

# STAFF REPORT

TO:

**Planning Commission** 

DATE:

July 8, 2013

FROM:

Tom Zanarini, Associate Planner

**SUBJECT:** 

70 Lee Street - Design Review and a Categorical Exemption - Markoff/Fullerton

Architects, Applicant – Jill Benioff, Owner – APN# 027-042-48 – File PL13-

4037

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

- 1.) Conduct a Public Hearing;
- 2.) Find that the project is categorically exempt under Sections 15303(a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in connection with the construction of a new 4,394 square foot house with a 536 square foot attached garage and a 260 square foot detached studio, and
- 3.) Approve the Design Review application in connection with the construction of a new 4,394 square foot house with a 536 square foot attached garage and a 260 square foot detached studio, based on testimony and evidence in the record and the findings in **Exhibit A.** The project will be approved based on the conditions of approval in **Exhibit B.**

# ZONING COMPLIANCE

The subject site is 41,367 square feet with an effective lot area of 28,762 square feet (minus 12,605 square feet for a right-of-way easement). The proposed project includes the construction of a 4,394 square foot residence with a 536 square foot attached garage and a 260 square foot detached studio. The proposed project meets all of the applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as described below.

Zoning:

RS-10 (Single-Family Residential, 10,000 square

foot minimum lot size)

Proposed Use:

Single-Family Residence

Lot Size:

Effective Lot Size:

41,367 square feet

28,762 square feet (less right-of-way easement)

	Allowed	Existing	Proposed 02/11/13	<b>Current Proposal</b>
Floor Area:				
Lower Level	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	1,687 square feet	1,685 square feet
Main Level:	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	915 square feet	2,413 square feet
Upper Level:	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	1,507 square feet	Not Applicable
Attached Garage:	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	546 square feet	536 square feet
Detached Studio:	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	260 square feet	260 square feet
Total:	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	4,915 square feet	4,894 square feet
*Total Counted into FAR:	4,438 square feet (15.7%)	Not Applicable	4,415 square feet (15.3%)	4,394 square feet (15.2%)
*Lot Coverage:	7,841 square feet (40%)	Not Applicable	6,615 square feet (23%)	6,615 square feet (23%)
House Setbacks:				
Exterior Setback (east):	15 feet	Not Applicable	15 feet 1 inch	15.1 feet
Interior Setback (west):	15 feet	Not Applicable	51 feet	38.7 feet
Interior Setback (south):	15 feet	Not Applicable	20 feet	28.6 feet
Interior Setback (north):	15 feet	Not Applicable	15 feet 7 inches	15 feet
Additional Info:				
Height:	25 feet / 35 feet	Not Applicable	33 feet (double setback)	33 feet (double setback)
Cut:	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	421 cubic yards	580 cubic yards
Fill:	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	377 cubic yards	270 cubic yards
Off-haul:	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	44 cubic yards	310 cubic yards
Impervious Surface:	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	5,752 square feet (13.8%)	5,752 square feet (13.8%)
Parking:	2 spaces	Not Applicable	5 spaces	4 spaces
*Lot Cover	age and Floor Area	Ratio Calculations ba	sed on 28,762 square foot Eff	fective Lot Area

# **PRIOR REVIEW**

This application was first presented to the Planning Commission as a Design Review Study Session on February 11, 2013. The staff report (Attachment 1) and minutes (Attachment 2) are attached. At the March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting the Planning Commission had the following suggestions and concerns about the project after reviewing the plans:

- Provide a native planting plan.
- Review project with the Fire Department.
- Minimize window glazing and/or potential 'lantern effect.'

#### **STAFF ANALYSIS**

The applicant has included revisions to the project plans from the March 11, 2013 Planning Commission hearing, which is detailed in the sections below:

Provide a native planting plan.

The February 11 study session site plan provided only minimal landscaping design features, but did provide some conceptual placement of screening plants. The Planning Commission stated that they would like to see a native planting palate to complement the natural feel of this site. The applicant has provided a Tree Preservation Plan / Arboricultural Report from Urban Forestry Associates, Inc. dated June 27, 2013 (Attachment 3). Of the 222 trees on site, five trees are proposed for removal due to construction and another 17 tree removals are proposed that are considered hazardous trees (invasive, exotic, poor health and/or disease). Additional trees are proposed on the landscape plan to aid privacy screening, specifically between the project property and 61 Lee Street to the east and near 60 Lee Street to the south. A landscape buffer between the driveway and proposed residence further aids in privacy screening for residence that use the Lee Street right-of-way on the project property.

Review the project with the Fire Department.

The project is located on a heavily wooded steep slope with considerable fire hazards. The Planning Commission asked that the applicant work with the Mill Valley Fire Department when preparing the Vegetation Management Plan to insure the best practices are considered for this project. The applicant and Fire Department staff met numerous times on site to identify which vegetation species should be removed and/or replaced that might be potential fire hazards. The applicant's arborist provided a Vegetation Management Plan (Attachment 4), which details the best practices for fire management. In addition to the trees slated for either removal due to the fire hazard, the VMP states that all landscaping proposed in the landscape plan (Sheet L1 of the project plans) are fire-resistant.

James Raives, Senior Open Space Planner of Marin County Parks submitted a letter (Attachment 5) concerning the defensible space identified on the VMP (Sheet L2 of the project plans) required the applicant to clear vegetation across the property lines. The property to the north of the project site is owned by Marin County Parks. Staff contacted the Fire Department who sent this statement from Jeff Davidson, Fire Chief:

"If an applicant can't meet the requirements of a VMP due to various constraints such as a neighbor not wanting to allow access to their property then the applicant needs to come up with alternatives such as a wider road, hydrant, increase ignition restiveness of structure, etc."

The Fire Department has routinely considered on-site alternatives when the defensible space crosses property borders. Such mitigation measures include providing a more robust brush removal plan as well as a fire resistive planting plan. The applicant has provided a detailed VMP that includes brush clearing and planting fire resistive plants. Should this project be approved by

the Planning Commission, the Fire Department will again review the VMP as a condition of submitting for a building permit as stated in Exhibit B – Condition #15.

Minimize window glazing and/or potential 'lantern effect.'

The Planning Commission commented at the February 11 study session that they were concerned with cross canyon views of the project and possible 'lantern effect,' which has been described by the Commission as excessive light emanating from the windows at night as viewed from off-site. The proposed project includes floor to ceiling windows that focus on the Mt. Tamalpais view to the west. The architectural design includes large overhangs (Sheets A3.1 and A3.2 of the project plans) that can mitigate the upward glare of light that may cause a 'lantern effect.' The east section of the residence is stucco with three small windows and a significant vegetative screen between the house and Lee Street.

Sheet A0.2 of the project plans includes a Project Vicinity Map, which shows that the west facing view has few houses with a cross-canyon view of 70 Lee Street. Elevation data found on marinmap.org shows that the central portion of 70 Lee Street is at approximately 390 feet elevation. The house shown on the vicinity map at 15 Lee Street is at approximately 280 feet elevation with a south facing orientation and a significant number of large trees screening its east view (towards 70 Lee Street). The only potential cross-canyon views are seen from 1 El Capitan at approximately 440 feet elevation and the Ralston White Retreat at approximately 520 feet elevation. The west view from 70 Lee Street, beyond the Ralston White Retreat is Marin Municipal Water District Open Space and Mt. Tamalpais.

The lack of cross-canyon facing properties and roof overhangs above the windows should significantly minimize any potential 'lantern effect' as viewed from off-site.

#### **Design Review Guidelines**

#### Slope Design Guidelines

The proposed project is located on a steep sloping lot where the natural elevation drops from 420 feet to 320 feet. The home is split into two circular pods with a swimming pool located between the two structures. The two pods have an interior connection through the lower level living area. The split design allows the house to integrate into the natural topography and step down the slope in conformance to Design Guidelines 1 and 2.

#### Flora and Fauna Design Guidelines

Landscape and Vegetation Management Plans are included on Sheets L1 (Landscape Plan) and L2 (Vegetation Management Plan) with an arborist report and VMP narrative included in Attachments 3 and 4. The landscape plan includes preserving the natural landscape (Design Guideline 3), proposing new species that are native and fire resistive (Design Guideline 4&9) and provide privacy screening between the house and Lee Street right-of-way (Design Guideline 6).

#### Soils and Grading Design Guidelines

The proposed project includes 580 cubic yards of cut, 270 cubic yards of fill that result in 310 cubic yards of off-haul. The off-haul is generated by lowering the grade of the house and auto court by 1-foot. Setting the house into the hill is proposed to lessen the visual impact of the residence as seen from the neighboring property at 60 Lee Street. This allows more native vegetation and existing mature trees to remain on site, which provides substantial privacy screening between the two properties. Attempting to keep more than the proposed 270 cubic yards of fill on-site would result in removing existing natural vegetation and creating artificial terracing, contrary to Design Guideline 12.

#### **Drainage Design Guidelines**

The drainage plan has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the Public Works Department. Further review of the plan will be conducted during the building permit phase. Conditions # 25-31 of Exhibit B, Conditions of Approval relate to the Public Works Department's requirements for construction grading and drainage standards.

## **Building Design Guidelines**

The applicant will comply with the City's Green Building Ordinance, WUI, and Energy Conservation requirements for the new structures. The residence is 4 feet 6 inches under the maximum height, conforming to Design Guideline 17 and complies with the setback requirements in the Mill Valley Municipal Code. The effective lot size for this property is 12,605 square feet less than the actual lot size (41,367 square feet), decreasing the maximum floor area ratio from 5,068 square feet to 4,438 square feet. The auto court includes parking for 3 guest vehicles, conforming to Design Guideline 21 that requires at least one additional offstreet parking space when on-street parking is not available along the immediate frontage of the property.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Staff has received one public comment from James Raives, Senior Open Space Planner for Marin County Parks.

#### **EXHIBITS**

- A. FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL
- **B. PROJECT CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT DATED MARCH 11, 2013
- 2. PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES DATED MARCH 11, 2013
- 3. ARBORIST REPORT FROM MARIN TREE SERVICE DATED JUNE 27, 2013
- 4. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT PLAN NARRATIVE DATED APRIL 29, 2013
- 5. PUBLIC COMMENT

# MILL VALLEY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

# **REGULAR MEETING OF Monday, July 08, 2013**

# COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL, 7:00 pm

#### 26 CORTE MADERA AVENUE

PLANNING .

John McCauley - Co-Chair

**ABSENT** 

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Heidi Richardson – Co-Chair Steve Geiszler – Vice-Chair

Chris Skelton Ricardo Capretta

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: Time for comments from members of the public on issues not on this Planning Commission agenda. (Limited to 3 minutes per person.)

PLANNING AND BUILDING DIRECTOR'S ORAL REPORT: Report on items being considered by the City Council.

LIAISON REPORTS: None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: JUNE 24, 2013** 

It was M/s by Commissioner Skelton/Commissioner Capretta to approve the minutes from JUNE 24, 2013. The motion was carried 3/0. Commissioner Geiszler abstained.

#### APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

It was M/s by Commissioner Capretta/Commissioner Skelton to approve the agenda. The motion was carried 4/0.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

1. 70 Lee - Markoff - Design Review - File No. 4037 (Zanarini) Construction of a 2-story 4,394 square foot single-family residence constructed as two detached buildings connected by a partially subterranean lower level, a 536 square foot attached garage, a 260 square foot detached studio accessory structure and a swimming pool.

70 Lee doc.

#### Staff Presentation from Associate Planner Tom Zanarini

# Presentation from Architect Antonina Markoff

# Presentation from Landscape Architect Jim Bradanini

#### **Public Comment**

#### **Commission Deliberation**

Commissioner Geiszler began by stating the house is near the floor area maximum but it is a large lot so it works. He said he could think of worse architectural styles that would not work well on the hillside; because of this the applicant is at a great starting point. He noted he liked the low pitched roofs and is greatly disappointed that it is not a green roof. He felt it was a major aspect of the project and would like to see what could be done to bring it back. There are issues with the plans, the cross sections and the floor plan heights do not match up. He mentioned there are opportunities to lower the house from the garage to kitchen floor level. He stated he would be more relaxed on the amount of fill removed from the site. The cut and fill from the site will present the neighbors with a short term problem, in regards to the narrow road and trucks, but will visually have long term benefits. He said the house does not have a big impact on the street. He stated the roof deck material is of extreme importance for cross canyon views. He would like to see the material and approve it in person. Commissioner Geiszler encouraged communication amongst neighbors for landscape mitigation.

Commissioner Capretta stated the applicant presented one of the best applications he has seen in his short time on the commission. It was well thought out an incredibly thorough. In regards to site layout he felt that pool is very large and dominates how the site will work. He echoed Commissioner Geiszler's thoughts on off haul. He noted the front structure is too tall and thinks some of the scale could be reduced. He is concerned about the height of the 8 foot retaining wall. He would like to see the retaining walls sloped to reduce mass. He stated the upper-living pavilion to the north could be reevaluated to push the house down. Grading caught him by surprise and he would like to see a phasing plan. He would like to see more information on drainage and suggested a possible rainwater collection system. He said the garage door is too large. He would like to see the green roof as well, but did state he does like copper roofs. He stated the materials were nice and agrees with Commissioner Geiszler's concerns with the roof deck material.

Commissioner Skelton thanked the applicant for the presentation. Like Commissioners Geiszler and Capretta, he is in favor of the green roof. He said given the site, it will be a challenge to mitigate views for neighbors and feels the roof would help. He mentioned he made two visits to the site and was caught off guard by the balance of the retaining walls, off haul, and the overall height. He thanked the applicant for the various options of off haul and felt the neighbors could have a say in choosing an option, short v. long term effects would be part of the process. He would like to see something to address the lower retaining walls. He said he supports the garage

and noted it provides a softer feel for the neighborhood. He stated he liked the project overall, he feels it is really creative and wonderful.

Chairperson Richardson has always really liked the project and stated it is sophisticated. She likes the site strategy and felt it was the best presentation as a commissioner she has seen. She said the site drawings are reading differently than the story poles and the project appears a bit larger. She asked for clarification of story pole placements. She felt the screening was doing its job to mitigate neighbor views. She stated when you live in the hills there are bound to be views of surrounding homes and one should do the best he or she can to be a good neighbor. Chairperson Richardson stated the architect has done a great job at softening the structure in the landscape. She felt the applicant should not cave on the green roof and stated there are ways to have the green roof and ensure fire safety. She agreed with her fellow commissioners on viewing the roof deck material. She stated, at the end of the day the project meets all of the Planning Commission requirements and it is a buildable lot.

2. 355 Vista Linda - Chambers - Design Review - File No. 4056 (Zanarini)

Demolition of an existing residence and the construction of a 3,295 square foot twostory residence with a 520 square foot attached garage and a 572 square foot Residential
Second Unit above the garage.

355 Vista Linda doc.

#### Staff Presenation from Associate Planner Tom Zanarini

#### Presentation from Architect Barbara Chambers

#### Presenatation from Landscape Architecht Jim Brandanini

#### **Public Comment**

It was M/s by Commissioner Geiszler/Commissioner Skelton to approve the application and find that:

- A. The project is Categorically Exempt from the CEQA requirement for the preparation of environmental documents under Section 15303(a) of the CEQA Guidelines.
  - CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(a) exempts, "one single-family residence in a single-family zone."
- B. The proposal is consistent with the General Plan and the Municipal Code.
  - The new house is a single-family residential development project consistent with the single-family land use designation in the General Plan. The project meets the height, setback and floor area ratio requirements of the Municipal Code for single-family



# STUDY SESSION

**DATE:** 

February 11, 2013

TO:

**Planning Commission** 

FROM:

Tom Zanarini, Associate Planner

**SUBJECT:** 

70 Lee Street - Design Review - Antonia Markoff, Architect - Jill Benioff,

Owner- APN 027-042-48 - File PL12-4037

The proposed project is located within a RS-10 (Single Family Residential – 10,000 square foot lot size minimum) zoning district on a 41,367 square foot lot. The proposed project involves the, construction of a 4,109 square foot home, 546 square foot garage, and 260 square foot accessory structure on a vacant lot.

The residence conforms to all height and setback requirements for the RS-10 Zoning District.

**Attachment 1: Project Data Table** 

The following information will be given to the Planning Commission with your plans prior to the Study Session hearing. Please include both square footage amounts and percentages for Floor Area, Lot Coverage, and Impervious Surface. If something is inapplicable to your project please leave that box blank.

General information:			
Zoning:	RS-10	Flood Zone:	
APN:	027-042-48	Lot Area (in sq. ft.):	41,367 sf
% of the Exterior Walls and Roof which will be Removed:			
Project-Related	Allowed	Existing	Proposed
Property Information:			
Residential Density			
Effective Lot Area*	28,762 sf		
Lot Coverage	40%		16% total area, 23% effective ar
Public and Private usable space			
Average Lot Slope at the Building Pac		\	27.7%
Floor Area:			
Lower Level of House			1687 sf
Main Level of House			915 sf
Upper Level of House			1507 sf
Garage			546 sf
Accessory Structure(s)			260 sf
Second Unit(s)			
Total			4915 sf
Total counted in FAR	4,438 sf (5% effective lot area + 3000 sf)		4415 sf
Setbacks:			
Exterior Setback	15'		15'-1"
Side Yard Setback	15'		51'-0"
Side Yard Setback	15'		20'-0"
Rear Yard Setback	15'		15'-7"
Additional Information:			
Height	25' / 35'		33' at highest point
Cut			421.3 cy
Fill			377.4 cy
On/Off-haul			43.9 cy off-haul
Impervious Surface	40%		13.8% total area / 19.9% effective
Parking	2 std + 1 compact		2 std + 3 compact

fective Lot Area is the gross horizontal area of a lot minus any portion of the lot encumbered by a trail easement or recorded eway or roadway easement.

48. This approval is effective from the date of approval until the building permit is issued and shall expire one year after approval should a building permit not be issued.

The motion was carried 4/0.

2. 70 Lee Street - Markoff - Design Review - File No. 4037 (Zanarini) A STUDY SESSION to review the application of Markoff Fullerton Architects for construction of a new 4,109 square foot residence, a 546 square foot garage and a 260 square foot assessor building on a 41,367 square foot parcel (28,762 square foot effective lot area).

70 Lee St doc.

#### Applicant presentation from architect Antonina Markoff

#### **Public Comment**

#### **Commission Deliberation**

Commissioner Richardson thinks this is a brilliant solution to a difficult site and feels this location is the best possible for everyone. She feels the different structures breaks down the massing and stated it's so rare that you get this level of site strategy sophistication as seen here. She stated the design is witty and playful. She stated it's big but feels very low profile to her. She supports to sod roof and loves the materials. She will look forward to seeing the screening options and an arborist report. She stated the next step is to discuss the project with the Fire Department.

Commissioner McCauley feels the project is stunning and is very impressed. His only concern is the glazing and hopes to see some cross canyon views during night time when it returns.

Commissioner Geiszler feels the house is pushed up against the Open Space setback and can't be moved any further. He feels the multiple pavilions are a big help as opposed to one big towering façade and feels the colors are in tune with the natural surroundings. His only comment is that he would like to see a very native planting palette to keep the natural feel of this site.

Commissioner Rand feels the property is amazing and the views are the best of Mount Tamalpais he's ever seen from a Mill Valley home. His one concern is about the amount of glazing as he would hate to see that area spoiled with a lantern effect. He feels the house is very innovative and unusual.

The Commissioners agreed that they would like to see a physical model next time around.

3. 13 Daffodil Lane - Moyer - Design Review & Variance - File No. 4049 (Zanarini) A STUDY SESSION to review the application of Michael Moyer for the

April 15, 2013

# URBAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATES, INC.

8 Willow Street San Rafael, CA 94901 415 454 4212 arborforestry@sbcglobal.net

Jim Bradinnini 70 Lee Street Mill Valley, CA 94941



JUN 27 2013

# TREE PRESERVATION PLAN / ARBORICULTURAL REPORTity of Mill Valley for the

Benioff Property: 70 Lee Avenue, Mill Valley, California 94941

# TREE ASSESSMENT SUMMARY - Heritage trees are listed in **bold** below.

#### **Subject Trees:**

- 26 Coast Live Oak (*Quercus agrifolia*): # 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, T-11, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, **T-14**, 65, 67, 68, 69, T-3
- 9 Tan Oak (Lithocarpus densiflorus): #44, 46, T-7, T-13, 66, 70, T-22, T-21, T-20
- 5 Pacific Madrone (Arbutus menziesii): #T-8, T-9, T-12, T-16, T-18
- 1 Arizona Cypress (Cupressus arizonica) #T-4
- 1 Bishop Pine (*Pinus muricata*): #T-1
- 2 Monterey Pine (Pinus radiata) #53, 55
- 1 Douglas Fir ((Pseudotsuga menziesii): #63
- 1 Canyon Live Oak (Quercus chrysolepis): #65
- 1 Hybrid Black Oak (Quercus moreha): #40-A
- 1 Acacia "Golden Wattle" (Acacia pycnantha): #71
- 1 Manzanita (Arctostaphylos spp.): #70

Total: 49

#### **Protected (Heritage) Trees:**

1 Coast Live Oak (*Quercus agrifolia*): **T-14** (2 Trunks 44" + 49" = 93")

Total: 1

#### **Removals for Proposed Construction:**

- 5 Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia): #45, 50, 51, T-3
- 1 Pacific Madrone (Arbutus menziesii): #T-8, T-16

Total: 6

#### Hazard Tree, Invasiv Exotic or Poor Health/Disease Removals:

- 2 Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia): #42, #60
- Tan Oak (Lithocarpus densiflorus): #44, 46, T-7, T-13, T-22, T-21, T-20, 53, 55, 66, 70,
- 1 Douglas Fir ((Pseudotsuga menziesii): #63
- 1 Bishop Pine (Pinus muricata): #T-1
- 2 Pine (*Pinus spp.*) #53, 55
- 1 Acacia "Golden Wattle" (Acacia pycnantha): #71
- 1 Arizona Cypress (Cupressus arizonica) #T-4

Total: 17

#### CITY OF MILL VALLEY'S TREE ORDINANCE

According to the City of Mill Valley's Tree Ordinance:

Heritage Trees: (Section 20.67.010) 'shall include the species of tanbark oak (Lithocarpus densiflorus), oak (Quercus spp.), madrone (Arbutus menziesii), and coast redwood (Sequoia sempervirens) which meet the following criteria:

- tanbark oak:

65" in circumference at CBH.

- oak:

75" in circumference at CBH.

- madrone:

75" in circumference at CBH.

- coast redwood:

95" in circumference at CBH.

#### Citations:

- City of Mill Valley Mill Valley Tree Regulations Mill Valley Municipal Code Section 20.67.
- Pukdeedamrongrit, Amorit.: Proposed Site Plan Option 2: 249 West Blithedale, Mill Valley, California. (Sheet A1.1). 14 December 2012.
- Topographic Survey Plan: 249 West Blithedale Avenue / APN 027-125-03 (Sheet C-1). GL A Civil Engineers, Inc., San Francisco, CA. No date. No stamp.

#### TREE ASSESSMENT

All tree diameters were taken at CBH (Circumference at Breast Height measured at 4.5 feet above grade) or otherwise stated.

Condition Rating: 1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Very Good, 5-Excellent Location: See attached Arborist Map

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

**ASSESSMENT** 

DBH - Diameter at Breast Height, diameter measured at 4.5 feet above grade

SOD - Sudden Oak Death (SOD), Phytophthora ramorum

TPZ - Tree Protection Zone

Tree #T-1 (from the 2004 survey)

Species Bishop Pine (Pinus muricata)

Size 40.15" CBH

Location Located immediately north-northeast of the existing

driveway entrance. It is approximately 3.5' from the paved

driveway, and is just south of the cutbank

Condition 2 - Fair Suitability for Preservation 2 - Fair

Construction Impact(s)

The construction impacts would be significant due to a

retaining wall that must be installed immediately up slope.

Conclusion

This tree is quite out of its native for zone habitat on this poor soil, droughty site and certainly will not survive the impacts of the construction of the retaining wall. The

impacts of the construction of the retaining wall. The prognosis of this tree is poor.

Recommendation Removal.

Tree #T-4 (from the 2004 survey

Species Arizona Cypress (Cupressus arizonica)

Size 55.6" CBH

Location

Located in the middle of the proposed driveway

Condition

3. Good health and structure. The structure of the proposed driveway

Condition 3- Good health and structure. Though a number of the

Suitability for Preservation branches are over-extended with poor taper (breakable). Fair to Good. However, this is a fire-prone tree on a fire-

prone site and its removal would likely be required for defensible space purposes.

Construction Impact(s)

Significant. This tree will be removed due to construction

impacts for the garage and driveway.

Conclusion

This tree will be removed.

Recommendation Removal and replacement.

Tree #40

Species Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia)
Size (2 stems) 18 022 (CDV)

Size (2 stems) 18.022"CBH north, 13.28" CBH south

Location Located west-southwest of the existing driveway and south

Suitability for Preservation

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

of the Juniper. Refer to Arborist Map.

3 - Good condition. This tree has some crown dieback.

Good.

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Not significant.

Conclusion This tree should not be in the construction impact zone.

Recommendation Preserve tree.

Tree #40-A

Condition

**Species** Oracle Oak (Quercus X moreha) Black Oak X Live Oak

Size Approx 9.5" CBH

Location South, southeast of T-40

Condition 3 - Good Suitability for Preservation 3 - Good

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Not significant.

Conclusion This tree may flourish if the diseased T-41 is removed.

Recommendation Preserve tree.

**Tree #41** 

**Species** Coast Live Oak (Quercus agrifolia)

Size 33" CBH

Location Located southeast of T-40. Refer to Arborist Map.

Condition 2 - Fair - Bacterial infection flux at base of tree, fluxing in

the crotch of the south branch and again on south branch

Suitability for Preservation 2 - Fair

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Tree may be located within area for studio walkway

Conclusion This tree may be impacted by stair/walkway construction,

but should be monitored for long-term health.

Recommendation Preserve with strict TPZ, if it declines replace.

**Tree #42** 

**Species** Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

Size 2 - stems at 16.65" CBH: & 20.42" CBH

Location Approximately 24' northwest of the property boundary

corner. Refer to Arborist Map.

Condition 3 - Good condition. There is some necrotic areas on the

3 - Good.

foliage which may be only a wet spring leaf disease (like anthracnose), otherwise no other indication of disease.

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Not significant.

Conclusion No construction impacts.

Recommendation Preserve tree.

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

**Tree #43** 

Species

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

Size

31.10" CBH

Location

Adjacent to the proposed walk. See Arborist Map.

Condition

3 - Good

Suitability for Preservation

3 - Good.

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Potentially significant. This tree is located just south of the

proposed studio walkway.

Conclusion

This tree may be impacted by grading and construction

activities for the studio walkway.

Recommendation

Preserve tree if possible provide adequate TPZ. The walkway could be designed to greatly mitigate impacts. Recommend replacement if this tree needs to be removed

for construction

**Tree #44** 

**Species** 

Tanbark Oak (Lithocarpus densiflorus)

Size

29.85" CBH

Location

Located approximately 12 feet north of T-43. This tree is approximately 10 feet southeast of the proposed studio.

Condition

3 - Good condition.

Suitability for Preservation

1 - Poor

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

This tree is above the walk and outside of the construction area for the studio but it may be near the walkway to the

studio pavilion.

Conclusion

It will more than likely contract SOD (*Phytophthora* ramorum) and die in the near future. SOD is on the site.

Recommendation

Removal and no replacement.

**Tree #45** 

Species Size

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

- .

(2 stems) 24.2"" & 18.54" CBH

Location

Approximately 10' southeast of proposed studio.

Condition

3 - Good condition.

Suitability for Preservation

3 - Good.

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Potentially significant. This tree is located just north of the

proposed studio walkway.

Conclusion

This tree may be impacted by grading and construction activities for the studio walkway, depending on walkway

design.

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

Recommendation

Preserve if possible, provide adequate TPZ. If tree needs to

be removed, recommend replacement.

**Tree #46** 

Species Tanbark Oak (Lithocarpus densiflorus)

Size 42.41" CBH

Location Located approximately 4 feet south of the Studio Pavilion

Center

Condition 3 - Good condition.

Suitability for Preservation 3 - Guarded. It is highly susceptible to SOD.

Proposed Construction Impact(s) This tree is located just south of the proposed construction

area for the studio walkway.

Conclusion It will more likely than not contract SOD and die in the

near future.

Recommendation Removal and no replacement.

<u>Tree #47</u>

Species Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

Size 20.10" CBH

Location Located approximately 5 - 10 feet southwest of the Studio

pavilion. It is approximately 15 feet west of the tanoak (T-

46).

Condition 3 - Good condition.

Suitability for Preservation 3 - Good.

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Potentially significant. This tree will be just south of the

studio deck and growth could be impacted by the

construction.

Conclusion This tree is just south, outside of the proposed construction

area for the studio but could be impacted long term by the

deck area construction.

Recommendation Preserve tree. Provide adequate TPZ.

Tree #48

Species Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

Size 17.9" CBH

Location Located approximately 3 feet west of the T-47.

Condition 2 - Fair to 3 - Good. This tree has some crown dieback. It

has one broken leader with the dominant leader west of the

main stem. It is for most part is in good condition.

Suitability for Preservation 3 - Good.

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Not significant.

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

Conclusion

Recommendation

This tree is outside of the proposed construction.

Preserve tree. Protect with TPZ

**Tree #49** 

**Species** 

Size

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

16.96" CBH

Location

Located approximately 5 feet directly west of the proposed

Pavilion It is northwest of T-47.

Condition

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

3 - Good condition.

3 - Good.

Potentially significant. This tree will be just northwest of

the studio deck, and both roots and growth could be

impacted by the construction.

Conclusion

This tree is just west, outside of the proposed construction area for the studio but could be impacted long term by the

deck area.

Recommendation

Preserve tree. Provide adequate TPZ with soil/root

protection.

**Tree #50** 

Species Size

Location

Condition

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

12.88" CBH

Located directly west of the proposed Pavilion and on the east side of the Studio. It is at the edge of the of the Studio

foundation. It is under the large existing Tan Oak. 2 - Fair. This tree has a lot of crown dieback. It is also

under the canopy of another coast live oak.

Suitability for Preservation Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion

Recommendation

2 - fair.

Significant it is very close to or within the Studio footprint.

This tree will be removed for construction of the studio.

Removal and replacement.

**Tree #51** 

**Species** Size

Location

Condition

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

20.10" CBH

Located approximately one-foot east of the proposed studio. It is approximately 3 feet northeast of T-50.

3 - Good condition. This tree appears to have been

trimmed in the past. The main leader is the remaining

leader of two original leaders.

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion

3 - Good. Significant.

This tree is within the proposed construction area of the

Recommendation

Remove and recommend replacement.

**Tree #52** 

**Species** Size

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) 14.14" CBH

Location

Located approximately 15 feet west, northeast of the

proposed Studio and west of the Pavilion.

Condition

1 - Poor condition. This tree has been aggressively pruned in the past and as a result the dominant leader extends to

the south. 2 - Fair.

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion

Recommendation

Not significant

It is outside the construction zone but must be protected.

Preserve with strict TPZ.

<u>Tree #53</u>

**Species** Size

Monterey Pine (Pinus radiata)

29.53" CBH

Location

Located approximately 12 feet north of the proposed

Studio.

Condition

2 - Fair to 3 - Good. This tree has some pitch weeping at

the base. Other than that it is in good condition.

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

3 - Poor (invasive exotic displacing native species on site). None.

Conclusion

This tree is a non-native species and fast growing species

and could be a fuel hazard.

Recommendation

Recommend for removal in the near future.

**Tree #54** 

**Species** Size

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

18.85" CBH

Location

Located approximately 5 feet east of T-53.

Condition

2 - Fair condition. There is some crown dieback. It has a dominant leader to the west. The second leader was

trimmed.

Suitability for Preservation

2 - Fair.

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Not significant with proper tree protections.

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

Conclusion

Recommendation

This tree appears to be outside of the construction area.

Preserve with strict TPZ.

**Tree #55** 

**Species** Size

Location

Condition

Suitability for Preservation Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion Recommendation Monterey Pine (Pinus radiata) 25.13" CBH

Located near to the proposed Studio. 3 - Good condition.

3 - Good. Significant.

This tree is an invasive exotic displacing native species. This tree is scheduled for removal. No replacement is

recommended.

**Tree #56** 

**Species** 

Size

Location

Condition

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Conclusion

Recommendation

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) 14.14" CBH

Located approximately 6 feet north of the proposed studio.

It is approximately 8-10 feet northeast of T-55.

2 - Fair condition. Tree appears to have been trimmed in the past. It has a weak dominant leader and some crown dieback.

3 - Good. Not significant with proper tree protection.

This tree is outside of the construction zone but vulnerable.

Preserve tree with strict TPZ.

Tree #T-11 (from the 2004 survey)

**Species** 

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) Size

3 -stems: 32.36" (southwest stem), 22.3" (east stem), 22.3"

(north stem) CBH

Location Condition

Located approximately 5' northeast of the proposed Studio. 2 - Fair to 3 - Good condition. The southwest stem has the most crown dieback. The other two stems have good

crowns.

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion Recommendation

3 - Good. Significant.

This tree will require a strict TPZ to preserve.

Monitor the location of the south stem that may be leaning

over the studio deck. It can be trimmed back to the dominant leader extending northwest.

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

Tree #T-9 (from the 2004 survey)

Species Pacific Madrone (Arbutus menziesii)

Size 37.7" CBH

Location Located approximately 15 feet northeast of T-11.

Condition 2 - Fair. The trunk has a westerly directional progression;

sloping down hill towards the west. It has some crown

dieback. Otherwise the tree is in good health.

Suitability for Preservation 3 - Good.

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Significant. This tree is within the grading limits of the

proposed main living area pavilion.

Conclusion It is about 6 feet west of the proposed Pavilion.

Recommendation Provide adequate TPZ and monitor.

Tree #T-8 (from the 2004 survey)

Species Pacific Madrone (Arbutus menziesii)

Size 24.82" CBH

Location Within footprint of the Pavilion. See Arborist Map.

Condition 2 - Fair to 3 -Good condition.

Suitability for Preservation 3 - Good.

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Significant. It must be removed for construction.

Conclusion This tree is within the proposed building envelope and will

need to be removed to accommodate the proposed design.

Recommendation This tree is scheduled for removal.

Tree #T-7 (from the 2004 survey)

Species Tanbark Oak (Lithocarpus densiflorus)

Size 40.21" CBH

Location Located approximately 12' below utility pole.

Condition 1 - Poor condition. Evidence of leaf mortality from SOD.

Suitability for Preservation 1 - Poor, The disease will become vascular and kill the tree.

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Significant.

Conclusion This tree is within the proposed building envelope and will

need to be removed to accommodate the proposed design.

Recommendation It should be removed for stand health. No replacement.

**Tree #57** 

Species Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

Size 10.36" CBH

Location Directly north of the west most corner of the Pavilion. See

Arborist Map.

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

Condition

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion

3 - Good condition.

3 - Good.

Potentially significant. This tree is located close to or within the proposed patio

and grading footprint.

Recommendation

Provide adequate TPZ and retain if possible. If tree needs

to be removed, replacement is recommended.

**Tree #58** 

**Species** 

Size

Location

Condition

Suitability for Preservation Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion

Recommendation

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

30.78" CBH

Located approximately 17 feet northwest of the northwest corner of the main residence. It is also approximately 10

feet northwest of T-57.

2 - Fair to 3 - Good condition. 3 - Good.

Not significant.

This tree is outside of the construction zone.

Preserve tree with TPZ fencing.

Tree #59

**Species** Size

Location

Condition

Suitability for Preservation Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion

Recommendation

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

10.37" CBH

Located approximately 5 feet north of T-58. 3 - Good condition.

Preserve tree with proper tree protection.

3 - Good.

Not significant.

This tree is outside of the construction zone.

Tree #T-12 (from the 2004 survey)

**Species** 

Pacific Madrone (Arbutus menziesii)

Size

31.73" CBH

2 - Fair.

Location

Located 15 feet north of the main residence and west of north end of patio area. See Arborist Map.

Condition

2 - Fair condition.

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion

Recommendation

Significant. This tree is just outside of the limits of grading

This tree is approximately 5 feet from construction.

Preserve if possible. Provide adequate tree armoring TPZ.

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

Tree #T-13 (from the 2004 survey)

Species Tanbark Oak (Lithocarpus densiflorus)

Size 2 stems: 37.38" (south stem) & 27.33" (north stem) CBH

Location Located about 4' north of T-12

Condition 3 - Good condition. Tree has acute angle crotch with

included bark at the base. It is in close proximity to trees

with SOD.

Suitability for Preservation 1 - Poor (per the 2004 report).

Proposed Construction Impact(s) Not significant.

Conclusion This tree is susceptible to SOD but appears to be in good

condition now. However, the 3 year prognosis is poor. This

tree is outside the zone of construction impacts.

Recommendation Monitor for health. Removal in the long term inevitable.

<u>Tree #60</u>

Species Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

Size 2 - stems: 20.42" (west stem) & 18.85" (east stem) CBH.

Location Located approx 5' north of T-13.

Condition 2 - Fair. This tree has an acute angle crotch at the base.

The canopy has some moderate dieback and is beneath the canopy of the large Tan Oak to the south. It looks like it has some decay throughout with some decay at the base. There appears to be bore holes on the trunk. It is in fair condition. It looks like there are cankers on one of the

branches and some mold.

Suitability for Preservation 1 - Poor.

Proposed Construction Impact(s) This tree is outside the limits of construction

Conclusion Located adjacent and below T-13, a Tan Oak, it appears to

have disease and may have SOD.

Recommendation Monitor for SOD and remove if necessary.

**Tree #61** 

Species Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia)

Size 2-stems: 38.95" & 11.62" CBH

Location Located just north of T-60 And it is approximately 20 feet

from the zone of construction.

Condition 2 - Fair condition. This tree has two stems at the base. It

was probably a three stemmed tree at one point. The west

most stem has already been removed. The existing northwest stem has been cut in such a way that there is a

Urban Forestry Associates, Inc.

new leader extending west. The southeast most stem appears to be in fair condition. There is crown dieback.

Suitability for Preservation 2 - Fair.

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion

None with adequate TPZ, this tree is outside the Con. zone. Due to proximity to T-13 and T-60, this tree may be more

susceptible to contracting SOD.

Recommendation

Provide TPZ and monitor for signs of disease and/or SOD.

**Tree #62** 

Species

Size Location

Condition

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion

Recommendation

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) 10.68" CBH

Located approximately 15 feet north, northwest of pool area 3 - Good condition. There is some deer rubbing on the east

trunk of the tree.

3 - Good.

None expected with adequate TPZ.

This tree is outside of the proposed construction area and should thrive with proper protection

Preserve and protect

Tree #T-14 (from the 2004 survey)

Species

Coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) Size

Measurements are not at DBH due to low branching. 44"

and 49" CBH at approximately 3.5' above grade

Location Adjacent to the proposed pool area - within the limits of the

pool construction

3 - Good

Condition

Suitability for Preservation

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

Conclusion Recommendation 2 - Fair to 3 - Good

Potentially significant without strict TPZ ans cultural care. The pool vault wall has been moved back from tree 10 ft.

This tree will need a strict TPZ, mulch and fertilization. Strict TPZ with root/soil armoring (mulch and plywood).

Tree #63

**Species** Size

Douglas Fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii)

19" CBH

Location

Approx 10' north of T-14, north of the pool area. See

Arborist Map 3 - Good

Condition Suitability for Preservation

Good

Proposed Construction Impact(s)

None with proper TPZ.

Page 13 of 24