, the Committee selected this property to be preserved. For the same reasons, I oppose this development.

If the parcel had been within the Town Limits, the owner would have had to appear before our Committee before proceeding with any development plans, and we would have exerted every effort to purchase the property or, failing that, to severely limit any development. Since it is outside the Town Limits, the Committee has no jurisdiction. But we have studied Ms. Rogers’ development plan with great concern, as it will be the first segment of the beautiful Memorial Ridge to be lost to development. If it is destroyed, the other private parcels are sure to follow and the whole untouched ridge will become another bank of big houses. Another property on Los Angeles Boulevard is already on the market. The Committee is currently building a new open space trail, the Memorial Ridge Trail, immediately adjacent to the Rogers property, and part of its charm and value to the community is the views of unspoiled land on both sides of the ridge. This development would ruin that.

The construction of a massive bridge, the cutting down of over a dozen heritage trees, and the disruption of the sensitive riparian environment along the creek are also serious concerns. The mitigated negative declaration says planting a few saplings will make up for the loss of the old heritage trees, but it will not, nor will bulldozing and landscaping a new bank restore the creek to its natural state.

Thank you for taking my comment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

RECEIVED
DEC 11 2018
COUNTY OF MARIN
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
PLANNING DIVISION

Brian Crawford
72 Oakland Avenue
San Anselmo CA
415-407-5776
Dear Ms. Taylor,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Cecily Rogers proposal at 308 Los Angeles Blvd., San Anselmo.

I live next door at 304 Los Angeles Blvd.

I have the following objections to the proposal:

1. There is a colony of rare, small bats that live on the property. I think it needs to be established whether they are endangered and whether the development will harm them and their habitat.

2. Encroachment on Sorich Creek is not acceptable. I support Jerry Draper’s objection that the home needs to be 50 feet — not 20 feet — from the creek.

3. Bridge. The proposed bridge is too big. The bridge on the adjacent property (Jerry Draper’s) is simply a covered culvert and has been approved by the County and the local fire department. I see no reason why two bridges need to be built, one temporary and one permanent.

4. Trees. Destroying 17 heritage trees is unacceptable.

5. Access. There is no reasonable access to the property for large construction vehicles — only a narrow, lightly paved driveway. If the project is approved, there MUST BE a guarantee that the builders will return the driveway to its pre-construction condition.

6. Out of character with the neighborhood. The proposed home is too large to fit in with the existing community of homes. It should be reduced in size.

Sincerely,

Lynne Nance
304 Los Angeles Blvd.
San Anselmo, CA 94960

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Ms. Taylor,

Regarding the Cecily Rogers building proposal at 308 Los Angeles Blvd., San Anselmo:

I have been reluctant over the years to mess with others when they want to use their land, and rather appreciate when others with land around me don’t mess with me.

I must say the County, at times, appears to give in to the folks who continually say they can't afford to follow the initial requirements set forth by the County, all the time having more money than most to do whatever they want, whenever they want, to whomever they want.

When Eli Cohen built the home behind my house, he was supposed to install a separate 12-inch storm drainage pipe to the Sorich Creek. The requirement was to install a 12-inch drainage line for future development of the lot Cohen purchased a few years ago after Don and Lynne Nance built their home maybe 18 years ago. When Don and Lynne built they were working with the same County inspector / engineer that Eli Cohen did when he developed the lot a few years ago. The Nances were told by that County Engineer that the lot that was at that time owned by the Nance estate, when developed, would be required to install a separate 12-inch drainage line. Cohen, after breaking ground and after he purchased the lot, talked the County out of it. Cohen also promised that he was going to not sell the house and he personally was going to live there. Cohen had the place sold before it was even completed. Cohen worked the County and pretty much did whatever he wanted. The County let Cohen off the hook on installing the 12-inch separate drainage line. It is my understanding that Cohen couldn’t afford it and the County let Cohen Engineer Mr. Fain (a former County of Marin Engineer with his own private practice) arbitrarily designed his drawings to connect the drain for Cohen to the 10-inch drain I installed in 1998...without my permission initially. I eventually let them tie their sub-standard drainage system to the drain I put in. The drain Mr. Fain designed is too shallow and constructed poorly. I will never forget the lies Cohen said to me and how the County gave into him on the drain...it was shameful. The County is not paying attention to the details when projects move forward either. I anticipate the County will still operate with the same poor coverage on this project.

How can the County not protect the heritage trees, the bats, the creek and the fact that Sorich Creek could become salmonid again some day with the appropriate creek riparian stewardship? See the recent news regarding the return of Chinook Salmon in the Silicon Valley: https://kCBSradio.radio.com/blogs/matt-bigler/chinook-salmon-return-los-gatos-creek-after-extensive-cleanup. It’s a great success story.

The Neg Dec calls for allowing sapling trees in lieu of protecting the live oaks and white oaks and other indigenous species. What are we supposed to look forward to? The trees we enjoy now are already well rooted and well established. It will be pretty tough to enjoy those saplings when they mature because we will all be pushing up daises in the afterlife. And we are not the only animals that are affected by cutting down these trees: deer, squirrels (albeit
mostly red squirrels now, not indigenous grey squirrels), bobcats, cougar, quail, turkey, raptors, raccoons, fox, coyotes, gopher snakes, California king snakes, ring-necked snakes, stinging snakes, garter snakes, rattlesnakes, alligator lizards, skinks, and blue belly snakes will all be impacted.

And what about the willows? We have a very sensitive balancing act going on with them too. Ruin their habitat in the Sorich Creek and look forward to a denser population of mosquitoes and fewer, if any, predators, due to the very real possibility that we will lose our bat population.

I would appreciate it if the County would respect the fact that building undersized drainage pipes that channelize storm water and creek flows under roadways create challenges to the local environment and property owners. Such is the case just west of the proposed construction site at 308 Los Angeles Blvd in the Sorich Creek riparian zone where an undersized dilapidating corrugated metal pipe has been in service for decades. Corrugated steel metal pipes (aka CMP) have an engineered service life of approximately 10 years. The 308 Los Angeles proposal should be required to address that major issue too. The County of Marin maintains thousands of CMP storm drainage pipes still in service ... barely ... that have been in place for decades longer than their engineered service life. The CMP just south of the proposed construction project at 308 Los Angeles Blvd tends to bottleneck the Sorich Creek during heavy run-off conditions during storms; then volunteers / neighbors clear it if they can. I know, because I am one of the neighbors who has had to clear the blockage with no help from the County, City or Special District...because we live in the unincorporated part of San Anselmo. I call it the Baja region of San Anselmo, where I am sure the County does not pay much attention until they get plan set submittals for development, and their coverage is limited, to say the least; and all too often the County provides very little oversight of the actual project from shovel-ready to completion, from what I have seen over the last 45 years.

These are just some of my thoughts.

Thank you,

Patrick A. Guasco
348 San Francisco Blvd
San Anselmo, CA 94965-1639
415-453-1020 hm
415-987-1476 cell
guasco@pacbell.net

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone
Dear Tammy Taylor,

Re: Rogers Design Review and Tree Removal Permit at 308 Los Angeles Bv., San Anselmo.

I am writing in relation to the above permit request. We have the following concerns or objections to the project in order of priority. I have been working with various neighbors in considering this proposal, so you will see commonality in language and concerns however given we live at 302 Los Angeles Blvd, with 3 children, this development will have very direct and immediate impacts to us.

1. Access & maintenance:
   a. The very narrow driveway that will serve the property has only a thin cover of asphalt that is not adequately supported and was installed AFTER the latest home construction at 302 Los Angeles; it is already cracking and will very likely significantly deteriorate with daily heavy construction vehicles and increased traffic. If this project moves forward, there must be a clear and verifiable requirement for the owner to both repair and reinforce this driveway both during and after the project.
   b. There are two heritage trees above the driveway will inhibit trucks and machinery taller than 11 feet. These are very old but sturdy trees that provide aesthetic value as well as natural diversity to the area. We are very much against these being removed or damaged.
   c. The driveway will need to serve three properties, yet two vehicles going in opposite directions will not be able to pass each other.

2. The bridge:
   a. Must the bridge be so large and environmentally impactful? The bridge on the adjacent property (11 Sacramento) is simply a very short culvert. It has been approved by the Fire Dept.
   b. Must there be both a temporary and a permanent bridge? Construction time and cost -- and impact on us -- could be reduced by building a permanent bridge to begin with.

3. Traffic: The adjacent property owner is already developing 6 new homes, all of which will be accessed via Sacramento Ave. Those 6 homes, plus this very large home, will place an undue burden on Sacramento Ave.

4. The steep slope is not conducive to building and may be susceptible to landslides.

5. Damage to the creek and the riparian areas adjacent to the creek.

Thank you for taking in our considerations.

Regards

Thomas E Benham 917 330 8170