August 19, 2021

Delivered by email

Planning Commission County of Marin
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 308
San Rafael, CA 94903
planningcommission@marincounty.org

Re: Opposition to Sasan Site Plan Review (P3073)

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

We believe satisfying Site Plan Review requirements is at the heart of any successful development proposal for this site and warrants careful consideration. Site Plan Review requirements are designed so “the natural heritage and beauty of the County will be preserved and adverse physical effects which might otherwise result from unplanned or inappropriate development, design, or placement are minimized or eliminated” (MCDC Section 22.52.10). [Emphasis added].

In 2017, we reached out to the applicants to propose a lower impact building location, closer to the developed end of Sacramento avenue and at a lower elevation [below the public right-of-way] that greatly reduces the amount of grading required for road construction and diminishes the visual impact to neighboring homes. Better siting of the home lower on the hillside avoids forcing it into unstable areas of the property in very close proximity to protected native trees and streams. Unfortunately, the applicants continue to propose development on the steepest, most exposed area of the lot, at the most distant point from the developed end of Sacramento Avenue, and in close proximity to a cluster of protected native trees. Figure 1 provides an overview of the site.
Table 1: Comparison of Environmental Impacts Associated with Each Building Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOME</th>
<th>PROPOSED LOCATION</th>
<th>LOWER IMPACT LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Review (MCDC)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds ground disturbance to a minimum? (22.52.020)</td>
<td>This project calls for excavating 1,248 cubic yards of soil to depths in excess of 15 feet, installing 12,148 sq. ft. of impervious surfaces and disturbing an additional 14,293 sq. foot area. In comparison, the nearby 2002 Pedersen project constructed two houses (171 and 179 Sacramento Ave) and extended the road 350 ft, yet it involved much less excavation (725 cubic yards) on a similarly steep lot.</td>
<td>By reducing the length of the road extension/driveway, a much greater area of the site can be left in its natural state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIRED OUTCOME</td>
<td>PROPOSED LOCATION</td>
<td>LOWER IMPACT LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Provides adequate landscaping, especially if substantial ground disturbance is entailed? (22.52.020) | No  
Plans only call for adding 3-24" planter boxes around the base of the fire truck turnaround even though substantial ground disturbance is entailed. | Yes  
This location makes use of existing vegetation to screen the house, sited lower on the hillside. |
| Discretionary Design Standards                                                                                                         |                                                                                  |
| Minimizes driveway length consistent with the clustering requirement? (22.16.030-C2)                                               | No  
This project involves constructing a 185 foot long driveway plus a 136 foot extension of Sacramento Ave (321 feet in total) across an unstable and very steep hillside (45% slope). | Yes  
The driveway length can be minimized consistent with the clustering requirement by locating the project closer to the developed end of Sacramento Avenue. |
| Clusters structures in the most accessible, least visually prominent and most geologically stable portions of the site...consistent with needs for privacy? (22.16.030-D1) | No  
The project is located on the highest, steepest and most exposed area, the farthest distance from the developed end of Sacramento Avenue. The imposing house faces directly into homes along Miwok Drive, disregarding needs for privacy. | Yes  
This location is much closer to the developed end of Sacramento Avenue, in the least visually prominent area, shielded by existing vegetation to minimize impacts to views across the open hillside and neighbors’ privacy. A house in this location would be oriented towards views of Mt. Tam rather that towards private residences along Miwok Dr. and is more consistent with the orientation of neighboring properties along Sacramento Avenue. |
| Minimizes the prominence of construction by placing buildings so that they will be screened by existing vegetation or depressions in topography? (22.16.030-D1) | No  
The project is located on the most visually prominent, steepest, highest elevation of the site where existing vegetation offers little screening. | Yes  
This location is at a lower elevation on a more gently sloped plateau. Existing vegetation is better able to screen this project by locating it lower on the hillside. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOME</th>
<th>PROPOSED LOCATION</th>
<th>LOWER IMPACT LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holds grading to a minimum and makes every reasonable effort to retain the natural features of the land? (22.16.030-J1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Although the applicants state that grading has been reduced as compared to the 2020 project, the level of grading is still higher than it was in 2018 when the Board of Supervisor commented that 1,000 cubic feet of grading associated with an earlier proposal was excessive.¹</td>
<td>By locating the project closer to the developed end of Sacramento Avenue and taking advantage of less steep areas of the lot, less grading is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids significant erosion and minimizes impervious surfaces? (22.16.030-J2)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project requires installing 12,148 sq. ft. of impervious surfaces that will significantly increase rainwater runoff on the very steep and unstable hillside that drains into protected streams. The road/driveway extension accounts for 66% of these impervious surfaces.</td>
<td>Locating the project closer to the developed end of Sacramento Avenue allows impervious surfaces to be reduced significantly by shortening the road extension/driveway and associated retaining walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes every effort to avoid construction that would cause the death of existing trees? (22.16.030-J3)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Although the applicants are not removing any trees immediately, they are putting the health of four protected trees in peril by forcing their project in close proximity to the few trees that are growing on the open hillside.</td>
<td>Unfortunately, the Oregon oak tree growing at the southern end of the lot is unhealthy, as evidenced by notable dieback and unhealthy trunk (Attachment 2). Even so, there is ample space to build a house and avoid this tree. Given that a 100’ drainage spreader will be installed immediately uphill of this already sick tree, it is unlikely to survive long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIRED OUTCOME</td>
<td>PROPOSED LOCATION</td>
<td>LOWER IMPACT LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids geologic hazard areas, such as slides? (22.16.030-J5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015 project plans label this area of the lot as “Ground eroded and unstable” (Attachment 3). Using MarinMap, we calculate the slope in this building location to be 55%. The Dept of Public Works review states that no current geotechnical report was submitted.</td>
<td>This site takes advantage of a less steep area of the lot (Attachment 4) while avoiding eroded and unstable areas. Using MarinMap we calculate the slope in this area to be 35%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Countywide Plan (CWP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves paper streets? (TRL-1.5)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed fire truck turnaround and associated 6 ft. high retaining walls will block public access to the Sacramento Avenue right-of-way. It is a stretch for the applicants to claim that a stairway right at the front entrance of a private residence improves public access.</td>
<td>At-grade access along the undeveloped portion of Sacramento Ave can be preserved with thoughtful placement of a single house and fire truck turnaround.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protects sensitive natural communities, and important wildlife nursery areas and movement corridors? (BIO-1.1 and BIO-2.4)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Installation of 12,138 sq ft of impervious surfaces and extensive grading over a steep slope will impact stream water quality and wildlife access to riparian areas. Spreaders will discharge water in the immediate vicinity of two protected oaks, likely killing them.</td>
<td>Impacts to the surrounding sensitive environment can be greatly reduced with fewer retaining walls, less impervious surfaces, less grading and less impacts to stream habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIRED OUTCOME</td>
<td>PROPOSED LOCATION</td>
<td>LOWER IMPACT LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves visual quality and protects public views?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DES-4.1 and DES-4.a)</td>
<td>The proposed location of the house on the most exposed area of the lot makes it highly visible from the surrounding neighborhood. The extensive network of concrete retaining walls is obtrusive on the open hillside and contrary to the semi-rural feel of the neighborhood.</td>
<td>Relocating the project lower on the hillside reduces visual impacts and takes advantage of existing trees to shield the house. Public views across the open hillside are less impacted and the house would screen the driveway/road. Placement of a house lower on the hillside is consistent with neighboring residences on Sacramento Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulates mass and scale?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DES-4.c)?</td>
<td>The extensive system of retaining walls up to 6 feet tall, massive fire truck turnaround, and 321 foot long driveway/road extension magnify the mass and scale of the project on the open hillside.</td>
<td>The mass and scale of the project can be significantly reduced by minimizing the retaining walls, shortening the driveway and road extension, and locating the project lower on the hillside to use existing vegetation as a screen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 **Grading.** The amount of grading proposed is one of the most environmentally damaging aspects of this project and should be considered carefully given the proximity to protected creeks and 45% slope. Although the applicants state that grading has been reduced as compared to the 2020 project, the level of grading is still **higher** than it was in 2018 when the Board of Supervisor commented: “The amount of grading necessary to construct the driveway, turnout and residence would exceed 1,000 cubic yards of grading...Less grading and reforming of the natural terrain would be necessary if the home were moved in a southwesterly direction, closer to the paved edge of Sacramento Avenue. This finding [that the proposed development will minimize cut and fill and the reforming of the natural terrain] cannot be made for the project as it is currently proposed because the project would require excessive grading as discussed above” (Resolution No. 2018-50, p.5).
Berkeleyside
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Contractor mistake damages lone redwood tree at library

By Frances Dinkelspiel, Oct. 11, 2012, 9 a.m.

The redwood tree at the West Branch of the Berkeley Library that will have to be taken down. Photo: Frances Dinkelspiel

A towering redwood tree that was to be the focal point of the garden at the new West Branch of the Berkeley Public Library was so damaged by the contractor that it will have to be taken down, library officials announced Tuesday.

The contractor will be removing the tree — which looks about 70 feet high — within the next few days, and will have to pay for the damage, said Corbeil. The Library Board discussed the issue Tuesday night and will address what kind of tree will replace the redwood when it considers the landscaping plan Nov. 14.

The news that the redwood tree would soon be cut down came as a shock to neighbors, who were already upset that the library project at 1125 University Ave. had entailed the cutting of five other redwood trees.

“It’s really shocking,” said Chaim Mahgel, whose family lives right next door to the library. He also owns Afikomen Judaica on Claremont Avenue. “It’s totally unbelievable. How many stands of redwood trees does a city have? You can’t just go out and plant more and expect them to grow back in 10 years.”

Nell Mahgel-Friedman said that the back of their apartment used to look out on a shady redwood grove. “While there is more light now, there is also much more noise from University and San Pablo Avenues.

“The trees created a certain protection there, a quiet zone,” said Mahgel-Friedman. “With the redwood trees taken down it will be a changed experience.”

She doesn’t understand why the library could not have worked to preserve the redwood grove.

“What is most infuriating to me is why plans were made to build the library in a way that killed these trees,” said Mahgel-Friedman. “The small redwood grove that grew on the library grounds was a crown of the neighborhood, a small natural hidden gem in the midst

stability exist. The roots served a vital function that cannot be restored by any other means.”

The contract with West Bay Builders required the company to take precautions to preserve the root structure of the redwood, but those measures were not followed, according to a letter Donna Corbeil, director of library services, sent out to neighbors. The contractor damaged the roots while excavating around the tree.

Dan Gallagher, the city's forestry engineer, recently examined the tree's roots and determined that they were so damaged that the tree is unstable and unhealthy.

“The result of severing those important roots is that the tree's anchorage and stability has been compromised,” Gallagher was quoted as saying in the letter. “No reasonable alternatives to re-establishing the tree's
of the urbanity and concrete. The library could have treasured this gift and adopted plans that protected and respected the trees, not sacrificed them for extra square footage.”

The library held numerous meetings with neighbors to talk about the library design, said Corbeil. The Mahgels did not attend, they said, which is why they were so surprised when the first redwood trees were cut down.

The library had intended to make the large redwood the centerpiece of a garden that could be seen from inside the library. The plan was to add native plants around the tree. Corbeil said the library will try to plant a mature tree in the redwood’s place. She does not anticipate there will be any delays in the construction of the new branch library. The branch at University Avenue shut down in May. The new building should be completed by the summer of 2013. Total construction costs, not including furniture and fixtures, are $7.5 million and are being paid through bonds authorized by Berkeley voters.

Read Donna Corbeil’s letter to neighbors.

Would you like a digest of the day’s Berkeley news in your inbox at the end of your day? Click here to subscribe to Berkeleyside’s free email Daily Briefing.

Frances Dinkelspiel is co-founder and executive editor of Berkeleyside. Email: frances@citysidejournalism.org.
ATTACHMENT 2
Large Oregon Oak Trees – one is healthy and the other is sick

Healthy Oregon oak tree growing in very close proximity to proposed building site.

Unhealthy Oregon oak tree growing in close proximity to lower impact building site.

The canopy of the unhealthy oak has been drawn larger than the healthy oak’s to give the impression there is less space for a house below the public right-of-way and more in the proposed location. This is not accurate.
ATTACHMENT 3
Northern area of the site is eroded and unstable

2015 Site Plans submitted by the applicants for a previous proposal indicate the northeast area of the site is eroded and unstable.
ATTACHMENT 4
Site Slope Map

Source: LSA Associates BSA, 10/17/19
Kathleen,

Attached are our comments on the Sasan Site Plan Review (P3073) for the Planning Commision hearing on August 23rd. As stated, this document supplements our original letter on file, dated May 21, 2021.

Please confirm receipt of this correspondence.

Thank you,
Brandon and Melissa Sullivan
August 19, 2021

Marin County Planning Commission
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 308
San Rafael, CA 94903
planningcommission@marincounty.org

RE: Sasan Site Plan Review, P3073

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

We are writing to express our concerns with the development proposal “Sasan Site Plan Review P3073” at Sacramento Avenue in San Anselmo and the June 28, 2021 approval of this project by the Community Development Agency, Planning Division. In the interest of time, this letter is meant to serve as a supplement to our original correspondence, dated May 21, 2021, submitted during the initial review of this project.

In summary, this application must be denied based on the following:

- The project fails to meet several standards of Site Plan Review, which includes guidelines within the Marin Countywide Plan and the Development Code’s Discretionary Development Standards.

- The applicant is proposing to site the home within a Stream Conservation Area recommended to extend from the edge of the riparian canopy.

- The project misrepresents the protected trees and associated protection zones located on and near the site. In doing so the development encroaches on the tree protection zones of the protected trees.
• Several site constraints and environmental factors associated with the proposal necessitate a comprehensive, independent review and should be subject to a CEQA Initial Study.

• The developer’s long term plan for the entire property manipulates the Development Code.

SITE PLAN REVIEW STANDARDS

Site Plan Review was created as an alternative to Design Review in order to afford Planning Staff the opportunity to focus a review on the fundamental impacts, namely environmental, imposed by prospective development.

The standards provided under Site Plan Review by the Development Code and the Marin Countywide Plan have not been adequately achieved to warrant approval of this project. To be clear this proposal does not fail to meet one or two isolated standards, it fails to address a majority of these required standards. Our original letter to the Planning Division, dated May 21, 2021, provides a detailed list and description of this project’s shortcomings in this area.

These standards are in place and clearly articulated for a reason: to address irresponsible proposals of this nature. Unfortunately, to date Planning Staff has chosen approval in lieu of implementing these standards accordingly. Why have these standards and guidelines in place if Planning Staff is not going to enforce them and instead defer to the applicant?

As we have presented in detail on several occasions, an alternative, more appropriate site exists on this property below the Sacramento Avenue right-of-way. This site represents a significantly more responsible development location, consistent with Development Code and Marin Countywide Plan standards. Furthermore, the site we have proposed mitigates or alleviates every concern and shortcoming of the current proposal while allowing the applicant to build a comparable and potentially larger home.

STREAM CONSERVATION AREA

To date three biologists have provided assessments of the mapped streams surrounding the project site:


2. Following the Planning Commission hearing on July 20, 2020 we reached out to Wetlands Research Associates (WRA) of San Rafael to conduct a review of the LSA bioassessment and assess the streams on the property.
3. Similarly, the applicant hired Bernhard Warzecha of First Carbon Solutions in Walnut Creek (FCS). It is noteworthy that prior to FCS, Mr. Warzecha was a Senior Biologist at LSA Associates.

In 2019, LSA directed a Stream Conservation Area along the western boundary of 50 feet from the riparian canopy edge while ignoring the significance of the mapped northern streams. In the current proposal both WRA and FCS agree that the mapped northern streams are significant and worthy of SCA protection. Consistent with the initial review from LSA the report from WRA directs a 50’ setback from the riparian canopy on both the western and northern boundaries due to stream classification and the extreme slope associated with the property. Not only has FCS recommended a reduced setback from the top of bank, contrary to the other two biologists and accepted by Planning Staff, but a recent rebuttal questions the scientific merit of WRA’s report and SCA recommendation.

First, WRA is a highly regarded environmental consulting firm located in San Rafael with an exhaustive background in providing bioassessments throughout Marin. Secondly, amongst the three, Phil Greer is the only biologist certified as a Professional Wetlands Scientist. Finally, despite what FCS may label as “arbitrary” and “unsubstantiated” there is considerable scientific evidence to support Mr. Greer’s claims and recommendations for an extended setback from the riparian canopy edge given the site’s extreme slope and instability.

PROTECTED TREES AND TREE PROTECTION ZONES

Several protected trees have been identified on or near the project site. As such, these trees require dedicated tree protection zones (TPZ) in order to preserve them during the course of construction. Unfortunately the applicant has not provided a reliable and consistent determination or delineation of the TPZ necessary to justify development at the proposed site. In fact, it is evident that the proposal encroaches significantly on the protected trees in question.

From the onset it must be noted that the arborist report provided is dated February 13, 2019. Thus at best every tree diameter presented and TPZ determination is not reliable as the trees have grown significantly since last assessed. Furthermore, several of the maps on file lack tree measurements or provide measurements from the original survey and plans back in 2015.

Initially, the LSA bioassessment from October 17, 2019 made an attempt to determine TPZ for the large oak just above the proposed site:

“Under the County’s Native Tree Preservation and Protection Ordinance, the large Oregon oak (32.4 inches DBH)...The tree protection zone shown on the Project Plans was calculated as 1 foot diameter per inch of trunk diameter DBH (i.e., 32.4 feet.)”

While the biologist provided a TPZ determination based on trunk diameter, his TPZ fell short of the County’s actual TPZ calculation:
“a radius surrounding the tree of one foot for each inch diameter at breast height (4.5 feet above grade) of the tree trunk”

Thus the TPZ provided by the LSA biologist and the basis for the applicant's proposals represent half the distance mandated (16.2 feet from the trunk versus 32.4 feet in this example). Keep in mind not only is the TPZ in this example grossly underestimated, this is only one of three tree protection zones required in this overly constrained building site. Furthermore, the protected trees have grown significantly since last assessed in 2019. This Oregon oak likely requires protection of 36 feet minimum from the trunk while the coast live oak located at the entry to the home, a TPZ of 12-13 feet from the trunk.

Evidently the applicant was not satisfied with the County’s recommendation for TPZ determinations. It appears now that the applicant has resorted to drawing arbitrary protection zones around the trees. In fact the shapes surrounding the trees are not even consistent from one drawing to the next throughout the plans.

Finally, as evidenced by the placement of stakes outlining the project footprint at the site, the development clearly encroaches into the drip lines of these trees at a minimum and would fall well within the County’s TPZ calculation based on DPH.

APPLICANT’S LONG TERM PLAN

As outlined above, approval of this project represents a complete failure to enforce the Development Code and Marin Countywide Plan. Furthermore approval is facilitating the applicants’ overriding objective to circumvent and manipulate the Development Code in order to construct two homes on the property.

The developer’s long term plan is abundantly transparent:

- extend Sacramento Avenue and build a home on the isolated upper parcel, APN 177-172-20 as proposed in the current plan

- initiate a merger of the remaining two lower parcels APN 177-12-10 (currently part of this proposal) and APN 177-172-09 (neighboring substandard lot)

- build a second home below the Sacramento Avenue right-of-way on the newly redrawn lot

To succeed, this must be accomplished in a stepwise, deceptive and calculated manner. Every effort has been made to preserve the dated development rights associated with the neighboring substandard parcel, APN 177-172-09. For good reason, the County’s development standards have evolved a bit since this lot was originally drawn. This lot fails to meet the
minimum lot area thresholds of the Hillside Development Standards, does not meet slide stability standards (in fact the entire property is located in the most severe stability zone of 4) and contains a mapped drainage channel.

Once a home is in place on the upper parcel APN 177-172-20, the developer will apply for a merger of the lower parcel APN 177-172-10 and the substandard lot APN 177-172-09, effectively siphoning land that used in the current proposal in order to accommodate future development on the neighboring substandard parcel.

This last maneuver will conveniently take advantage of the current Development Code's policy on Owner-Requested Mergers. Additionally and equally egregious, the development in this proposal, sited on APN 177-172-20, would not be compliant with the Hillside Development Standards, as the lot area will fall below the one acre (43,560 square feet) minimum for land of such extreme slope.

At a previous hearing on June 12, 2017, this Planning Commission appreciated the potential scope of the applicants' long term plan and the adverse implications to the environment and neighborhood. To ensure responsible development on the site the Planning Commission requested a voluntary merger of the three parcels. In response the applicants transferred title for the substandard lot to Mr Thompson’s LLC, effectively blocking the forced merger that was warranted by the Development Code. The Board of Supervisors reached the same conclusions articulated by the Planning Commission and stressed the need for more responsible siting of the home (March 13, 2018, Resolution No. 2018-50), a decision that was subsequently upheld by both the Marin County Superior and Court of Appeal of the State of California.

In conclusion, given the issues raised here, in our letter from May 21, 2021 and by our neighbors, we urge you to uphold our appeal and deny the Sasan Site Plan Review in its current form. Over the last 6-7 years our group of neighbors have provided the applicant with substantial and genuine concerns for the impact that development at this site would impose on our quality of life and the environment. Furthermore our concerns are consistent with the standards and guidelines provided by the Development Code and the Marin Countywide Plan. Finally, we have provided the applicant with an alternative building site that alleviates or mitigates nearly all the issues associated with the current proposal and one that is consistent with the direction provided by the Planning Commission (June 12, 2017 hearing) and the Board of Supervisors (March 113, 2018, Resolution No. 2018-50).

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Brandon and Melissa Sullivan
Yes...I remember they were a little outside the 50-ft distance, but were otherwise ok....

Scott D. Alber, PE, EFO, CFO, FM, MiFireE
BATTALION CHIEF/FIRE MARSHAL

Marin County Fire Department
PO Box 518/33 Castle Rock Avenue
Woodacre, CA 94973
415.473.8566 T
415.473.4246 F
415.717.1520 M
CRS Dial 711
salber@marincounty.org

Follow us on Facebook and Twitter

From: Kilgariff, Kathleen <KKilgariff@marincounty.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 4, 2021 11:24 AM
To: Alber, Scott <SAlber@marincounty.org>
Subject: RE: Fire Truck Turnaround Question

Thanks, Scott! So if you did not require it as a Condition of Approval, it is not likely that you would require this change as part of this application?

From: Alber, Scott <SAlber@marincounty.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 4, 2021 11:17 AM
To: Kilgariff, Kathleen <KKilgariff@marincounty.org>
Subject: RE: Fire Truck Turnaround Question

Hi Kathleen,

Yes, we would like the turnaround within 50-ft of the structure, but it's not absolutely critical and we have made compromises in the past. Also, I noticed that the turnaround requirement is worded incorrectly; a turnaround is required when the driveway exceeds 300-ft in length (150-ft in the WUI), not that it has to be within 300-ft of the road...

Let me know if you have other questions.
Hi Scott,

Neighbors of a project I am working on are indicating that a fire truck turnaround must be no more than 50 feet from the proposed residence. Is this true? The only standard you provided in your transmittal (attached) is this one:

An approved fire apparatus turn around shall be designed and installed at the driveway end so as not to exceed 300 feet (150 feet in the Wildland-Urban Interface) from the street and shall be capable of accommodating MCFD apparatus. The turnaround shall be recorded, dedicated, and clearly delineated on the subdivision map as 'Dedicated Fire Apparatus Turnaround'.

Here are the project plans, if you would like to review:


Thanks!
Kathleen Kilgariff
PLANNER
County of Marin
Community Development Agency
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite #308
San Rafael, CA 94903
415 473 7173 T
415 473 7880 F
kkilgariff@marincounty.org
Katherine,

Please find our letter attached for the Sasan Site Plan Review P3073

Rick Block

Block Builders Inc.
415-606-1113
Richard M. Block
Vicki Crane Block
46 Miwok Drive
San Anselmo, CA 94960

August 19, 2021

Kathleen Kilgraiff
Planning Division
Marin Community Development Agency
3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 38
San Rafael, CA 94903

RE: Sasan Site Plan Review P3073

Dear Ms. Kilgariff:

We are writing in regards to the development proposal Sasan Site Plan P3073 at Sacramento Avenue in San Anselmo that is under your review. Yet again, we are seeing a plan that is not much different from previous application attempts. Yet again, the applicants continue to ignore any input from neighbors. The applicant has sued Marin County twice and lost both times. Why we continue to go down this road is beyond us.

Following is a brief list of our continued complaints. While it is not as detailed, we are and continue to be in agreement with every issue brought forth by our neighbors stated in their letters. As stated by Robin McKillop and John Herr in their letter dated August 19, 2021, with which we entirely concur, we strongly oppose this project for as follows:

- The possibility of construction of a second house.
• Encroachment into the Stream Conservation area.
• Overall environmental impact.
• The blocking of public right-of-way.
• Access for fire vehicles on Sacramento Avenue which may already be below minimum standards.
• Site Plan Requirements not met.

While we know it is the right of an owner to build on their property; we ask again that it would be done in an appropriate manner taking into consideration all the concerns of the neighborhood and the environment. **We feel that the above issues continue to be ignored.** It is our hope that those that have the responsibility to oversee the development of Marin County neighborhoods will do so in a conscientious manner.

We ask that you deny the current proposal.

Respectfully,

Richard M. Block
Vicki Crane Block