



TOWN OF FAIRFAX

142 Bolinas Road, Fairfax, California 94930

(415) 453-1584 / Fax (415) 453-1618

March 23, 2018

Marshall Rothman, Managing Partner
Timberstone 4038T, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 2434
Mill Valley, CA. 94942

Re: Marinda Heights subdivision of the Wall Property Vested Tentative Map, Design Review, Hill Area Residential Development Permit, Ridgeline Development Permit, Excavation Permit, (potentially) Variance.

Dear Mr. Rothman,

This letter is provided in accordance with State Planning and Zoning Law requirements for a written determination regarding the completeness of a development application. The Department of Planning and Building Services has reviewed the above-referenced applications for completeness. Your application has been deemed **incomplete**. As outlined below, additional information or materials are needed in order to process your application. Individual residential, subdivision, and environmental review portions of the project are discussed separately. This letter does not constitute either an approval or denial of your application.

The project has been transmitted to the Town Engineer, the Fairfax Open Space Committee, and involved outside agencies for their review and comments. Comments received to date are listed as attachments. Any additional comments will be forwarded to you when received.

The following includes additional information necessary for a complete submittal, non-conformities with the Town's Zoning Ordinance and General Plan, design issues, and preliminary Environmental Impact Report (EIR) topical items pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Failure to respond in full to incompleteness items identified may delay application processing. Additional incompleteness items may also be forthcoming after information or plans is submitted and reviewed. Partial or piecemealed submittals will not be accepted or processed. Prior to re-submittal, please contact planning staff to schedule a meeting to review the additional application information and materials to facilitate an acceptable submittal. Please note that some of the required additional information may

be incorporated into the environmental review portion of the project, and that process, as well as the public review process for the project, will generate the need for additional materials and documentation to be prepared and submitted. As a result, some portion of this work may be performed by the environmental consultant that will be working on the EIR.

Incompleteness Item Overview:

Residential

The following are general comments on the Design Review, Hill Area Residential Development Permit, Ridgeline Development Permit, Excavation Permit, and (potentially) Variance portions of the project, which require further documentation to process your application. More detailed comments relating to each proposed lot and building site are included as Attachment A.

1. Information submitted to date for the individual residences and residential parcels remains inconsistent and incomplete. For example, while most of the house square footages appear to be accurate, some do not match staff's calculations. Several of the deck and patio square footages are not listed or incorrect.
2. With the exception of the one color rendering, the rest of the building elevations, including a repeat of the one shown in the rendering, are to be unshaded with the exception of shadow lines.
3. Eliminate shading within the canopy area of trees depicted on the site and other plan-view plans.
4. All existing trees that are located within 25 feet of the developed areas of residences should be (but are not) shown on the architect's site plans.
5. Grading plans must be provided that shade newly graded areas within building envelope disturbance areas. All existing contours to be modified should be shown as dashed. Provide cross-sectional views showing and calling out maximum depths of cut and fill versus existing where either occurs.
6. Identify location of maximum building height, and call out height with natural and finished grade elevations. Provide separate specific roof elevation (or cross-section) if location of maximum building height is in a different location and cannot be readily identified on an elevation already provided.
7. Identify pool dimensions (length and width) as well as gallons of water each contains. Provide a calculation of average annual water usage.
8. Solar panel square footages are not called out. It also isn't clear whether any of solar arrays panels will be angled to maximize their solar efficiency. If so, the proposed heights of individual angled arrays must be called out. Will the solar arrays generate all of the energy necessary to heat cool the respective residences and pools?
9. Finished floor and roof elevations need to be called out for all floors for all residences. In some instances, this may be most easily listed in side elevations or cross-sections.

10. Provide at least one cross-section that extends through all construction areas. The cross-section must show all grade changes – including both existing and proposed if changed.
11. Differentiate and call out square footages on walkable (i.e. roof deck) versus non-walkable portions of roofs.
12. Provide cut sheets of all proposed lighting. All exterior lighting should be fully shielded from direct out-of-building-area illumination, and should be the minimum number and wattage necessary for safety purposes.
13. Story poles: Story poles will need to be installed for this project. Consistent with prior communication, the timing of story pole installation will be determined by the Town to facilitate public review. Insofar as many of the proposed building elements to be reflected in the story poles will be where trees are located, all story poles should feature a one-foot square (1' x 1') piece of wood at the top, painted day-glo orange, with the story pole number written in 1-inch black block numerals, to better allow distant viewing correlation with discrete building elements.
14. Provide a story pole plan for all structures. Identify proposed story poles by numbers, which are to be reflected in the painted numbers place on the wooden square atop each story pole.
15. Visual analysis: Additional viewpoints will need to be incorporated into the visual analysis. Photographs and possibly visual simulation viewpoints will be finalized after story poles have been installed and comments have been received on potential visual effects.
16. Show all building envelopes on all sites. Call out setbacks to nearest property line (if the distance is greater than 50 feet, call out approximate distance). It is recommended that the Lot 10 site plan (sheet A-2) be used as the example/ template to be followed for site plans for other residences.
17. Provide a north arrow and graphical scale on all site plans and floor plans.
18. The residential designs feature multiple floor levels. For clarity's sake, provide dashed half-tone outlines of whatever floor isn't being represented on the floor plan for a particular floor. It is recommended that Lot 10 sheet A-3 as the example/ template to be followed for other residences.
19. Call out square footages of each floor on the plan view plans for that floor, and in the project statistics box on Sheet A-1 for every residence.
20. All information on full-sized and reduced plan set submittals must match. Proposed numbered street addresses are shown on the reduced sets but not on the full sized sets.
21. Provide an 8½" x 11" color and materials board for each residence. Manufacturer's color pictures of each material and color are acceptable.

Residential merits comments

22. Several of the residential designs and building envelopes appear to extend beyond the flat, previously-graded portions of the proposed building sites. Residential improvements and/or construction area disturbances that result in

removal of trees located towards the edge of existing flat areas have the potential to substantially increase development visibility from offsite. It is noted that such designs may conflict with the Town's Zoning Code provisions pertaining to ridgeline development, hillside area development, and design review, as well as Fairfax General Plan policies and programs.

23. Residential designs and placement in general should minimize visibility through limits on height, size, and careful use of materials designed to blend the buildings into the hillside (for example, living roofs).
24. Preservation of existing trees on the southwest, west, and southeast sides of the building areas appears to be important for providing adequate visual screening of the residences.
25. Some of the residences as currently proposed appear to be too large to successfully minimize tree removal and their visual appearance from offsite. All residential designs will be reviewed in detail by the Planning Commission in the merits portion of the project review.
26. Provide in the plan set for each residence a vicinity map that is equivalent to (an updated) Vesting Tentative Map Marinda Heights Subdivision, sheet C3.1, including a Lot Table and showing the subdivision roads and house sites.

Subdivision

Please review and respond to the Town Engineer's comments (see Attachment 2). In addition to those comments, the following needs to be provided:

27. The land upon which Lot 1 is proposed contains two different land classification zones - both RS-7.5 and UR-10. Data needs to be shown on the map of how much square footage is contained in each zoning district.
28. Based on prior communication about the Lot 1 area contained within each zone, the proposed lot area does not appear achieve the minimum lot size required for creation of a legal parcel. This determination is based on the following:

Lot 1	Square footage within each zone	Required minimum lot size*	Percentage of minimum lot size
RS-7.5	14,164 sq.ft	48,400 square feet	29%
UR-10	45,165 sq.ft.	10 acres	10%
Totals	59,329 sq.ft.		39%

*Lot area for the RS-7.5 zoned portion is based on Zoning Code §17.076.050 (c), wherein minimum lot size is based on slope (the estimated slope for the parcel is 47%).

Unless information is provided to document that sufficient land area exists for this proposed lot, it should and will be removed from consideration as part of this subdivision proposal.

29. Zoning Code §17.076.050 (c) also stipulates an increase in lot frontage width based on average slope. According to staff calculations, Lot 1 frontage width would need to be 196 feet, wider than the not-called-out proposed frontage.

30. The March 5, 2018 letter from Marin Municipal Water District states that public water will only be available to serve development with fixtures no higher than the 400 foot elevation, and that therefore development higher than Lots 1, 2, 3, and 6, cannot be provided water service. Please document how adequate water supply serving residences on Lots 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10 will be provided. Include diagrammatic mapping to show in full any proposed new water mains from current source to the residence(s), over whose land that water supply would cross, and the need for and current status of any utility easement(s) that would be necessary.
- If any portion of a future water supply would involve a private water system, full information and documentation must be provided on how the water system will be adequate to serve the proposed lots. Compliance with all regulatory requirements for such a water supply, including water quality testing, well locations (if a well or wells are proposed), and well logs adequate to show adequate volume, and other information must be provided.
31. Vehicular access to water tank site: Provide elevation and other information on existing versus grade, total cut and fill, and retaining wall extent and maximum and minimum heights.
32. Water tank size: Provide details (dimensions, elevations, site plan) on the proposed 47,000-gallon tank. If further water storage is necessary as a result of complying with Ross Valley Fire Department and/or MMWD requirements, these need to be incorporated reflected in the tank(s) design and information.
33. Use of water tank(s): Is water storage necessary for both water supply and or firefighting water storage purposes? If the tank will be used for both purposes, confirmation will be necessary from Ross Valley Fire about the acceptability of the tank for joint use.
34. Story poles will be required for the water tank(s).
35. Proposed public land/trail dedication: Additional information/clarification is needed on the route and design of the proposed trail connecting the existing spur ridge fire road and trails. Staff recommends that you work with the Fairfax Open Space Committee (FOSC), and consider consulting with the Marin County Open Space District (MCOSD) for information on and assistance with trail design.
36. Further details will need to be provided on how the roadway cross-slope interacts with the walkable area and drainage/infiltration incorporated into the trail.
37. Proposed public land dedication: Depending on further information that may be forthcoming, further consideration may be desired regarding of options for achieving permanent private/public open space, land dedication, and trail use. The FOSC may be helpful in exploring these options.
38. As noted in the Town Engineer's comments, there are substantial questions regarding the location of the proposed Ridgeway Avenue extension with respect to the surveyed right-of-way. Should it prove necessary to expand the paved section in order to located and align the improvements to the right-of-way, consideration might be given to creating a fire department turnaround at the end of the existing Ridgeway Avenue pavement. .
39. Park land dedication requirements: Consideration will be given to the permanent open space counting towards parkland dedication requirements.

40. The Geotechnical Report by William W. Moore and Phyllis E. Flack dated 10/31/16 inaccurately identifies certain of the proposed subdivision lots (for example, Lot 10 is misidentified as Lot 9). Provide a corrected report with accurate lot references.

Environmental

Staff's comments relating to environmental review are intended to alert you to items that could or will need to be addressed in the environmental review of the project. You should expect that the environmental review process will generate the need for further information, which cannot be identified as part of this initial application review, as necessary to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project and to fully inform the public and decision-makers:

41. The proposed new access roadway/driveway to Lot 10, extending from the end of the existing pavement on Ridgeway Avenue, appears to abut two existing but currently undeveloped privately owned parcels. There may also be additional potential for development on privately owned parcels in the vicinity of the proposed driveway. To the extent that the potential development of any of those parcels becomes reasonable and foreseeable as a result of this project, such future development will need to be incorporated into the environmental analysis of this project.
42. Trees (species, size, location, and number) necessary to be removed in order to satisfy fire safety Fire requirements, specifically along the roadways and driveways, and in proximity to the proposed residences, should be incorporated into the environmental review of the project.
43. The extent of project-wide understory vegetation removal necessary to satisfy fire safety requirements will need to be evaluated.
44. One active small active debris flow and one active slump scarp located uphill and near the end of the paved portion of Marinda Drive have been identified and will need to be evaluated for repair/stabilization. The geotechnical report recommends building a debris wall next to Marinda Drive, and notes that development upslope has the potential to increase drainage to this area and add to instability. These issues will have to be addressed, in the EIR process if not separately.
45. The archeological evaluation performed by ARS dated 10/27/16 indicates that communication was attempted with the two tribal groups involved with such assessments, but without a response. An update should be provided regarding subsequent communications and the results regarding potential resources.
46. The Biological Studies performed by LSA incorporate references to County of Marin biological protection policies and programs. The County of Marin is a separate jurisdiction from Fairfax and their policies are inapplicable outside its jurisdiction and should be deleted.
47. There does not appear to be any reference in the Geotechnical Report on any offsite slope stability issues, particularly those involving existing residential

development that may be affected by the project. Down-slope, offsite drainage and slope stability will need to be addressed. Efforts to achieve 'no net increase' in runoff, minimize runoff concentration, and identify downslope locations potentially vulnerable to increased runoff (see debris flow and slump scarp comments above) is recommended.

Information Necessary to Evaluate Project Merits

48. Public parcel/trails: Your offer to dedicate for public use the existing spur ridge fire road and trail (where they occur on your property) is appreciated. Your proposed new trail that would cross-connect the Marinda Drive fire road to the edge of the property near the Ridgeway Avenue trail is also a laudable concept. These would enhance public access to and enjoyment of the site's open space
49. The cross-connecting trail concept lacks detail about the proposed route. There may be opportunities for further refinement of the proposed cross-trail location beyond following the property southerly boundaries. Additional information could be provided on the proposed trail location and design in the pending public review of this project.
50. Preliminarily, some of the proposed building envelopes and size of the residences appear substantial in relation to the size of the existing previously graded portions of the proposed building pads. Consideration should be given to the potential visual impacts of these designs and potential reductions in the size, height, and potentially location of some of the residences and their building envelopes.
51. As you are aware, there is a substantial amount of woody vegetation contributing to the fire fuel load on/near the southeastern most portion of the property. While you are not responsible for fuels located off your property, efforts in reducing the fuel load will involve your site, and your participation and cooperation in the overall efforts would be appreciated.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have questions or comments.

Sincerely,



Ben Berto
Director of Planning and Building Services
Town of Fairfax
142 Bolinas Road
Fairfax, CA 94930
ph. 415-458-2346
bberto@townoffairfax.org

- Attachments:
1. Residential lot comments
 2. Memo from Town Engineer dated 2/21/18
 3. Letter from MMWD dated 3/5/18
 4. Letter from PG&E dated 2/26/18
 5. Memo from Ross Valley Fire Department dated 3/1/18

Attachment 1

RESIDENCE REVIEWS FOR COMPLETENESS

Lot 1 – 321 Marinda Drive

[Note: the following Lot 1 completeness submittal requirements are only applicable if information is provided that documents Lot 1 compliance with minimum lot size]

Additional information needed:

1. Call out setbacks to nearest property line (if >50 feet, call out approximate distance).
2. For any roof that is also proposed to be a walkable surface, please show a representation of a person on the elevation that best shows the portion of roof in question.
3. Side elevations:
 - a. Shading confusing – in some cases doesn't appear to represent any possible sun shadow
 - b. Show existing/proposed grade for all side elevations where is difference. Dash natural grade if changed
 - c. Call out maximum building elevation.
4. Shade any graded areas within building envelopes on plan view sheet. Show modified contours (existing as dashed). Call out elevation at 5-foot intervals.
5. Call out proposed exterior materials for every residence on at least one elevation sheet.
6. Call out solar panels.
7. Square footages shown on each story should match the square footages shown in the application forms for each house and the living space square footage for each floor should be shown on each page along with the patio/deck square footage for that level.
8. Show pool and spa square footages on plans and in application form.
9. 13 foot tall parking area retaining wall requires a retaining wall height variance application and approval.

Lot 2 – 351 Marinda Drive

Additional information needed:

1. Call out setbacks to nearest property line (if >50 feet, call out approximate distance).
2. Square footages called out accurately for each floor on the plan view plans for that floor.
3. For any roof that is also proposed to be a walkable surface, please show a representation of a person on the elevation that best shows the portion of roof in question.

4. Dashed half-tone outline of whatever floor isn't being represented on particular floor plan. Use Lot 10 sheet A-3 as template.
5. Side elevations:
 - a. Shading confusing – in some cases doesn't appear to represent any possible sun shadow
 - b. Call out finished floor level (fll) for all floors, carry as dashes across the plans
 - c. Show existing/proposed grade for all side elevations where is difference. Call out elevation of finished and natural grade where maximum building height occurs. Dash natural grade if changed
 - d. Call out maximum building elevation.
6. Shade any graded areas within building envelopes on plan view sheet. Show modified contours (existing as dashed). Call out elevation at 5-foot intervals.
7. Call out dimensions and gallon size of swimming pool..
8. Square footages shown on each story should match the square footages shown in the application forms for each house and the living space square footage for each floor should be shown on each page along with the patio/deck square footage for that level.
9. Call out and dimension solar panels on plans.
10. Garage exceeds the permitted 15 foot height limit for accessory structures and requires submittal of a height Variance application.
11. All sets of submitted plan sets should match i.e. address numbers are shown on the reduced sets but not on the full sized sets.

Lot 3 – 400 Marinda Drive

Additional information needed:

1. Call out setbacks to nearest property line (if .>50 feet, call out approximate distance).
2. Side elevations:
 - a. Shading confusing – in some cases doesn't appear to represent any possible sun shadow
 - b. Call out ffl for all floors, carry as dashes across the plans
 - c. Show existing/proposed grade for all side elevations where is difference. Call out elevation of finished and natural grade where maximum building height occurs. Dash natural grade if changed
 - d. Call out maximum building elevation. C
3. Clearly depict with an "x" any trees that are proposed for removal (trees to be removed within garage footprint are currently not marked with "x").
4. Shade any graded areas within building envelopes on plan view sheet. Show modified contours (existing as dashed). Call out elevation at 5-foot intervals.
5. Square footages shown on each story should match the square footages shown in the application forms for each house and the living space square footage for each floor should be shown on each page along with the patio/deck square footage for that level.

6. Call out solar panels and show pool and spa square footages on plans and in application form.
7. Accessory structure/garage exceeds the permitted 15 foot height limit and will requires submittal of a height Variance application.
8. All sets of submitted plan sets should match i.e. address numbers are shown on the reduced sets but not on the full sized sets.

Lot 4 – 501 Marinda Drive

Additional information needed:

Call out setbacks to nearest property line (if >50 feet, call out approximate distance).

1. With the exception of one color rendering, the rest of the building elevations, including the one shown in the rendering, should be unshaded.
2. Side elevations:
 - a. Shading confusing – in some cases doesn't appear to represent any possible sun shadow
 - b. Call out ffl for all floors, carry as dashes across the plans
 - c. Show existing/proposed grade for all side elevations where is difference. Call out elevation of finished and natural grade where maximum building height occurs. Dash natural grade if changed
 - d. Call out maximum building elevation.
3. Shade any graded areas within building envelopes on plan view sheet. Show modified contours (existing as dashed). Call out elevation at 5-foot intervals.
4. Call out any proposed solar panels and call out dimensions of swimming pool.
5. The plan set for this house that staff was reviewing is missing plan sheet pages A-11 grading plan and A-12 story pole plan.
6. Square footages shown on each story should match the square footages shown in the application forms for each house and the living space square footage for each floor should be shown on each page along with the patio/deck square footage for that level.
7. All sets of submitted plan sets should match i.e. address numbers are shown on the reduced sets but not on the full sized sets.

Lot 4 merits comment

The proposed design extends substantially beyond the currently graded area and proposes extensive removal of trees that are in fair or better condition. Additional visual analysis is needed, but preliminarily it appears the residence will to be highly visible from offsite and too large.

Lot 5 – 551 Marinda Drive

Additional information needed:

1. Call out setbacks to nearest property line (if >50 feet, call out approximate distance).
2. With the exception of one color rendering, the rest of the building elevations, including the one shown in the rendering, should be unshaded.

3. For any roof that is also proposed to be a walkable surface, please show a representation of a person on the elevation that best shows the portion of roof in question.
4. Show access road detail on site plan (use Lot 3 sheet A-2 as template example)
5. Side elevations:
 - a. Shading confusing – in some cases doesn't appear to represent any possible sun shadow
 - b. Call out ffl for all floors, carry as dashes across the plans
 - c. Show existing/proposed grade for all side elevations where is difference. Call out elevation of finished and natural grade where maximum building height occurs. Dash natural grade if changed
 - d. Call out maximum building elevation.
6. Shade any graded areas within building envelopes on plan view sheet. Show modified contours (existing as dashed). Call out elevation at 5-foot intervals.
7. Call out dimensions of swimming pool on plans and in application form..
8. Provide separate elevations of all visible elevations for any detached accessory structures. Show west elevation of garage which appears to reach 18 feet in height at the south west corner. If the garage exceeds 15 feet in height, it will require submittal of a height variance application.
9. Square footages shown on each story should match the square footages shown in the application forms for each house and the living space square footage for each floor should be shown on each page along with the patio/deck square footage for that level.
10. All sets of submitted plan sets should match i.e. address numbers are shown on the reduced sets but not on the full sized sets.

Lot 5 merits comment

The proposed building site appears to be exceptionally challenging to accommodate a residence and achieve adequate visual screening. Additional visual analysis is needed, but preliminarily the residence appears to be highly visible from offsite and too large.

Lot 6 – 611 Marinda Drive

Additional information needed:

1. Call out setbacks to nearest property line (if >50 feet, call out approximate distance).
2. With the exception of the one color rendering, the rest of the building elevations, including a repeat of the one shown in the rendering, are to be unshaded with the exception of shadow lines For any roof that is also proposed to be a walkable surface, please show a representation of a person on the elevation that best shows the portion of roof in question.
3. Side elevations:
 - a. Shading confusing – in some cases doesn't appear to represent any possible sun shadow
 - b. Call out ffl for all floors, carry as dashes across the plans
 - c. Show existing/proposed grade for all side elevations where is difference. Dash natural grade if changed

- d. Call out maximum building elevation.
4. Shade any graded areas within building envelopes on plan view sheet. Show modified contours (existing as dashed). Call out elevation at 5-foot intervals.
5. Call out any proposed solar panels. Call out dimensions of swimming pool.
6. Square footages shown on each story should match the square footages shown in the application forms for each house and the living space square footage for each floor should be shown on each page along with the patio/deck square footage for that level.
7. Show pool and spa square footages on plans and in application form.
8. All sets of submitted plan sets should match i.e. address numbers are shown on the reduced sets but not on the full sized sets.
9. House is 4 stories in height and requires the submittal and approval of a height variance to exceed the permitted 3 stories in the UR-10 Zone.
10. Plan set is missing sheets A-12 grading plan, and A-13 story pole plan.

Lot 7 – 630 Marinda Drive

Additional information needed:

1. Show all building envelopes on all sites. Call out setbacks to nearest property line (if >50 feet, call out approximate distance).
2. With the exception of the one color rendering, the rest of the building elevations, including a repeat of the one shown in the rendering, are to be unshaded with the exception of shadow lines.
3. For any roof that is also proposed to be a walkable surface, please show a representation of a person on the elevation that best shows the portion of roof in question.
4. Side elevations:
 - a. Shading confusing – in some cases doesn't appear to represent any possible sun shadow
 - b. Call out ffl for all floors, carry as dashes across the plans
 - c. Show existing/proposed grade for all side elevations where is difference. Dash natural grade if changed
 - d. Call out maximum building elevation.
5. Shade any graded areas within building envelopes on plan view sheet. Show modified contours (existing as dashed). Call out elevation at 5-foot intervals.
6. Call out any proposed solar panels.
7. Square footages shown on each story should match the square footages shown in the application forms for each house and the living space square footage for each floor should be shown on each page along with the patio/deck square footage for that level.
8. Project appears to require the submittal variance application for front/side setback (required front setback is 6 feet, required side setback is 5 feet).

Lot 8 – 650 Marinda Drive

Additional information needed:

1. Show all building envelopes on all sites. Call out setbacks to nearest property line (if >50 feet, call out approximate distance).
2. With the exception of the one color rendering, the rest of the building elevations, including a repeat of the one shown in the rendering, are to be unshaded with the exception of shadow lines.
3. Side elevations:
 - a. Shading confusing – in some cases doesn't appear to represent any possible sun shadow
 - b. Call out maximum building elevation.
4. Square footages shown on each story should match the square footages shown in the application forms for each house and the living space square footage for each floor should be shown on each page along with the patio/deck square footage for that level.
5. Show pool and spa square footages on plans and in application form.
6. Plan sheets A-11 grading, and A-12 story pole plan, are missing from the plan set.

Lot 9 – 680 Marinda Drive

Additional information needed:

1. Show plan north and align and call out plan north on all plan view sheets.
2. Call out setbacks to northwest, southwest, and southeast property lines.
3. Call out portions of roof that is also proposed to be a walkable surface.
4. Side elevations:
 - a. Shading confusing – in some cases doesn't appear to represent any possible sun shadow
 - b. Call out ffl for all floors, carry as dashes across the plans
 - c. Show existing/proposed grade for all side elevations where is difference. Dash natural grade if changed
 - d. Call out maximum building elevation.
5. Shade any graded areas within building envelopes on plan view sheet. Show modified contours (existing as dashed). Call out elevation at 5-foot intervals.
6. Call out any proposed solar panels.
7. Call out dimensions of swimming pool and spa and gallonage of pool.
8. Square footages shown on each story should match the square footages shown in the application forms for each house and the living space square footage for each floor should be shown on each page along with the patio/deck square footage for that level.
9. All sets of submitted plan sets should match i.e. address numbers are shown on the reduced sets but not on the full sized sets.
10. Show and call out on Sheet A-2 diameters of all trees within 25 feet of construction disturbance.
11. Call out grade on Sheet A-7, and clarify ffl versus finished exterior grade.

12. Plan set is missing sheets A-12 materials colors, A-13 grading plan, and A-14 story pole plan.

Lot 10 – Ridgeway Residence

Additional information needed:

1. Show plan north and align and call out plan north on all plan view sheets.
2. Floor plan dimensioning must call out distances from face of exterior wall to exterior wall. Total floor and building area must reflect the increased dimensions.
3. Call out portions of roof that are also proposed to be a walkable surface.
4. Side elevation(s): Call out maximum building height and applicable elevations.
5. Shade any graded areas within building envelopes on plan view sheet. Show modified contours (existing as dashed). Call out elevation at 5-foot intervals.
6. Call out any proposed solar panels.
7. Call out dimensions of swimming pool and spa and gallonage of pool.
8. Square footages shown on each story should match the square footages shown in the application forms for each house and the living space square footage for each floor should be shown on each page along with the patio/deck square footage for that level.
9. All sets of submitted plan sets should match i.e. address numbers are shown on the reduced sets but not on the full sized sets.
10. Show and call out on Sheet A-2 diameters of all trees within 25 feet of construction disturbance.
11. Call out/differentiate square footage of garage vs. habitable area on Sheet A-3..
12. Plan set is missing sheets A-11 grading plan, and A-12 story pole plan.

Lot 10 merits comment

The proposed residential development on/near the top of the knoll on proposed Lot 10 appears to have potentially substantial visual effects from Sir Francis Drake and other public viewing locations. Consideration should be given to relocating the proposed building envelope and building to reduce potential visual effects, and driveway length/impervious surface area.



TOWN OF FAIRFAX

142 BOLINAS ROAD, FAIRFAX, CALIFORNIA 94930
PHONE (415) 453-1584 / FAX (415) 453-1618

MEMORANDUM

To: Ben Berto – Director of Planning and Building Services

Date: February 21, 2018

From: Ray Wrysinski
Town Engineer

Page 1 of 5

Subject: Marinda Heights Subdivision
Proposed Tentative Map
Marinda Drive and Ridgeway Avenue
Fairfax, CA

A.P. 001-150-12, 001-160-09, 001-17-51
and 001-251-31

This memorandum provides my first review of the proposed project Tentative Map.

The binder listed below is date stamped received by the Town as November 13, 2017, which includes updated Tentative Map and the Architectural plans. The binders appear to contain, roughly 1,000 pages and there may be other items that have been changed in the plans and information dated December, 2017 (noted below).

Documents used in making this review include a binder listing contents of 1. Vesting Tentative Map, dated December, 2017, 2. Archeological Study, 3. Biological Study Wildlife, 4. Biological Study Plants / BSA Update, 5. Geotechnical Report, 6. Hydrology Report, 7. Traffic Study, 8. Tree Studies Lots 1 through 10, 9. Visual Study, 10. CEQUA Checklist, 11. Hazardous Waste Declaration, 12. Required Statements General Conditions Development, 13. Reimbursement Contract, 14. Title Report, 15. Road and Trail Construction & Management Plans, 16. Architectural Plans. There was a 32 sheet plan set from Oberkamper & Associates Civil Engineers, Titled Vesting Tentative Map, dated December, 2017. There was a 10 sheet plan set from Urban Forestry Associates, Inc. titled Vegetation Management Plan for lots 1 through 10 and there were 10 plan sets from Pahana known architects titled Residence for lots 1 through 10, dated December 20, 2017.

Town Code Chapter 16.08 gives requirements for Tentative Maps.

The submitted map is signed by a Licensed Civil Engineer who is licensed to do Land Surveying so that signature requirement is satisfied. Code Section 16.08.020 provides some more specific comments on contents requirements.

Items of additional information required for the Tentative Map document will be given below.

Sheet C1.0, titled Vesting Tentative Map shows the phone numbers and addresses for the record owner and the Engineer. This sheet shows two copies of a note on housing supply which eliminated a previous copy's notes on an atmospheric regulation system. Sheet C2.0 provides an overall view of the property with boundary dimensions and with topography information. A set of closure calculations must be

provided for the property exterior boundary so that a check is provided that a complete set of dimensions is shown on the map. A copy of the current property fee title deed must be submitted. Copies of the easement deeds listed in the title report must be provided. A note must be added to the map stating that all easements shown in the title report and all easements known, for the property by the Surveyor, are shown on the map as required by the Code.

Access to lot 10 from Ridgeway Avenue is not adequately shown. Start showing the access to lot 10 at just below the existing end of pavement below the sharp turn in the right of way. This will include showing the dimensioned right of way lines and the location of the existing improvement, utilities and pavement and the location of the existing graded trail. Previous reviews in this area have indicated a lack of right of way for the roadway and for utility right of way extension. A recorded record of survey is required for the right of way that shows the ownership and right of way dimensions sufficient for the roadway and utility extensions. Fire Department requirements must be met including the 50 foot inside minimum radius and the minimum 20' road width in Town owned right of way. Grading and retaining walls must be indicated. The new roadway will increase the stormwater peak flow on lower Ridgeway and complaints have been received from residents in this area, on flooding with existing conditions. The increased flow must be shown to be mitigated. Diverting flows to Chester area will increase the flooding there. Previous reviews in this area have indicated a lack of access for electric, telephone and cable television facilities. Right of way for extension of those facilities must be shown.

The Ridgeway area street right of way lines and the existing improvements in that area must be shown on the plan for this project, including those on the closest private property that will be affected by this new driveway and road to lot 10. The property lines in the area must be shown so that the right of way for the new access is clearly shown relative to those property lines. I assume that there will need to be a right of way property or easement acquisition needed to allow the new access to be placed, so ownerships must be shown. There is some steep ground in the area so there may be a need for a right of way that is much wider than the new improvements to accommodate the needed grading and other construction work. The grading work and effect on trees in the area must be shown on the plan. The proposed location of the underground utilities including water, gas, electric, telephone and cable TV must be shown in Ridgeway and in the driveway. There is an indication that Taylor Lane, Burdett Lane and Parker Lane right of ways will be used for access and sanitary sewer extension. The topography and right of way, with dimensions, for the areas to be used, must be shown on the plan so that the effect of the construction on the existing conditions can be determined and addressed. The location and effect of placing utilities in Ridgeway Avenue must be shown. The question, "Can all of this be done so that lot 10 is served?" must be answered.

The location of the joint utility trench must be shown for service to all the lots similar to the sewer and water installation. The plans indicate that telephone will be provided by Comcast. Normally conduits or pipes are placed for all utilities including telephone and cable TV. I am requiring that conduits for both cable TV and telephone be included in the joint utility trench unless this requirement for telephone (not Comcast) is waived by the Planning Director or by the Planning Commission. I am concerned that only providing service facilities for Comcast will exclude service to property owners normally provided by the telephone company.

Lot 6 has an extensive force main shown for service. I am concerned about the difficulty of maintaining a sanitary sewer force main with such a long length and large elevation change. The Sanitary District may have restrictions for private force mains of such great elevation change and a private property owner may have difficulty keeping it working. The applicant is to provide information to show that will resolve the above concerns.

Lot 1 does not have an obvious location for the sanitary sewer connection location shown and that must be shown.

The extent of Parcel A is not clear so that limit must be clarified on the map with notes or some other delineation. This parcel seems to have different boundaries shown on different plan sheets so consistency is needed. There appears to be a water tank on Parcel A so it must be shown who will own the water tank and who will own the land the tank is on and who will own the land that provides access to the tank.

I reviewed the Traffic Study and I do not have any comments on it or reservation about it.

Additional information must be shown on the plan for the private road extension and for the driveways. The road and driveways are shown with relatively weak pavement sections. This may be suitable if the subgrade soil is very good. A note must be added for these sections that the pavement will be designed as a durable pavement that will carry the full loads required by the Fire Department. The private street and the driveways appear to be steeper along the inside of curves than is acceptable to the Fire Department in some locations and have sharper curvature than is acceptable to the Fire Department in some locations. Dimensions and slopes must be shown on the plans to confirm that the design satisfies minimum standards.

The Geotechnical Report is dated October 31, 2016. This indicates it was done before the submitted Tentative Map was prepared. Statements in the Geotechnical Report indicate that the report does not reflect review of the Tentative Map design. A letter from the Geotechnical Engineer must be provided that indicates the current design has been reviewed and that the design satisfies the Geotechnical Engineers requirements. The report notes the hillside soils are highly erodible and notes localized areas of slope instability. It notes that controlling surface drainage to minimize erosion will be very important. Significant areas of slope instability are mentioned and must be shown on a base map that uses the site topography information and lot layout so that the Town and future property owners will have that information including location to forewarn them of these problems and of the potential liability that may come from landslide activity in these areas. This map and information must cover the whole site at a scale that allows an accurate assessment of location and extent of unstable areas. The map must indicate that it shows these problem areas that the geotechnical engineer has been able to identify. The Geotechnical Engineer must identify those areas of instability that must be repaired as part of this project. The areas to be repaired are the ones that may damage improvements proposed in this project or areas that are likely to damage down hill improvements and thereby become a cost and liability problem for the new homeowners. Repair recommendations must be provided and also shown on the plans in sufficient detail to address instability problems.

The drainage design has many hillside discharge areas for the proposed project drainage. Based on the extreme steepness in the area of many of these drainage discharges and based on my review of the Geotechnical report, I conclude that these drainage discharges on the hillside have the potential to cause

serious erosion and landslide problems. A report from the Geotechnical Engineer is required that provides a review of the total drainage design. This report must provide recommendations for designing all of these drainage discharges so that they will not become erosion or landslide problems. If a location is deemed free of these problems the report must state that. If a location is a potential problem the new Geotechnical Report must give recommendations for design that will solve the problems and the plans must, then, be modified to satisfy the Geotechnical Engineer's corrective requirements. There also must be a follow-up letter from the Geotechnical Engineer stating the modified design provides resolution for the problems of erosion and instability.

The project grading is shown as 6,500 cubic yards of excavation and 6,500 cubic yards of fill on sheet C5.0. This quantity of grading requires Planning Commission approval. The grading quantity is shown, as required, on the Tentative Map as an estimate from the project Civil Engineer with excavation, fill and soil removed from the site. No material is shown to be removed from the site. The information on lot 10 lacks cut and fill banks and lacks retaining walls so it suggests that grading quantities were not determined for that area. That area must be included in the grading quantities and plan. Provide information that is currently missing on the amount of grading for the water tank area including access. The note on grading indicates that trenching, structural excavation and piers are excluded. Those items must be included so that the Planning Commission can understand and consider the full scope of grading quantities and of material hauled out of and into the project area. The driveway layouts on the Architect's site plans and on the Civil Engineer's grading plans are different by small and large amounts. This will make approval of grading, tree removal and general appearance uncertain so these plans must be made to be consistent to avoid that problem.

There is likely to be damage to existing streets from construction activity that will have to be monitored and repaired related to the project. The lot building pad grades must be shown to sufficient detail so that grading for the building sites, including the driveways can be estimated and visualized. The project trench excavation for sewer, water, storm drain and joint utility trenching must be included in the estimate. This will include material from the trenches hauled out of the site and must include select material hauled into the site to backfill the trenches. These quantity estimates will necessarily be rough but they must provide a reasonable indication of overall material movement. I think this information will add at least another 15,000 cubic yards of material movement to the project information.

I reviewed the hydrology study and drainage calculations. We need to receive a copy of those calculations bearing the signature and seal of the licensed engineer responsible for them. In the time I have been reviewing submittals for the Town, I have not seen anything like those calculations. Are these in response to the recent State Water Quality Control Board requirements? They do not follow the typical 1974 Caltrans Guidelines that have been used in this area for many years. I have attempted to provide guidelines to make that 1974 information along with Caltrans Highway Design Manual guidelines so that is a standard for Fairfax. The local requirement for design includes 100 year storm event design. The calculation seemed to provide flows that would be in the neighborhood of the flows that would come from the 1974 Guidelines. Has the Caltrans Runoff Coefficient frequency factor of $C(f) = 1.25$ been used? If that is in the calculations, I need to know where it is. If it was not used, then the calculations must be adjusted. I thought the runoff coefficient of 0.57, in the calculations, was quite low for this steep hillside area that has soils that typically have low infiltration characteristics. The required 1.25 factor will help bring this coefficient to a level appropriate for these conditions. The typical minimum time of concentration in the Highway Design Manual is five minutes and a minimum time in these calculations is given as seven minutes. Why is the greater minimum time of concentration used? Using an

inappropriately long time of concentration will result in design flows that are too low and pipe sizes that are too small. I want to avoid getting undersized systems through technical tinkering of design factors. The flooding problems in Fairfax are substantially due to stormwater conveyance systems being too small. Obtaining lower flows by using less conservative calculation factors results in economy of smaller systems but increases frequency of system overflows during larger storms. I am not looking for another review of the calculations. I can see there is good layout of storm drain facilities so sizing them, including appropriate head loss calculations, can be done during environmental or construction plan review. There does seem to be an effort to provide infiltration systems to go into relatively impermeable clay soils and bedrock. The Geotechnical Engineer should explain how that is supposed to work. There were no conduit sizes that I could spot and it would be just speculation for me to attempt to look at what inlet structure the noted flow, in the calculations, will enter and what system that will be moving through. Conduits in the public right of way must be a minimum of 12" diameter for maintenance purposes. A better map for identifying drainage area, inlet location, structure type, conduit size and slope is needed for future review. The watershed maps must be of a size so that all the information on them is easily read. I do not expect problems with the existing systems flows since the design should provide needed flow control so flows are not increased due to development.

The Code requires that the net lot areas must be shown on the Tentative Map with these areas excluding access easements.


Prior to issuing a construction permit, the Town must receive confirmation that State Water Quality Control Board requirements have been satisfied.

Many trees are proposed to be removed, so a Fairfax Tree Committee Report and tree removal permit must be obtained. I find it difficult to identify many trees that likely will have to be removed for construction or that are so close to construction that they will be likely to receive damage. I will leave it to the Planning Department to decide if a specific plan set must be provided that clearly shows trees that must be removed or that likely should be removed because they will be damaged by construction.

There is a length of the site boundary that adjoins County of Marin jurisdiction. This must be shown on the plans. Where the proposed parcel A meets the project boundary, show the ownership or easement condition on the adjoining land so that access can be understood at that location.

I recommend that the processing of this project be considered incomplete until the above required information is provided.

Please let me know if you need any more information from me on this project.



Ray Wrysinski, P. E.
Town Engineer



MARIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT

220 Nellen Avenue Corte Madera CA 94925-1169
www.marinwater.org

March 5, 2018

Linda Neal
Fairfax Planning Dept.
142 Bolinas Rd.
Fairfax, CA 94930

RE: WATER AVAILABILITY – Subdivision
Assessor's Parcel No.: 001-150-12, 001-160-09, 001-171-51, 001-251-31
Location: Marinda Drive and Ridgeway Ave., Fairfax

Dear Ms. Neal:

The above referenced parcels are not currently being served and no water has been allocated to these properties. Based upon the plans submitted dated December 2017, entitled "Vesting Tentative Map – Marinda Heights Subdivision", water service for "Lot 1" will be available upon request and fulfillment of the requirements listed below.

The proposed lots labeled as "Lot 2 – Lot 10" do not meet the conditions for service as set forth by the District which state in part: "the property must be fronted by a water main; the structures must be within 125 feet of the water main." Under these conditions, water service to this development may require the upgrade of existing facilities along with a pipeline extension from the end of the District's existing facilities. The applicant must enter a pipeline extension agreement for the installation of the necessary facilities and said agreement must be approved by the District's Board of Directors. All costs associated with a pipeline extension are borne by the applicant.

Please note, water service from Marinda Drive can only be provided to homes with water using fixtures no higher than an elevation of 400-feet. Based upon the plans submitted dated November 2017, entitled "Vegetation Management Plan Lot 1 - Lot9", only Lots 1, 2, 3 and 6 are below 400-feet elevation.

Upon completion and acceptance of these facilities, this development will be eligible for water service upon request and fulfillment of the requirements listed below.

1. Complete Low Pressure Water Service Applications.
2. Submit a copy of the building permits.
3. Pay appropriate fees and charges.
4. Complete the structures' foundations within 120 days of the date of application.
5. Comply with the District's rules and regulations in effect at the time service is requested.
6. Comply with all indoor and outdoor requirements of District Code Title 13 – Water Conservation. This may include verification of specific indoor fixture efficiency compliance.
7. If you are pursuing a landscaping project subject to review by your local planning department and /or subject to a city permit, please contact the district water conservation department at 415-945-1497 or email to plancheck@marinwater.org. More information about district water conservation requirements can be found online at www.marinwater.org

8. Comply with the backflow prevention requirements, if upon the District's review backflow protection is warranted, including installation, testing and maintenance. Questions regarding backflow requirements should be directed to the Backflow Prevention Program Coordinator at (415) 945-1558.
9. Comply with Ordinance No. 429 requiring the installation of gray water recycling systems when practicable for all projects required to install new water service and existing structures undergoing "substantial remodel" that necessitates an enlarged water service.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (415) 945-1531.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'CB' with a stylized flourish extending from the bottom right.

Chris Borjian
Engineering Technician

CB



WE DELIVER ENERGY.™

February 26, 2018

Town of Fairfax Department of Planning and Building Services
Ben Berto-Planning and Building Services Director
142 Bolinas Rd.
Fairfax, Ca. 94930

Re: Marinda Heights Subdivision Development

This is to inform you that PG&E has existing gas and electric distribution facilities up to 262 Marinda Dr. and 182 Ridgeway Ave. in Fairfax, California. PG&E will be able to extend both gas and electric distribution to serve the Marinda Heights Subdivision property. Based on the limited information I have my recommendation is to serve this subdivision from Marinda Drive.

The extension of electric and gas lines will be made in accordance with the Rules on file with the California Public Utilities Commission. Upon receipt of the necessary contract agreements and advance money, PG&E will commence construction to and within the development.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 257-3428.

Sincerely,

David Brown
Senior New Business Representative
1220 Andersen Dr.
San Rafael, CA. 94901
415-257-3428 (office)
415-265-5610 (cell)



Ross Valley Fire
Department
777 San Anselmo Ave
San Anselmo, Ca 94960
Ph. 415-258-4686

FIRE DEPARTMENT PLAN REVIEW

PROJECT: New Subdivision
ADDRESS: Marinda Heights
Fairfax, Ca

Page: 1 of 4

Date: 3/1/18

Reviewed by: Rob Bastianon
(415) 258-4686 Ext 12

TYPE OF REVIEW: Planning

E-mail: rbastianon@rossvalleyfire.org

Building Dept. 1/8/18

Fire Dept. # 18-0007

Review No. 1

Fire Department Standards can be found at: www.rossvalleyfire.org

Applicant*: Goefft Design

Address:

***Applicant is responsible for distributing these Plan Review comments to the Design Team.**

Occupancy Class: R-3	Fire Flow Req: 750 GPM	Sprinklers Required: YES
Type of Construction: V-A	On-site Hyd. Req: YES	Fire Alarm Required: NO
Bldg Area: Varies	Turn-Around Req: YES	Permits Required: Sprinkler
Stories: +2	Fire Flow Test Required: YES	VMP, Fire Main, Water Storage
Height: ft	Wildland Urban Interface: YES	

The project listed above has been reviewed and determined to be:

- () **APPROVED** (no modifications required)
() **APPROVED AS NOTED** (minor modifications required - review attached comments)
() **NOT APPROVED** (revise per attached comments and resubmit)
(X) **INCOMPLETE** (provide additional information per attached comments and resubmit)

NOTE: Please review the comments and make corrections and/or add notes as required. Changes and/or additions shall be clouded and referenced by

does not approve any omission or deviation from the applicable regulations. Final approval is subject to field inspection. Approved plans shall be on site and available for review at all times.

ROSS VALLEY FIRE DEPT

____ Approved

☒ Approved with Conditions

☒ Not Approved -- need revision

☒ Incomplete

Date: 3-2-18

Inspections required:

- () Access/Water Supply prior to delivery of combustibles
(X) Defensible Space/Vegetation Management Plan
() Sprinkler Hydro/Final
(X) Final



Ross Valley Fire
Department

777 San Anselmo Ave
San Anselmo, Ca 94960
Ph. 415-258-4686

FIRE DEPARTMENT PLAN REVIEW

PROJECT: New Subdivision
ADDRESS: Marinda Heights
Fairfax, Ca

Page: 2 of 4

Date: 3/1/18

Reviewed by: Rob Bastianon
(415) 258-4686 Ext 12

TYPE OF REVIEW: Planning

E-mail: rbastianon@rossvalleyfire.org

Building Dept. 1/8/18 Fire Dept. # 18-0007

Review No. 1

Fire Department Standards can be found at: www.rossvalleyfire.org

ITEM #	SHEET	COMMENTS	Corr. Made
1		I have reviewed the Fire Protection Plan from Eshconsultants dated February 15, 2018 prepared by Elliot Gittleman, FPE. Plan includes, WUI requirements for each parcel, water supply, apparatus access, vegetation management and sprinkler system requirements.	
		Submitter's Response: Correction has been completed. See Sheet ____ of <input type="checkbox"/> Plans <input type="checkbox"/> Calculations.	
2		Marinda Heights subdivision is located in the wild-land urban interface (WUI) area of Town of Fairfax. All development shall comply with the codes adopted by the Town of Fairfax at the time of building permit application. Current codes relating to WUI are the 2016 CFC Chapter 49, CBC Chapter 7A or CRC Section R327 and the 2006 WUI Code. Construction documents shall include details how minimum regulations Meeting both WUI requirements and 1 hour construction requirements as called using Type V-A construction methods.	
		Submitter's Response: Correction has been completed. See Sheet ____ of <input type="checkbox"/> Plans <input type="checkbox"/> Calculations.	
3		Fire access roads shall be in accordance with the Town of Fairfax adopted Fire and WUI Codes ant the time of building permit application. Access shall be designed in accordance with RVFD Standard # 210 and marked in accordance with RVFD Standard #204. 10 feet on each side of the access road and driveways shall be cleared of flammable vegetation and other combustible growth. Please provide a detailed plan showing how minimum requirements will be met. It shall be noted on the plans that the entire access road shall be installed and made serviceable prior to delivery of combustible to the site.	
		Submitter's Response: Correction has been completed. See Sheet ____ of <input type="checkbox"/> Plans <input type="checkbox"/> Calculations.	
4		The fire protection plans call out the use of a private 47,000 gallon storage tank to provide required fire water storage and domestic demand. Please review WUI Code Section 404.5 below for minimum water supply	



Ross Valley Fire
Department

777 San Anselmo Ave
San Anselmo, Ca 94960
Ph. 415-258-4686

FIRE DEPARTMENT PLAN REVIEW

PROJECT: New Subdivision
ADDRESS: Marinda Heights
Fairfax, Ca

Page: 3 of 4

Date: 3/1/18

Reviewed by: Rob Bastianon
(415) 258-4686 Ext 12

TYPE OF REVIEW: Planning

E-mail: rbastianon@rossvalleyfire.org

Building Dept. 1/8/18

Fire Dept. # 18-0007

Review No. 1

Fire Department Standards can be found at: www.rossvalleyfire.org

ITEM #	SHEET	COMMENTS	Corr. Made
		<p>requirements.</p> <p>Private water storage tanks are not permitted unless the cost of providing a municipal supply exceed 10% of the total construction costs. Please note in the exception below that if a private water supply is installed that a fee of 5% of the total building construction cost will be paid to Fire for upgrading municipal fire flow.</p> <p>Tank size shall be increased by 2000 gallons for each residence which utilizes the tank for fire sprinklers and domestic water storage.</p> <p>Single family dwellings constructed to comply with <u>Type V-A</u> construction requires a fire flow of 750 gpm at 20 psi for a 1 hour duration when a sprinkler system is installed.</p> <p><u>404.5 Adequate water supply. Adequate water supply shall be determined for purposes of initial attack and flame front control as follows:</u></p> <p><u>1. One- and two-family dwellings. The required water supply for one- and two-family dwellings shall be from a municipal supply. Required flow rates and duration shall be determined by the code official.</u></p> <p><u>Exception: If the cost of providing a municipal supply exceeds 10% of the total construction costs (based on the building permit valuation and required site improvements), an on-site private fire protection water supply (minimum storage requirement to be determined by the code official and local standards, but not less than 3,000 gallons plus 2,000 gallons dedicated to automatic fire sprinklers and domestic water) may be permitted. If a private, on-site water supply is installed, a fee in an amount up to and including 5% of total building construction cost may be charged for the purpose of upgrading existing municipal fire flow.</u></p> <p>It shall be noted on the plans that water supply and hydrants shall be installed and made serviceable prior to delivery of combustible to the site.</p> <p>A separate deferred Fire permit is required prior to the installation of</p>	



Ross Valley Fire
Department

777 San Anselmo Ave
San Anselmo, Ca 94960
Ph. 415-258-4686

FIRE DEPARTMENT PLAN REVIEW

PROJECT: New Subdivision
ADDRESS: Marinda Heights
Fairfax, Ca

Page: 4 of 4

Date: 3/1/18

Reviewed by: Rob Bastianon
(415) 258-4686 Ext 12

TYPE OF REVIEW: Planning

E-mail: rbastianon@rossvalleyfire.org

Building Dept. 1/8/18

Fire Dept. # 18-0007

Review No. 1

Fire Department Standards can be found at: www.rossvalleyfire.org

ITEM #	SHEET	COMMENTS	Corr. Made
		the fire service main. Note requirement on plans	
		Submitter's Response: Correction has been completed. See Sheet ____ of <input type="checkbox"/> Plans <input type="checkbox"/> Calculations.	
5		A Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) designed in accordance with Ross Valley Fire Standard #220 is required for this project and each individual residence. A separate deferred permit shall be required for each plan. Please submit directly to the Fire Department for review. As a condition of approval for this subdivision, each entire parcel shall be cleared and maintained free of all underbrush and dead vegetation less than 8 inches in diameter. All trees shall be limbed up 10 feet or 1/3 the height if less than 30 feet.	
		Submitter's Response: Correction has been completed. See Sheet ____ of <input type="checkbox"/> Plans <input type="checkbox"/> Calculations.	
6		Applicant may propose alternate materials or method in accordance with Section 103.3. All approved alternates requests and supporting documentation shall be included in the plans set submitted for final approval.	
		Submitter's Response: Correction has been completed. See Sheet ____ of <input type="checkbox"/> Plans <input type="checkbox"/> Calculations.	

*If re-submittal is required, all conditions listed above shall be included in revised drawings.
Fire and life safety systems may require a separate permit. Fire permits may be noted as deferred.*