## TOWN OF FAIRFAX STAFF REPORT Department of Planning and Building Services

TO: Planning Commission
DATE:
FROM:
LOCATION:
ZONING:
PROJECT
August 17, 2023
Linda Neal, Principal Planner
34 Hill Avenue; Assessor's Parcel No. 002-214-01
RD 5.5-7 Zone
Construction of a new single-family residence
Conditional Use Permit, Design Review Permit, Variance, and Excavation Permit; Application \# 23-18
APPLICANT: John Simenic
OWNER: Same as above
CEQA STATUS: Categorically exempt, sections 15303(a), 15304(a) and 15305(a).


## 34 HILL AVENUE <br> ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO. 002-214-01

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Construction of a 1,318 square-foot, 2-story, 3-bedroom, $21 / 2$-bathroom, single-family residence with an attached 317 square-foot, 1-car garage and two uncovered parking spaces located within the west side-yard setback.

## BACKGROUND

The project was continued at the July 20, 2023, Planning Commission meeting where the Planning Commission directed the applicant to:

- Re-examine whether the project can be redesigned to eliminate the need for minimum and combined side-yard setback variances for the structure. Provide revised drawings if possible and if it is not possible to redesign to comply with the setbacks, provide an explanation of why redesign cannot occur.
- Erect as many of the story poles shown on the story pole plan, project plan set page A103, a minimum of ten days prior to the August 17, 2023, regular Planning Commission meeting.

For more information regarding the project and required discretionary permits please see the original July 20, 2023, staff report using the following link:

## https://storage.googleapis.com/proudcity/fairfaxca/uploads/2023/07/Item-3-34-Hill.pdf

## DISCUSSION

The residence has been decreased approximately 1-foot in width and lengthened by approximately 3 -feet to maintain the residence proposed 1,318 square-foot size while complying with the required minimum and combined side-yard setbacks as directed by the Planning Commission. The narrower width was accomplished by decreasing the width of the garage at the front of the house, relocating the master bathroom from the east side of the structure to the center, and narrowing the width of the bedrooms, living room and kitchen. The height of the house and the floor area ratio (FAR) of the house remain the same at 28 -feet $53 / 8$-inches in height with a FAR of .40 while the lot coverage has decreased slightly from .33 to .32 , all complying with the regulations of RD 5.5-7 Zoning of the project site.

The story poles were in place on August 7, 2023, ten days prior to the August 17, 2023, as required.

The owners of 32 Hill Avenue have provided a letter from their surveyor addressing their position relating to the western property boundary location and which has been included as Attachment C.

As previously discussed, the applicant is in a property line dispute with the owners of 32 Hill Avenue who have presented the Town with a conflicting survey of the west side property line. Property boundary disputes are civil matters between property owners. The Town, on the direction of its legal counsel, is processing this application based on the applicant's survey which has been accepted by the Town Surveyor as complying with the State subdivision map act and standard surveying practices.

Based on what has been submitted by this applicant, the Town has the information necessary to take action to grant or deny the requested entitlements and we are required to proceed with processing the application by State Law (the Permit Streamlining Act). The owners of the neighboring property have had the ability and will continue to have the ability to take legal action relating to the accuracy of the submitted survey, a civil matter, after the Town acts on this application.

The narrowing and lengthening of the house do not change the drainage plan, grading amount, number of trees being removed, or staff's analysis of the project and ability to recommend findings to approve the project. The findings and recommended conditions of approval can be found in the attached Resolution No. 2023-16.

## RECOMMENDATION

Move to approve application \# 23-18 by adopting Resolution No. 2023-16 setting forth the findings and the conditions for the project approval.

## ATTACHMENTS

A - Resolution No. 2023-16
B - Letter and attachments from licensed Land Surveyor Josh Woelbing dated 8/3/23
C - Link to July 20, 2023, staff report and attachments
https://storage.googleapis.com/proudcity/fairfaxca/uploads/2023/07/Item-3-34-Hill.pdf

## A Resolution of the Fairfax Planning Commission Approving Application No. 2318 for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Design Review Permit, Excavation Permit, <br> Tree Removal Permit and Side-yard Setback Variance for the Construction of a Single-family Residence with Attached Garage at 34 Hill Avenue

WHEREAS, the Town of Fairfax received an application on April 7, 2022, from John Simenic to construct a two-story, three bedroom, two and one half bathroom singlefamily residence with an attached one car garage and two uncovered parking spaces located in the west side-yard setback at 34 Hill Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the proposed project on July 20, 2023, and a second meeting on August 17, 2023; and

WHEREAS, after holding the public hearings the Planning Commission determined that the project complies with the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Ordinance and that findings can be made to grant the requested CUP, Design Review permit, Excavation permit, Tree Removal permit and Setback Variance to allow parking within the side-yard setback; and

WHEREAS, The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act per Categorical Exemption Sections 15303(a), 15304(a) and 15305(a); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has made the following findings:
The project is consistent with the 2010-2030 Fairfax General Plan as follows:
Policy LU-1.2.3: New and renewed development shall be designed and located to minimize the visual mass. The Town will require exterior materials and colors that blend the exterior appearance of structures with the surrounding natural landscape, allowing for architectural diversity.

Policy LU-4.1.4: New and renewed development shall be designed to minimize run-off in a manner that does not cause undue hardship on neighboring properties.

Policy LU-7.1.5: New and renewed residential development shall preserve and enhance the existing character of the Town's neighborhoods in diversity, architectural character, size, and mass.

Policy LU-7.2.2: To the extent feasible natural features including the existing grade, mature trees and vegetation shall be preserved for new and renewed development.

Conditional Use Permit (Town Code § 17.032.060)

1. The approval of the CUP for a 28.5 -foot tall, two-story, 1,318 square-foot, 3 bedroom, $21 / 2$-bathroom, single-family residence that complies with the floor
area ratio and lot coverage limitations and the required minimum and combined front/rear and side-yard setbacks and provides the required three parking spaces will not be a grant of special privilege.
2. The development and use of the property as described in finding one above and subject to compliance with the conditions contained in this resolution shall not create a public nuisance or cause unreasonable detriment or adverse physical or economic effects to neighboring properties.
3. Approval of the CUP is not contrary to the goals, objectives or policies of the 2010-2030 Fairfax General Plan or Town Code Title 17, Zoning.
4. Approval of the CUP and development of the site as proposed will be a better use of the property than would otherwise be the case because the residence is in scale with the site and with other structures in the neighborhood.

## Excavation Permit (Town Code § 12.20.080)

Based on the Town Engineer's review and recommendation that the project can be safely constructed, the Planning Commission finds that:

1. The health, safety and welfare of the public will not be adversely affected.
2. Adjacent properties will be adequately protected by project investigation and design from geologic hazards as a result of the work.
3. Adjacent properties are adequately protected by project design from drainage and erosion problems as a result of the work.
4. The amount of the excavation or fill proposed is not more than that required to allow the property owner substantial use of his or her property.
5. The visual and scenic enjoyment of the area by others will not be adversely affected by the project more than is necessary.
6. Natural landscaping will not be removed by the project more than is necessary; and
7. The time of year during which construction will take place is such that work will not result in excessive siltation from storm runoff nor prolonged exposure of unstable excavated slopes (Town Code § 17.072.090(c)(4) prohibits grading of hillside properties from October $1^{\text {st }}$ through April $1^{\text {st }}$ of each year).

## Design Review (Town Code § 17.020.040)

1. The project depicted in the plans submitted to the Town on April 7, 2023, is this the correct date? complies with the Design Review Criteria set forth in Town Code § 17.020.040.
2. The exterior of the structure has been articulated, landscape screening is proposed, and the setbacks have been maximized to minimize significant impacts on neighboring property and to allow the development to harmonize with the surrounding residential development.

Variance to Allow Parking in the Side-Yard Setback (Town Code § 17.028.070)

1. The small size and 3 -foot to 47 -foot width of the site are the features that warrant granting the requested Side-yard Setback Variance to construct the required parking spaces to support the new single-family residence within the side-yard setback. The strict enforcement of prohibition of required parking in the side yard setback would deprive the applicant of the ability to improve the on-site parking required to allow for construction of a single-family residence on this RD 5.5-7 residentially zoned site and would make designing a complying structure difficult.
2. Most properties in town that are similarly small sites have some portion of their required parking spaces and/or parking structures and portions of the residence within one or more required setbacks. Therefore, allowing the uncovered parking spaces to encroach into the minimum and combined side-yard setbacks will not be a grant of special privilege.
3. The strict application of the setback regulations would render the site undevelopable, which would be a hardship for the applicant.
4. The granting of the side-yard setback variance to allow the uncovered parking within the minimum side yard setback will not be detrimental to the public health, welfare, and safety or injurious to other property in the vicinity in which the property is situated.

## Tree Removal

The seven trees proposed for removal within the structure footprint and throughout the site have been reviewed by the Tree Committee who has recommended that the Planning Commission approve the requested removal permit. Therefore, the project is in compliance with all the considerations listed in Town Code 8.36.060(B)(1 through 7) of the Tree Ordinance, Town Code Chapter 8.36.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has approved the project subject to the applicant's compliance with the following conditions:

1. The project is approved based on the following plans and reports:

Project Plan Set including the architectural plans by John Simenic submitted to the Town on August 7, 2023, and the engineering plans by DVC Engineering Group and the Topographic Survey by Leon Oberkamp submitted to the Town on April 7, 2022, and the Drainage Report by DVc Group dated 5/31/22 (received 8/10/22).
2. Prior to issuance of any of the building permits for the project the applicant or his assigns shall:
a) Submit an amended construction plan to the Public Works Department for their approval. The amended plan shall include, but is not limited to, the following:
I. Construction delivery routes approved by the Department of Public Works.
II. Construction schedule (deliveries, worker hours, etc.)
III. Notification to area residents
IV. Emergency access routes
V. Construction worker staging area
3. The applicant shall prepare, and file with the Public Works Director, a video of the roadway conditions on the public construction delivery routes (routes to be pre-approved by Public Works Director).
4. Submit a cash deposit, bond, or letter of credit to the Town in an amount that will cover the cost of grading, weatherization, and repair of possible damage to public roadways. The applicant shall submit contractor's estimates for any grading, site weatherization and improvement plan for approval by the Town Engineer. Upon approval of the contract costs, the applicant shall submit a cash deposit, bond or letter of credit equaling $100 \%$ of the estimated construction costs.
5. The grading, foundation and drainage elements shall be designed by a structural engineer certified as such in the state of California. Plans and calculations of the foundation and retaining elements shall be stamped and signed by the structural engineer and submitted to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer or the Building Official.
6. The grading, foundation, and drainage elements shall also be stamped and signed by the project civil engineer as conforming to the recommendations made by the DVC Engineering group in their drainage report dated $5 / 31 / 22$ by the project Civil Engineer.
7. Prior to submittal of the building permit plans, the applicant shall secure written approval from the Ross Valley Fire Department, Marin Municipal Water District and the Ross Valley Sanitary District noting the development conformance with their recommendations and conditions.
8. Submit three copies of the recorded record of survey with the building permit plans.
9. The Tree permit must be kept on the job site while the trees are being removed and the owner must verify that the tree company performing the approved tree work has a current Fairfax Business License.
10. During the construction process the following shall be required:
a) Prior to the concrete form inspection by the building official, the structural engineer shall field check the forms of the foundations and provide written certification to the Town staff that the work to this point has been completed in conformance with their recommendations and the approved building plans.
b) The Building Official shall field check the concrete forms prior to the pour.
c) All construction-related vehicles including equipment delivery, cement trucks and construction materials shall always be situated off the travel lane of the adjacent public right(s)-of-way. This condition may be waived by the Building Official on a case-by-case basis with prior notification from the project sponsor.
d) Any proposed temporary closure of a public right-of-way shall require prior approval by the Fairfax Police Department and any necessary traffic control, signage or public notification shall be the responsibility of the applicant or his/her assigns. Any violation of this provision will result in a stop work order being placed on the property and issuance of a citation.
e) In accordance with Town Code §8.20.060(C)(1) and (2), the operation of any tools or equipment used in construction or demolition work or in property maintenance work between the hours of 6:00 PM and 8:00 AM Monday through Friday, or on weekends and holidays between 4:00 PM and 9:00 AM is prohibited.
11. Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit the following shall be completed:
a) The civil engineer shall field check the completed project and submit written certification to the Town Staff that the foundation, grading and drainage elements have been installed in conformance with the approved building plans and the recommendations of the drainage report.
b) The Planning Department and Building Official shall field check the completed project to verify that all Planning Commission conditions and required engineering improvements have been complied with including installation of landscaping and irrigation prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy.
12. The roadways shall be kept free of dust, gravel, and other construction materials by sweeping them daily, if necessary.
13. Any changes, modifications, additions, or alterations made to the approved set of plans will require a modification of Application \# 23-18. Modifications that do not significantly change the project, the project design or the approved discretionary permits may be approved by the Planning Director or the Planning Commission. Any construction based on job plans that have been altered without the benefit of an approved modification of Application 23-18 will result in the job being immediately stopped and red tagged.
14. Any damage to the public portions of Hill Avenue, Kent Avenue, Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, or other public roadway used to access the site resulting from construction activities shall be the responsibility of the property owner.
15. The applicant and its heirs, successors, and assigns shall, at its sole cost and expense, defend with counsel selected by the Town, indemnify, protect, release, and hold harmless the Town of Fairfax and any agency or instrumentality thereof, including its agents, officers, commissions, and employees (the "Indemnitees") from any and all claims, actions, or proceedings arising out of or in any way relating to the processing and/or approval of the project as described herein, the purpose of which is to attack, set aside, void, or annul the approval of the project, and/or any environmental determination that accompanies it, by the Planning Commission, Town Council or Planning Director or any other department or agency of the Town. This indemnification shall include, but not be limited to, suits, damages, judgments, costs, expenses, liens, levies, attorney fees or expert witness fees that may be asserted or incurred by any person or entity, including the applicant, third parties and the Indemnitees, arising out of or in connection with the approval of this project, whether or not there is concurrent, passive, or active negligence on the part of the Indemnitees. Nothing herein shall prohibit the Town from participating in the defense of any claim, action, or proceeding. The parties shall use best efforts, acting in good faith, to select mutually agreeable defense counsel. If the parties cannot reach agreement, the Town may select its own legal counsel and the applicant agrees to pay directly, or timely reimburse on a monthly basis, the Town for all such court costs, attorney fees, and time referenced herein, provided, however, that the applicant's duty in this regard shall be subject to the Town's promptly notifying the applicant of any said claim, action, or proceeding.
16. The applicant shall comply with all applicable local, county, state and federal laws and regulations. Local ordinances which must be complied with include, but are not limited to: the Noise Ordinance, Chapter 8.20, Polystyrene Foam, Degradable and Recyclable Food Packaging, Chapter 8.16, Garbage and Rubbish Disposal, Chapter 8.08, Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention, Chapter 8.32 and the Americans with Disabilities Act and Best Management Practices for Stormwater Pollution Prevention.
17. Conditions placed upon the project by outside agencies, Town department or by the Town Engineer may be eliminated or amended with those agencies,
departments, or the Town Engineer's written notification to the Planning Department prior to issuance of the building permit.

## Town Engineer

18. The building permit application plans, including the final drainage plan and associated report(s) shall be reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer and the San Anselmo Public Works Director and Town Engineer prior to issuance of the building permit.

## Ross Valley Fire Department

19. A 20-foot-wide fire lane must be improved and be serviceable in compliance with Ross Valley Fire Standard \#210 along the site frontage prior to delivery of combustibles to the site.
20. A fire sprinkler system that complies with National Fire Protection Association standard 13-D and local standards must be installed and requires a separate permit from Ross Valley Fire.
21. All smoke detectors in the residence shall be provided with AC power and be interconnected for simultaneous alarm. Detectors shall be located in each sleeping room, outside of each sleeping room in a central location in the corridor and over the center of all stairways with a minimum of one detector on each story of the occupied portion of the residence.
22. Carbon monoxide alarms shall be provided in existing dwellings when a permit is required for alterations, repairs, or addition and the cost of the permit exceeds $\$ 1,000.00$. Carbon monoxide alarms shall be located outside of each sleeping area in the immediate vicinity of the bedrooms and on every level of the dwelling, including basements.
23. Address numbers at least 4-inches tall must be in place adjacent to the front door. If not clearly visible from the street, additional numbers must be placed in a location that is visible from the street. The numbers must be internally illuminated or illuminated by an adjacent light controlled by a photocell that can be switched off only by a breaker so it will remain illuminated all night.
24. Alternative materials or methods may be proposed for any of the above conditions in accordance with Section 104.9 of the Fire Code.
25. All approved alternatives requests, and their supporting documentation, shall be included in the plan sets submitted for final approval by the Fire Department.

## Marin Municipal Water District (MMWD)

26. A copy of the building permit must be provided to the district along with the required applications and fees.
27. The foundation must be completed within 120 days of the date of application.
28. All indoor and outdoor requirements or District Code Title 13, Water Conservation must be complied with.
29. Any landscaping plans must be reviewed and approved by the District.
30. Backflow prevention requirements must be met.
31. Ordinance 420, requiring installation of a grey water recycling system when practicable, must be incorporated into the project building permit plans or an exemption letter from the District must be provided to the Town.
32. All the District's rules and regulations in effect at the time service is requested must be complied with.

## Ross Valley Sanitary District (RVSD)

33. A sewer connection permit and a side sewer connection permit are required for all work outside the new building footprint.
34.Fees will include sewer capacity charges as well as permit fees.
34. Test the sewer lateral(s) from the outer face of the building to the connection at the existing sewer main, in accordance with RVSD Ordinance 100 and Standards.
35. Include a sewer cleanout and backwater protection device within 2-feet of the building foundation.
36. The Ross Valley Sanitary Standard Notes shall be shown on the submitted plans and are found in Subsection L of Section 3 of the Design and Construction Standards and demonstrate that all materials used in the construction of the sewer improvements are from the approved materials list.
37. A hold will be placed on the property when the building permit is issued and will not be released for occupancy until the District permit and sewer requirements have been fulfilled.
38. A Certificate of Compliance for the lateral must be obtained from the RVSD prior to the project final inspection by the Fairfax Building Department.

## Fairfax Public Works Department

40. All large trucks with more than two axles accessing the site for construction will be limited daily to the hours between 9 AM to 3 PM.
41. Complete road closures will be limited to concrete pours and steel placement and
will be coordinated with the Fairfax Police Department and Ross Valley Fire Department.
42. A detailed construction management plan must be submitted with the building permit application that includes construction delivery routes, construction schedule (deliveries, worker hours, etc.), notification to area residents, emergency access and egress routes and proposed employee parking locations during construction and be approved by the Department of Public Works.
43. The applicant shall prepare, and file with the Public Works Director, a video of the roadway conditions on the construction delivery routes.
44. A bond will be submitted prior to issuance of the building permit in an amount that will cover the cost of grading, weatherization, and repair of possible roadway damage in an amount equaling 100\% of the estimated construction costs and pay for the Town Engineer's/Plan Checker's time to review and confirm the contractor's estimate.

## Building Official

45. Prior to the start of construction, the surveyor shall mark the property lines in the field and shall meet the Building Official for a preconstruction inspection once the markings are in place.
46. After the foundation framing and prior to the foundation concrete pour, the contractor shall call for a second inspection by the Building Official to ensure that the proposed setbacks are being maintained.
47. A code compliant sidewalk shall be constructed along the entire property frontage.

## Miscellaneous

48. A drainage system maintenance agreement including a system location plan and required maintenance schedule shall be approved by the Town Engineer and then be recorded at the Marin County Recorder's Office setting forth the required maintenance schedule to ensure the drainage system continues to function as designed. A copy shall be provided to the Town prior to issuance of the building permit.
49. All the exterior fixtures must be dark sky compliant (fully shielded and emit no light above the horizontal plane with no sag or drop lenses, side light panels or upplight panels) as well as compliance with color temperature to minimize blue rich lighting. The lighting plan shall be submitted with the building permit application and be approved by the Planning Department prior to issuance of the project building permit. The lighting shall not emit direct offsite illumination and shall be the minimum necessary for safety.
50. The driveway access shall be limited to 20 -feet in width within the public right-ofway in compliance with Town Code § 12.12.030.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Planning Commission of the Town of Fairfax hereby finds and determines as follows:

The Conditional Use Permit, Design Review Permit, Excavation Permit, Tree Removal Permit and Variance to Allow the Required Uncovered Parking in the Side-Yard Setback for Application \# 23-18 are approved, and the findings have been made to grant the requested discretionary permits. Therefore, the project is in conformance with the 2010 - 2030 Fairfax General Plan, the Fairfax Town Code and the Fairfax Zoning Ordinance, Town Code Title 17; and

Construction of the project can occur without causing significant impacts on neighboring residences and the environment.

The foregoing resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission held in said Town, on the 17th day of August 2023 by the following vote:

## AYES:

NOES:
ABSENT:

Chair Cindy Swift
Attest:

Linda Neal, Principal Planner

# \& Associates LLP 

J. Timothy Nardell

## VIA EMAIL

August 3, 2023

Linda Neal
Principal Planner
Town of Fairfax
142 Bolinas Road
Fairfax, CA 94930

## RE: Development of Lot at 34 Hill Avenue (APN 002-214-01)

Dear Ms. Neal:
I represent Aaron and Kelley O'Brien, the owners of 32 Hill Avenue. The O'Briens ask that the Planning Department and the Planning Commissioners consider the enclosed letter from Josh Woelbing before making a decision in this matter. Mr. Woelbing is a well-respected local surveyor who has surveyed the boundaries of the property located at 34 Hill Avenue (Lot 39 on the subdivision map of the neighborhood) 32 Hill Avenue, and the surrounding neighborhood. His conclusion, that the survey proposed by the owner of 34 Hill Avenue erroneously shifts the boundary of that lot 3+ feet towards the O'Briens' property, has implications for both the O'Briens and the entire neighborhood.

With two competing surveys and serious questions about the validity of Mr . Simenic's survey, it is unfair to allow the proposed project at 34 Hill Avenue to move forward. The O'Briens are willing to pay for Mr. Harmina's time to meet with Mr. Woelbing and evaluate both of the surveys that impact this project, as requested in Mr. Woelbing's letter.

A decision on this project without addressing the merits of both surveys, under the rationale that the determination of the correct boundary should be deemed "a civil matter" that could be worked out in the courts, would leave the O'Briens with no recourse. Any decision from the courts, pursued at enormous expense, would be too late to stop construction of the proposed residence at 34 Hill, situated well within the

## Linda Neal, Principal Planner

Town of Fairfax
August 3, 2023
Page 2
minimum setbacks with parking spaces that actually encroach onto the O'Briens' property.

The O'Briens request that the Town give full and fair consideration to Mr .
Woelbing's conclusions regarding the correct location of the boundary between 34 and 32 Hill Avenue.


Enclosure (Letter from Joel Woelbing, with its enclosures)

Date: August 3, 2023
File: 2200107
Linda Neal, Principal Planner
Town of Fairfax
142 Bolinas Road
Fairfax, CA 94930

## RE: 32 HILL AVE BOUNDARY DISPUTE LETTER REQUESTING GJ HARMINA TO REVIEW OUR SURVEY

Dear Linda,
I have received the letter dated July 17, 2023 that was prepared by GJ Harmina, PLS in regard to 34 Hill Avenue. In this letter Mr. Harmina mentions meeting with Oberkamper staff regarding their survey and discussed evidence they collected. However, GJ Harmina has never reached out to me at CSW/Stuber-Stroeh or even mentions reviewing the Record of Survey we created and filed with Marin County Public Works recorded in Book 2023 of maps, page 85, Marin County Records. How could a determination be made without revicwing both sides? In this letter by Mr. Harmina he states, "... that Lot 39 and Lot 40 were under the same ownership" he then goes onto say that, "The addition to the structure appears to have been constructed without regard for a boundary since the lands were all under one owner." The next paragraph then reads, "In my experiences with contiguous lots under one ownership, it is very common to find construction or other features to be located without regard for boundary". I agree with this statement it does not appear that a survey was done for the addition. However, this is irrelevant because the location of the addition has no weight over the boundary resolution to determine the common line of Lot 39 and 40 . The addition was not used by Oberkamper or CSW|ST2 as evidence to resolve the boundary.

The CSW|ST2 survey shows that the Oberkamper survey took $3.1^{\prime}+/$ - feet from the rear line of Lot 40 (which is 32 Hill Avenue -- the O'Brien parcel) and adds 3.1 ' $+/$ - to the rear of Lot 39 (which is 34 Hill Avenue -- the Simenic parcel). This discrepancy means that the set back for the proposed Simenic residence is significantly narrower than is indicated on the plans submitted to the planning department. Both Lot 40 and 39 are part of a subdivision that created all lots simultaneously, which means that if any error is found in the overall block then all of the lots would share that error equally. We broke down the block and found that record bearings and distances do not fit within the block. Therefore, it is inappropriate to assign record bearings and distances for each lot. If you review the Oberkamper Record of Survey and the original subdivision and draw out Lot 46 with the record and bearings shown it does not close. There is an error on that lot. How could this be used then? In addition, how could only one lot (their client's) be larger than what is mapped? How can a single lot grow in a simultaneous conveyance? I spoke with Oberkamper to hear their perspective and they are claiming there is an error on the map and this error should be placed into Lot 39 as a "book end". However, they ignore the fact that record does not fit for all these lots and each lot MUST either grow or shrink based on a ratio proportion of measured versus record.

## CSW ST2

## 32 Hill Ave Boundary Dispute Letter to Fairfax Planning Department Page 2

Brown's Boundary Control and Legal Principles by Curtis Brown, fifth edition (arguably the book widely accepted as the bible for boundary surveying) describes proration as, "A method of distributing discovered excess or deficiency between parties having equal rights or proportionate rights to the excess or deficiency" (Browns, page 445). Mr. Brown also states under Chapter 12 entitled, "Locating Simultaneoushy Created Boundaries", Curtis Brown states, "A simultaneously created boundary results when several parcels of land area created in the same legal instant by the same person, persons, or agency and by the same instrument. All parcels have equal standing, and no such portion can be said to have prior rights or seniority over any other portion" (Browns, page 343).

In this time and age equity is a cornerstone of our society that we recognize. In a subdivision (simultaneous conveyance) it is no different. All lots are required to share in an equal matter as a proportion of how the distances were originally mapped and labeled by the original surveyor. The survey that I prepared and as shown on 2023 M 85 breaks down the block by curb alignments and brick column occupation. This is the standard way when original monuments were never set or shown on the original map. Almost every other survey map that was done in this area used curb locations to breakdown portions of the block such as 28 OS 28, 32 OS 72, 2023 M 61, 2016 M 16, 2016 M 69, 2018 M 133 and my map 2023 M 85.

How can record be held if you don't know if it fits the block? Why would just Lot 39 be adjusted when it has no senior rights over other parcels? This is not a senior versus junior right issue. All of these lots were created at the same time chronologically and therefor are tied to each other equitably.

The Oberkamper survey has ramifications for the lots on the entire block. Here is a screenshot showing that record doesn't fit out there. See a breakdown of Lot 46 in the same block as Lot 39 and 40 , which is at the other end of Hill Avenue. If you use the bearings and distances shown you end up with an error of 4.99'. How could you use record bearings and distances from a map that was done 116 years ago without checking it if fits the block now?


## CSW ST2

## 32 Hill Ave Boundary Dispute Letter to Fairfax Planning Department

 Page 3Lot 39 is shown as a triangular three course lot on the original map. The original map also unambiguously shows a rear distance of 45.4 ' for Lot 40 , with Lot 39 converging to that rear point. Oberkamper's survey has modified the rear line of Lot 40 to 42.34 ' on their map and in essence removing $3.1^{\prime}+/$ - from Lot 40 which makes their client's lot larger in the process and the O'Briens lot smaller. If the original subdivider did not intend the rear line of Lot 40 to be $45.4^{\prime}$ then why was it labeled that way? Why was the 45.4 ' label placed on the northerly side of the shared line between Lot 40 and 51? Why does Oberkamper's Record of Survey show "( 42.3 'R 1 ) when clearly R1 shows a rear distance of 45.4 ?


## 32 Hill Ave Boundary Dispute Letter to Fairfax Planning Department Page 4

It would be unfair for the Planning Commiission to approve plans based on an erroneous boundary between 32 and 34 Hill Avenue. At a minimum, fairness requires review of both neighbors' survey evidence. I request that Fairfax Planning department ask Mr. Harmina to review both sides of the story and consider evidence we found. I request that he reviews the Record of Survey I prepared, evidence we found on the map, draw out all the record lots in the block (Lots 39 through 51) of record and see if any ambiguities can be found as we discovered. If so, how could record be applied here? If any ambiguities are found then those need to be resolved and the block broken down as CSW|ST2 did and resolved equitably by a ratio proportion by lines of occupation as other surveyors have done in this block.

I am open to having a meeting with Mr. Harmina to discuss details. I would like the evidence we uncovered to be reviewed. I feel that the boundary resolution and work I have done is court defensible, follows acceptable boundary principles and standard of care for Marin County. I look forward to future discussions on this matter in a fair and equitable manner with the homeowner for 32 Hill Ave also getting a chance to sit down with their surveyor as Mr . Harmina did with the owner of 34 Hill Ave. I can be reached by phone at (415) $664-8459$ or by email at JoshW@cswst2.com.


## Enclosures:

Letter by GJ Harmina, dated July 17, 2023
Record of Survey by Oberkamper (Book 2021 M 191)
Record of Survey by CSW|ST2 (Book 2023 M 85)
Original Map (2 RM 114)

## ENCLOSURES

High Definition Surveying

July 17, 2023
Town of Fairfax
142 Bolinas Road
Fairfax, California 94930
Attention: Linda Neal, Principal Planner
Subject: $\quad 34$ Hill Avenue - Boundary Review
Dear Linda,
This morning I met with Jim Clark, PE, Shane Rauch, PLS \& Leon Oberkamper at the Oberkamper office to discuss the subject survey. We had a productive discussion regarding occupation and found boundary evidence.

One important bit of new evidence that was presented was the fact that Lot 39 and Lot 40 were under the same ownership at one point in time. It was also revealed that the existing house on Lot 40 had an addition to the east side of the structure, which is the current area of conflict. When measured, the original building corners are 5 feet from the resolved lot line, which agrees with common setbacks. The addition to the structure appears to have been constructed without regard for boundary since the lands were all under one owner.

In my experiences with contiguous lots under one ownership, it is very common to find construction or other features to be located without regard for boundary and only upon a change of ownership are conflicts, like this one, revealed.

In conclusion, I will state that on review of this new information, I agree with the Oberkamper map on file, Let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,




ENGINEER'S COPY


ARCHITECTURAL ABBREVIATIONS エモテ

GENERAL NOTES
 Coin















 Sill








| $\underset{\substack{\text { Room } \\ \text { NQME }}}{\text { cen }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Room name } \\ \text { Bose } \\ 1505 \mathrm{SF} \end{gathered}$ | wnoow tree | 2000｜e］ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wall trpe | 10 | ${ }_{\text {elevarion }}^{\text {Rcp }}$ | $\theta$ |
| dooripe | Covel | cinsfler | $\bigcirc$ |
| $\underset{\substack{\text { colunn } \\ \text { cridun }}}{ }$ | （0） | Eleation | $\underset{\text { Elevatione }}{\text { Name }}$ |
| secton | $\hat{A 10}^{1}$ | оEAL | （A101 ${ }^{\text {（1）}}$ |
| nevaton | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{c}\left(A_{1}\right.$ |  | (A10) |

GENERAL NOTES CONTINUED









PROJECT DIRECTORY

Contact：Jonnsmencequallcom






| PROJECT INFORMATION AND CALCULATIONS |  | SHEET LIST |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| prouect name： | smencorestence |  |  |
| Prouect rvee | entral new constructoon |  |  |
| Parcel number | －oseretennep |  | SHEEN NME |
|  | Tobe diternmeo |  |  |
| Trpe of construectov： spankler prouection： |  | －1 Anooo | Covise |
|  |  | ${ }^{-1}$ |  |
| Assessors Parce wumers： | 00227401 | － | Lanoscar man |
| zownc oisticir | ${ }_{\text {R55．7 }}$ |  | Stoerpole Plu |
|  |  |  | foortans |
|  |  |  | Reftectie cellug plans |
| Ava．Lot slope： | ${ }^{623 \%}$ SEEA10 |  | Ele |
| wloloand urban niteracac： |  | $\square^{\prime}$ |  |
| Wax allowable hegr： | ${ }^{\text {3，30ss }}$ |  |  |
| floorareas： | Exstrime proposed |  | ERESAIS Conrol pla mo deals |




SIMENIC RESIDENCE



| seriack： | REQured | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { FRONT YAR } \\ & \text { REAR YARD } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { FRON } \\ \text { REAR }= \end{array}$ |









## APPLICABLE BUILDING CODES




VICINITY MAP









