This amended agenda includes an updated staff report for item G1. and an updated Attachment A for item F3.

NOVEL CORONAVIRUS, COVID-19, EMERGENCY ADVISORY NOTICE
On March 19, 2020, the Governor ordered a statewide stay-at-home order calling on all individuals living in the State of California to stay at home or at their place of residence to slow the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Additionally, the Governor has temporarily suspended certain requirements of the Brown Act. For the duration of the shelter in place order, the following public meeting protocols will apply.

Teleconference meeting: In accordance with Government Code section 54953(e), and in light of the declared state of emergency, all members of the Planning Commission, city staff, applicants, and members of the public will be participating by teleconference.

How to participate in the meeting

- Submit a written comment online up to 1-hour before the meeting start time: menlopark.org/planningpubliccomment *
- Access the meeting real-time online at: zoom.us/join – Meeting ID# 831 6644 9012
- Access the meeting real-time via telephone (listen only mode) at: (669) 900-6833
  Regular Meeting ID # 831 6644 9012
  Press *9 to raise hand to speak

  *Written and recorded public comments and call-back requests are accepted up to 1 hour before the meeting start time. Written and recorded messages are provided to the Planning Commission at the appropriate time in their meeting. Recorded messages may be transcribed using a voice-to-text tool.

- Watch the meeting
  - Online: menlopark.org/streaming

Subject to Change: Given the current public health emergency and the rapidly evolving federal, state, county and local orders, the format of this meeting may be altered or the meeting may be canceled. You may check on the status of the meeting by visiting the City’s website www.menlopark.org. The instructions for logging on to the webinar and/or the access code is subject to change. If you have difficulty accessing the webinar, please check the latest online edition of the posted agenda for updated information (menlopark.org/agenda).
Regular Meeting

A. Call To Order

B. Roll Call

C. Reports and Announcements

D. Public Comment

Under “Public Comment,” the public may address the Commission on any subject not listed on the agenda, and items listed under Consent Calendar. Each speaker may address the Commission once under Public Comment for a limit of three minutes. Please clearly state your name and address or political jurisdiction in which you live. The Commission cannot act on items not listed on the agenda and, therefore, the Commission cannot respond to non-agenda issues brought up under Public Comment other than to provide general information.

E. Consent Calendar

E1. Approval of minutes from the October 18, 2021, Planning Commission meeting. (Attachment)

F. Public Hearing

F1. Use Permit/Marjorie Andino/730 Ivy Drive:
Request for a use permit to partially demolish, remodel, and construct first-floor additions to an existing nonconforming one-story, single-family residence in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The proposed work would exceed 75 percent of the replacement value of the existing nonconforming structure in a 12-month period and requires use permit approval by the Planning Commission. (Staff Report #21-062-PC)

F2. Use Permit and Variance/Rasoul Oskouy/671 Live Oak Avenue:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story, single-family residence and detached accessory buildings, and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width and area in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district. The proposal includes a request for a variance for the new residence to encroach into the required 20-foot separation distance between main buildings located on adjacent lots. The project also includes a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) above the attached garage, which is a permitted use, and not subject to discretionary review. (Staff Report #21-063-PC)

F3. Use Permit and Architectural Control/Matthew Pearson/66 Willow Place:
Request for a use permit and architectural control to construct a 1,440-square-foot temporary modular office in the C-1 (Administrative and Professional District, Restrictive) district. The applicant requests that the office module be placed on the property for a period of three years to accommodate additional temporary staff associated with the completion of the Stanford Hospital expansion. The office module would occupy nine parking spaces, decreasing the number of parking spaces from 91 to 82 spaces where 77 spaces is required. (Staff Report #21-064-PC)
F4. Architectural Control and Use Permit/Paul Turek/2400 Sand Hill Road:
Request for architectural control review and a use permit to construct a new entrance along with
other modifications to an existing commercial building in the C-1-C (Administrative, Professional,
and Research, Restrictive) zoning district, at 2400 Sand Hill Road. The project also includes
landscape modifications. (Staff Report #21-065-PC)

G. Study Session

G1. Study Session/Cyrus Sanandaji/1300 El Camino Real:
Study session on a request for a zoning text amendment to modify Municipal Code Chapter 16.92
(Signs-Outdoor Advertising) with regard to a previously approved architectural control, below market
rate housing agreement, environmental review, and use permit for a new mixed-use office,
residential, and retail development on a 6.4-acre site in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown
Specific Plan) zoning district. The proposed zoning text amendment includes eliminating the square
footage cap on the total sign area for larger projects within the SP-ECR/D zoning district and
establishing new regulations to calculate permitted signage for certain projects in the SP-ECR/D
zoning district. (Staff Report #21-066-PC)

H. Regular Business

H1. Review of Draft 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Dates. (Staff Report #21-067-PC)

I. Informational Items

I1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule – The upcoming Planning Commission meetings
are listed here, for reference. No action will be taken on the meeting schedule, although individual
Commissioners may notify staff of planned absences.

• Regular Meeting: December 20, 2021 – Cancelled

J. Adjournment

At every regular meeting of the Planning Commission, in addition to the public comment period where the public shall have
the right to address the Planning Commission on any matters of public interest not listed on the agenda, members of the
public have the right to directly address the Planning Commission on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by
the chair, either before or during the Planning Commission’s consideration of the item.

At every special meeting of the Planning Commission, members of the public have the right to directly address the
Planning Commission on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by the chair, either before or during
consideration of the item. For appeal hearings, appellant and applicant shall each have 10 minutes for presentations.

If you challenge any of the items listed on this agenda in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or
someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City of
Menlo Park at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Any writing that is distributed to a majority of the Planning Commission by any person in connection with an agenda item is
a public record (subject to any exemption under the Public Records Act) and is available by request by emailing the city
clerk at jaherren@menlopark.org. Persons with disabilities, who require auxiliary aids or services in attending or
participating in Planning Commission meetings, may call the City Clerk’s Office at 650-330-6620.

Agendas are posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2(a) or Section 54956. Members of the public
can view electronic agendas and staff reports by accessing the City website at menlopark.org/agenda and can receive
email notification of agenda and staff report postings by subscribing to the “Notify Me” service at menlopark.org/notifyme.
Agendas and staff reports may also be obtained by contacting City Clerk at 650-330-6620. (Posted: 12/10/2021)
A. Call To Order

Chair Michael Doran called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

Associate Planner Matt Pruter explained the basics for participating in a virtual public meeting.

B. Roll Call

Present: Andrew Barnes, Chris DeCardy (Vice Chair), Michael Doran (Chair), Cynthia Harris, Camille Gonzalez Kennedy, Henry Riggs

Absent: Michele Tate

Staff: Calvin Chan, Senior Planner; Fahteen Khan, Assistant Planner; Matt Pruter, Associate Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Acting Principal Planner Corinna Sandmeier reported that the Independent Redistricting Commission recruitment was extended to October 29, 2021.

D. Public Comment

None

E. Consent Calendar

E1. Approval of minutes and court reporter transcript from the August 23, 2021, Planning Commission meeting. (Attachment)

Commissioner Henry Riggs said he had the following corrections, which he had shared with staff:

Court reporter transcript, page 27, line 18, the phrase “not assisted” should read “not as if”;
Court reporter transcript, page 28, line 15, the phrase “to a ray of solar panels” should read “to an array of solar panels.”

ACTION: M/S (Riggs/Harris) to approve the minutes and court reporter transcript from the August 23, 2021 Planning Commission meeting with the following corrections; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Michele Tate absent:
F. Public Hearing

F1. Use Permit/Melissa McJannet/654 Hermosa Way:
Request for a use permit to demolish an existing two-story residence and detached garage, and construct a new two-story residence with a basement and an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width in the R-E (Residential Estate) zoning district. The proposal also includes a new detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU), which is a permitted use. (Staff Report #21-049-PC)

Staff Comment: Assistant Planner Fahteen Khan said the property owner’s name should be corrected to William Young. She said staff had received multiple pieces of neighbor correspondence after publication of the staff report. She said those had been emailed to Commissioners and were online attached to the October 18, 2021 agenda. She summarized neighbors’ concerns as follows: privacy for the right and left neighbors, close proximity of the proposed ADU, size of the proposed residence and the removal of the tree from the front yard.

Questions of Staff: Commissioner Chris DeCardy asked staff if the property had been 20 inches wider whether the proposed item require Commission review. Planner Khan replied that it would not.

Commissioner Riggs referred to neighbor comments and asked if trees were removed prior to permit application. Planner Khan said the applicant had submitted a Heritage Tree Removal permit application that was approved for removal of the deodar cedar from the front yard. She said the approval was due to the tree’s poor health, which did not require noticing. Replying further to Commissioner Riggs, Planner Khan said she believed only the cedar had actually been removed and there were some trees proposed for removal.

Applicant Presentation: Mark Godby, Godby Construction, said he began designing the project for the previous owner Melissa McJannet in July 2020. He said at that time the health of the cedar tree and a nearby olive tree were declining and continued to decline over the year. He said due to poor health those were approved for removal. He said they then submitted a permit to remove a camphor tree and that had been approved. He said everything done with the trees on the lot had been done through permit approval. He said the camphor was on the right side and for the right-side neighbor a plan had been developed before the property was sold to plant, per their landscape architect at the time, six fern pine trees to provide screening. He said then they also agreed and amended the plan to make the windows smaller and raise sills. He said regarding the left side there had been recent commentary regarding an oak tree on the neighbor’s property and the proximity of part of the proposed ADU, which would be built close to grade with a tree sensitive slab and a single pier in the encroachment area of the tree. He said their arborist John McLenahan found that the encroachment affected only 15% of the root area. He said the project sensitivity included a stepped back second floor and softening on first floor with a wraparound porch. He said based on neighbor input they lowered the height to 28.5 feet and located all the light wells within setbacks.

Chair Doran said in disclosure he had visited with a neighbor of the project site but that would not affect his decision. He opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.
Commission Comment: Chair Doran asked about state regulations regarding ADUs and the proximity of the ADU to the neighbor’s tree. Planner Fahteen said she did not think the Commission could change the location of the ADU as it met the four-foot setback requirement and safe construction practices were proposed to protect the neighbor’s oak tree.

Planner Sandmeier said Planner Khan was correct and the ADU was not part of the use permit application and thus was not something the Commission could condition.

Commissioner Camille Kennedy moved approval of the project as submitted in the staff report.

Commissioner Riggs said the project was handsome and the lot was nearly a standard size per Commissioner DeCardy’s observation. He referred to the podocarpus (fern pine) proposed for screening and noted based on the number of those to be planted that it might look like a 30-foot-tall hedge. Mr. Godby said he would defer to the landscape architect. He said the City Arborist had asked them to plant the trees further apart than what they had originally proposed and that was shown on the current plan. Commissioner Riggs seconded the motion to approve.

ACTION: M/S (Kennedy/Riggs) to approve as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Tate absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort, and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.

3. Approve the use permit subject to the following standard conditions:

   a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by October 18, 2022) for the use permit to remain in effect.

   b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Godby Construction, consisting of 33 plan sheets, dated received August 31, 2021, and approved by the Planning Commission on October 18, 2021, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

   c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies’ regulations that are directly applicable to the project.

   d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering, and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.

f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.

g. All applicable public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements and the dedication of easements and public right-of-way, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division prior to building permit final inspection.

h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition, or building permits.

i. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. The applicant's design professional shall evaluate the Project's impact to the City's storm drainage system and shall substantiate their conclusions with drainage calculations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building permit issuance.

j. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.

k. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report by McClenahan Consulting, LLC, dated August 24, 2021.

l. If construction is not complete by the start of the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the Applicant shall implement a winterization program to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation.

m. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule

F2. Use Permit/Jenny and Chris Buddin/1750 Bay Laurel Drive:
Request for a use permit for excavation within the required right side and rear setbacks for two basement lightwells associated with a new two-story residence with a basement and attached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) on a standard lot in the R-1-S (Single-Family Suburban Residential) zoning district. (Staff Report #21-050-PC)
Staff Comment: Senior Planner Calvin Chan said staff had no additions to the staff report.

Applicant Presentation: Lauren Goldman, LORO Architecture and Interior Design, said the request for a use permit was for excavation for a right side and right yard rear setback for two basement lightwells associated with a new two-story residence on a standard lot. She said the design was to protect a large tree and noted neighbor outreach throughout with positive responses.

Chair Doran opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Kennedy moved to approve the item as presented.

Commissioner Riggs noted the standard lot and asked if they had considered working within the setbacks noting the square footage of the home. Ms. Goldman said as the project unfolded, they had done trenching to have the arborist explore the root systems and they designed around the large tree. She said if they included the light wells in the setback they would have had to impose on the tree.

Commissioner Riggs noted that the ADU could have been located differently. He observed that the project like the prior one was handsome if large. He said it appeared the ADU was done in such a way that that extra square footage could be added legally to the primary residence and suggested consideration of that in future City discussions regarding ADUs. He seconded the motion to approve

ACTION: M/S (Kennedy/Riggs) to approve the item as recommended in the staff report; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Tate absent.

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.

3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:

   a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by October 18, 2022) for the use permit to remain in effect.

   b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by LORO Architecture and Interior Design, consisting of 17 plan sheets, dated received August 13, 2021, and approved by the Planning Commission on October 18, 2021, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.

   c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies’ regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.

e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.

f. All applicable public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements and the dedication of easements and public right-of-way, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division prior to building permit final inspection.

g. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.

h. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. The applicant's design professional shall evaluate the Project's impact to the City's storm drainage system and shall substantiate their conclusions with drainage calculations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building permit issuance.

i. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.

j. Heritage and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report by McClenahan Consulting, LLC, dated July 16, 2021.

k. If construction is not complete by the start of the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the Applicant shall implement a winterization program to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation.

l. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.

F3. General Plan Amendment and Rezoning/City of Menlo Park/105-155 Constitution Drive and 1395 Chrysler Drive:
Request for a general plan amendment to change the land use designation of an approximately 3,600 square-foot portion of an existing approximately 8.9-acre parcel from Commercial Business Park to Public/Quasi-Public and to change the land use designation of an approximately 3,600 square-foot portion of an existing approximately 5,000 square-foot parcel from Public/Quasi-Public to Commercial Business Park. In addition, the area with a resulting Public/Quasi-Public land use
would be rezoned to the P-F (Public Facilities) district, and the area with a resulting Commercial Business Park land use would be rezoned M-3-X (Commercial Business Park, Conditional Development District). The requested entitlements are associated with a lot line adjustment to construct a new City-owned pump station at 1395 Chrysler Drive. - Item continued to the November 1, 2021 meeting

ACTION: M/S (DeCardy/Harris) to continue the item to the November 1, 2021 Planning Commission meeting; passes 6-0-1 with Commissioner Tate absent.

F4. Development Agreement Annual Review/Cyrus Sanandaji, Presidio Bay Ventures/1300 El Camino Real and 550 Oak Grove Avenue:
Annual review of the property owner’s good faith compliance with the terms of the Development Agreement for the 1300 El Camino Real project. (Staff Report #21-051-PC)

Staff Comment: Planner Sandmeier said staff had no additions to the report.

Applicant Presentation: Cyrus Sanandaji, Presidio Bay Ventures, said project construction had proceeded diligently since their report last year in full compliance with the City’s and County’s health requirements. He said the project was shut down at the start of Covid restrictions in 2020. He said since then they had received their conditional TCO for the south office building in late August and they anticipated receiving the TCO for the north office building hopefully within the next few weeks. He said substantial progress had been made with the residential building. He said the dog park had been completed and the dog park agreement with the City had been recorded. He said as soon as rules and regulations were finalized the park would be ready for public use. He said the central plaza and fountain area was open to the public as well. He noted they had provided the compliance matrix and the project was in full compliance with the Development Agreement obligations.

Chair Doran disclosed that he met with Mr. Sanandaji at two of the properties and noted that would not affect his impartiality.

Chair Doran opened the public hearing and closed it to allow the applicant to make a few more comments.

Mr. Sanandaji said when their team took over the project about a year and a half ago, they evaluated what was being built at the time, which had been paused due to the shelter in place order. He said there were a series of operational and functional challenges that the approved design posed that affected the residential and two commercial buildings. He said leaving those unaddressed they believed would result in the project struggling to attract tenants for both the retail and community serving elements that were originally contemplated as part of the approvals and also for the office buildings. He said they also thought the design had prejudiced access to the residential building as well. He said they wanted to summarize the series of project modifications and subsequently engaged with Planning staff and the City team more broadly to bring the modifications forward for the approvals needed to proceed with them. He said a fountain had been contemplated at the access to the residential building, which was at the corner of Oak Grove and Garwood. He said the fountain was not designed though to provide primary ADA access to the building to the residences. He said there was a side entrance that would lead to an elevator, which in their view was not in the spirit of accommodation so they proposed changes to the stair design to substitute some stairs for ramps to create a more gradual grade and slope change for full ADA access to the primary residential lobby. He said the anticipation originally was to have community serving retail and uses along El Camino Real and a portion also of Oak Grove. He said however there was no consideration
from a physical standpoint to how those spaces would be serviced such as trash urns in the basement and trash enclosures at grade at the back of Garwood and other similar back of house functions that were not in place. He said those would require significant compromise to the public areas that were for the broader community benefit in terms of the plaza and other outdoor spaces. He said other related challenges included notification from USPS that they wanted a consolidated mail area in the basement due to restricted parking along El Camino Real and the other frontages. He said they did not believe tenants using these buildings in light of pandemic conditions would want to congregate in elevators, so they wanted to have pedestrian circulation vertically in the building. He said they cut in new oversized stairs to encourage the use of that connectivity within the building. He said in the south building they could only go to the plaza level but in the north building they were able to do to B2. He said once the core was put into both office buildings and with how the structural bracing design worked that the second floor of both buildings were severely limited preventing access physically. He said other modifications had to do with outdoor seating and alcohol use for the restaurants that they were negotiating with for leases. He said a ministerial issue related to the emergency generator building that had been approved and gone through a series of permits and approvals was that a diesel use permit had not been considered and would need to be secured.

Chair Doran opened the public hearing and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Commissioner Barnes moved to approve as recommended in the staff report Commissioner DeCardy seconded the motion.

ACTION: M/S (Barnes/DeCardy) to approve as follows:

1. Make a finding that the Annual Review of the Development Agreements has no potential to result in an impact to the environment and does not meet the definition of a Project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

2. Make a finding that Presidio Bay Ventures is in compliance with the provisions of the approved Development Agreement for the period of October 2020 through October 2021.

Chair Doran said that both Commissioners Harris and Kennedy had to be recused from the next item, a study session.

Commissioner Harris said for the record that she understood her residence was within 500 feet of the very edge of the Specific Plan area. She said the City Attorney and staff were researching how that should be handled in the future; however, as that research was not completed, she would need to recuse herself from the study session item this evening.

Planner Sandmeier clarified that the sign amendment in the next item involved the entire Specific Plan area which was why the two Commissioners were recusing themselves and not due to proximity to the 1300 El Camino Real project site.

Chair Doran noted there was a quorum with Commissioners Barnes, DeCardy, Riggs and himself in attendance.

G. Study Session

G1. Study Session/Cyrus Sanandaji/1300 El Camino Real:
Study session on a request for a zoning text amendment to modify Municipal Code Chapter 16.92
(Signs-Outdoor Advertising) with regard to a previously approved architectural control, below market rate housing agreement, environmental review, and use permit for a new mixed-use office, residential, and retail development on an 6.4-acre site in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district. (Staff Report #21-052-PC)

Staff Comment: Planner Sandmeier said they received an email from Michael Burch that had been sent to the Planning Commission. She said the writer was in support of the proposed amendment and described in detail how that would affect the Middle Plaza at 500 El Camino Real project.

Questions of Staff: Replying to Commissioner Barnes, Planner Sandmeier said over the last few years an issue was identified that larger projects along El Camino Real would be capped at 100 square feet of signage for primary frontage and 50 square feet for secondary frontage. She said originally this matter was intended to be included in Specific Plan updates that were delayed due to staffing shortages and other work priorities. She said that the applicant had applied for this amendment to speed up the process. She said that there was no formal staff recommendation as it was a study session; however, overall staff was supportive of increasing signage for these properties within the Specific Plan. She said staff was seeking guidance from the Commission and the staff report included a couple of bullet points for the Commission's consideration.

Replying to Commissioner DeCardy, Planner Sandmeier said she did not think in the past they had many properties with over 100-feet of frontage. She said the 1300 El Camino Real and the 500 El Camino Real projects merged parcels together creating great frontage widths. She said that merging parcels did not mean the previous sign allowances had been merged together.

Applicant Presentation: Mr. Sanandaji said the project at 1300 El Camino Real was approved in 2017 and was now close to completion with two pending issues critical to the project's success. He said in addition to the other modifications mentioned previously that a critical issue was signage. He said they had approximately 200,000 feet of office space and two, three-story buildings, and approximately 25,000 square feet of community serving uses fronting El Camino Real and Oak Grove Avenue. He said they were in the process of negotiating with several tenants and the provision of adequate signage was integral to the vibrancy and success of the project and that of the businesses wanting to take occupancy there. He said the City’s signage ordinance was last updated in 1992 and those rules did not work for larger projects such as this one and others in the Specific Plan area. He said that need was acknowledged in 2017 when the City Council directed that the provision for signage rules be pursued to allow for “larger projects to receive larger signage allocation subject to discretionary review.” He said when his group took over the project in the summer of 2020, they found that the signage had not been addressed so concurrent with the other project modifications they initiated discussions with staff. He said their team did an intensive study of what signage would be needed to make the project work given the varying uses. He said they submitted a signage plan to staff in May 2021 and again in August 2021 based on staff response. He said they were not seeking a master signage plan this evening rather only to address the first step to update the sign ordinance to address three specific areas: signage for the primary frontage, signage for the secondary frontage, and additional signage for more upper floor uses. He said essentially the goal was to leave the City’s sign ordinance intact except to remove the 100 square cap per lot for primary frontages. He said what they proposed was to allow for 540 square foot of signage in aggregate. He said a large portion of that total signage would be used for the project identification signage and way finding. He said the archway currently blank between the two buildings on El Camino Real itself would require about 180 to 200 square feet just to hold the words “Spring Line” and provide identification to the actual project itself. He said they were also proposing to remove the current effective cap of 50 square feet for secondary frontages to allow signage on
Oak Grove Avenue and Garwood Avenue at about half the amount permitted on the El Camino Real frontage. He said that was critical to the signage for the community serving grove and for the retailers there to succeed. He said they added a concept that would allow for additional signage for upper floor uses along the primary frontage on El Camino Real only specifically for each story above the first story. He said they were asking for additional signage area equal to half the area permitted based on the frontage length. He said this approach was consistent with the logic of the City’s current signage limitations while providing some additional signage based on the size of the building. He said procedurally anyone wishing to apply for additional signage rights including them would submit a master sign plan for the Planning Commission’s review and approval to ensure that any expanded signage would meet the overall design and aesthetic goals of the Specific Plan. He said they had submitted an illustrative master plan for their proposal that showed conceptually the overall signage allowed for each frontage. He said it was not intended to show the exact location and size of an image sign but to give a general impression of the amount of signage area the proposal would allow. He said they were showing maximum 50 square foot of signage for individual office tenants and a maximum 25 square feet or less for individual retail tenants.

Chair Doran opened the public comment period and closed it as there were no speakers.

Commission Comment: Chair Doran said it seemed there would be an aggregate limit of signs but there did not seem anything to prevent using the aggregate as one enormous sign. Planner Sandmeier said there was nothing in the specific text but applicants using this new provision would be required to get a master sign plan approval from the Planning Commission. She said that could control the size of signage either through condition or denial. Chair Doran asked for a parcel with a 100-foot frontage on El Camino Real now subject to a 100 square foot sign limit what the result would be with this formula, whether it would also be 100 square feet or more signage than that. Planner Sandmeier said now the ordinance allowed 100 square feet of signage for an 80-foot frontage. She said in the proposal there was a complicated formula that when applied for a 100-foot frontage would allow it slightly more than 100 square feet of signage if it was along El Camino Real as the primary frontage. Chair Doran confirmed that would increase in relation to frontage size.

Commissioner DeCardy asked about signage regulations for Atherton and Palo Alto. Planner Sandmeier said that would need to be researched.

Commissioner Riggs noted his extensive involvement over the years with development of the Specific Plan and that there had not been extensive discussions about signage. He said information regarding signage regulations in Redwood City and Palo Alto would have been relevant as those entities had larger projects and signage in scale. He said he did not want El Camino Real to appear as a large shopping mall or a cluster of big box stores. He said he appreciated staff and the applicant offering up the street elevations with a color key zones where there might be signage. He said he completely supported expansion of retail signage on the retail floor, typically the ground floor, and that needed to address each and every retail outlet. He said regarding the overall building signage that typically was located at the top of the building between the highest windows and the parapet and when adjacent to a freeway was used to communicate hundreds of feet. He said with El Camino Real there was not those hundreds of feet. He said they should look more carefully at upper signage and assure there was a level of restraint. He said if the 200,000+ square foot office building was leased to 15 different tenants and there were 15 different signs running along the parapet that would not be acceptable. He said he could see two signs but not four signs there. He said it would be tempting to have large scale signage at the upper floor, which he did not think would be a good aesthetic addition to Menlo Park. He said regarding the proposal for Planning Commission review of master sign plans his concern was that Commission members change, and they should not assume
that Commissions of the future would be attuned to aesthetics. He said having guidelines in place would benefit the community and would make the Planning Commission’s job more reasonable and structured. He referred to the proposal regarding retail signage and asked if other Commissioners thought the applicant might be allowed that but to require additional study of signage on upper floors.

Chair Doran said he agreed with Commissioner Riggs’ concerns and that having 15 different sign designs for office tenants on the tops of the office buildings was undesirable. He said his greater concern was turning El Camino Real into something like Times Square with four story buildings with a lot of frontages and no upper limit on the sign size permitted. He said staff had posed specific questions for the Commission in the staff report. Referring to whether the proposed formulas for calculating signage were generally supported, he said he was not supportive and thought more specificity was needed to guide the Planning Commission in its review of any master sign plan. Referring to the question, did the additional signage permitted for multi-story buildings seem reasonable, he said it was reasonable to have additional signage. He said certainly these large parcels were not contemplated in 1992 when the sign ordinance was last updated and probably not when the Specific Plan was developed. He said he would like to see more guidance in the ordinance and the proposal than what was there now regarding how the aggregate square footage was parcelled out. He said he agreed retail stores each needed a sign. He said his concern was permitting a higher aggregate limit on signs than having all that used on one large billboard type sign. Referring to whether the master sign plan be required for projects that fell under the proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment, he said he agreed with that.

Replying to Chair Doran, Planner Sandmeier said she thought a master sign plan could provide guidelines to allow staff review and approval when tenants changed. She said that would be a new process so the Commissioners should feel free to comment on what their preferences would be. She said perhaps for larger changes those would come to the Planning Commission for review and approval and for smaller ones come to Planning staff.

Commissioner Riggs said he was envisioning what the current sign permitting included in terms of review and that the Commission saw only applications that were in the gray area of the ordinance or wanted exemption from some portion of it.

Replying to Commissioner DeCardy, Planner Sandmeier said the proposed text amendments came from the applicant and were the applicant’s proposal. Replying further, she said the next step would be the applicant revising the proposal based on Commission comment to then come back to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation to the City Council for its approval.

Commissioner DeCardy said he was in general agreement with Commissioner Riggs’ comments and distinguishing between lower-level retail signage and upper-level signage and in keeping with the community scale. He said he appreciated the Chair’s comments on the overall limit of the size of a sign. He said he agreed with a master sign plan that was more specific and had guidance fairly definitive and easy to follow so that applications did not repeatedly have to come to Planning Commission for approval. He said he thought signage was important to residents and he thought there should be community engagement for what residents wanted to see as signage along the business corridors as it was a big part of the look and feel of the community. He said he thought it would be helpful to get input from neighboring communities. He said it was not apparent to him that size determined the effectivity of signage. He noted communities he had lived in with viable retail and restrictive signage. He said he thought it had more to do with clarity and identification.

Recognized by the Chair, Mr. Sanandaji said that the larger projects did not have a level playing field
such as described by Commissioner DeCardy noting a large project not having retail signage and the business across the street having full frontage signage. He said that was the inconsistency they were trying to address. He said their sign consultant RSM had done considerable study of signage along El Camino Real and in neighboring communities.

Commissioner DeCardy said he appreciated that input and the information they had received. He said as the Planning Commission he thought it was important they hear other perspectives from the community.

Commissioner Barnes said he was sympathetic to the premise of leveling the playing field in relationship to existing conditions. He said to have a reasoned discussion of what was fair they would need to look at what was currently existing on El Camino Real. He said he wanted to know whether this project was disadvantaged and would like information related to that.

Commissioner Riggs noted the interest in furthering the discussion and at the same time how to serve the imminent retail tenants of the project as it was nearly ready. He said he met with Mr. Sanandaji a week or so ago to look through the existing situations of the project. He asked if there was a way to have a prompter resolution of the retail signage if they thought the overall building signage was going to take further reporting or other studies such as existing signage now.

Chair Doran said he was sensitive to the developer’s situation, but he would like to know if there was a practical way to do something for the retail signage and leave the other questions to a future time. Planner Sandmeier said changing the retail signage regulations would require a zoning ordinance amendment. She said the Commission could recommend to the applicant to bring a separate proposal that would be just for the retail for review and bring as either another study session or a public hearing. She said one part of the proposal was lifting the cap of the 100 square feet and the second part was allowing additional signage for multi-story buildings. She said in that sense it would not just level the playing field with other El Camino Real properties and the additional square feet for the additional stories would only be permitted along the El Camino Real, noting the language at the top of page 3 of the staff report.

Recognized by the Chair, Mr. Sanandaji asked as the Planning Commission had control over all master sign plans whether it would be acceptable to proceed on the basis of removing the cap in place that created the unlevel playing field and allow for time for further discussion to occur. He said from their project’s perspective they were sort of the test project and wanted to extricate themselves from that discussion to the extent the Commission was amenable to. He suggested that instead they could come to the Planning Commission with a specific proposal that could address each of the Commissioner’s current concerns. He said at the minimum removing the cap was necessary for the viability of retail at the site.

Commissioner Barnes asked if someone could address the practical implications of removing the cap.

Chair Doran said if there was no cap and each master sign plan had to be approved by the Planning Commission that he was still concerned that they would have too little control on that. He said he would like to see clear rules as what was being proposed now seemed underdefined.

Replying to Chair Doran, Planner Sandmeier said Commissioners could recommend to the applicant that they revise their proposal to just remove the cap. She said it did not sound like there was support to allow additional signage for multi-storied office buildings. She said a recommendation
could also be made to the applicant to revise the proposal to perhaps include a maximum sign size. She said limitations whether based on colors or size could be added to the coding zone amendment.

Commissioner DeCardy said he was a little confused. He said it sounded like they were making the conversation specific to this project to help it move forward. He said they had two Commissioners recused because they live near the entire Specific Plan area and not this project. He questioned if the discussion was about this project why those Commissioners had not been allowed to participate in this conversation.

Planner Sandmeier said the City Attorney advised that Commissioners with residences within 500 or 100 feet of the Specific Plan area should recuse themselves pending more research. She said regarding the question whether this was only applying to 1300 El Camino Real that it was supportive of the entire Specific Plan area. She said the Middle Plaza project at 500 El Camino Real was not far behind this one in terms of leasing space and for them it was as pressing an issue as it was to the 1300 El Camino Real applicants as well as for other parcels that would face the same issues. She said it made sense to have it apply to the whole Specific Plan area. She said as written parcels along El Camino Real with El Camino Real frontage would be allowed more signage than what was currently allowed under the Specific Plan.

Commissioner DeCardy said he appreciated Mr. Sanandaji’s dilemma, but he was uncomfortable without knowing whether the two other Commissioners could participate or not on matters of the Specific Plan area and to expedite out of the study session some informal guidance about how they would proceed based on background information on signage provided solely by the applicant.

Chair Doran asked how long it was expected to get final guidance from the City Attorney regarding the question of a conflict of interest, and if they wanted to do another study session, hopefully with the participation of the other members, and with input about similar ordinances in neighboring cities, how long before that came back to the Commission. Planner Sandmeier said she believed the upcoming meetings were fairly full so likely it would be in December. She said she also received a message that one person was raising a hand to speak. She said she understood public comment was closed.

Chair Doran recognized Commissioner Riggs. Commissioner Riggs said there was a reason they did not reopen public comment noting individuals who used that to have the last word in the past.

Chair Doran thanked Commissioner Riggs and said he would not reopen public comment. He said he was not prepared to make a recommendation.

Commissioner Riggs said perhaps the Commission could make a formal recommendation of support for increasing retail signage similar to removing the cap but with some limitations regarding the size of individual signs and limitations on aggregating the square footage.

Planner Sandmeier said that this was a study session and Commissioners could provide individual feedback and it did not require a motion and vote.

Commissioner Riggs said he was suggesting that recommendation to provide a comfort level for the applicant as it seemed some Commissioners were heading in that direction.

Recognized by the Chair, Mr. Sanandaji said the topic was sensitive. He said it not only applied to their project but to other projects. He said he believed the person trying to comment was the sign
consultant for another project. He said without removing the cap they did not have a retail proposal. He said his final plea to the Commission was for them to be able to present a proposal to the Commission that could only happen if the aggregate limit were removed noting that the Commission retained 100% discretionary control over each part of the application they would bring forward regarding retail and way finding signage.

Chair Doran said he was open to the proposal made by Commissioner Riggs to remove the aggregate cap with respect to retail and for him retail was confined to ground level. He said if there was to be an amendment to the zoning ordinance besides removing the aggregate cap of 100 square feet for a project on one parcel that provisions be included that the increase could not be used for one large sign and how signage would be distributed.

Replying to Chair Doran, Commissioner Barnes said he was perplexed with the idea of working through this on one specific project. He said they were looking at a zoning amendment that would be applicable across the Specific Plan area but specifically working from one project’s viewpoint. He said he was sympathetic to the applicant’s need to move forward. He said he was not super sensitive to the signage issue and thought there was reasonable best practices so that there would not be a Vegas or Times Square result. He said he felt comfortable with not having wide community outreach as he thought the Planning Commission was empowered to make a recommendation to the Council to make a zoning amendment. He said he was fine removing the cap for the purposes of working with this applicant with respect to retail and having an upper limit to prevent a billboard effect. He said in crafting the amendment he would want to see additional viewpoints or work products. He said he was not really interested in what Redwood City or Los Altos did on signage as he thought they had enough of a baseline in Menlo Park to know what was wanted and best practices from existing conditions.

Commissioner DeCardy said he provided his input earlier. He said he understood the need for retail to have signage. He said from a policy perspective the matter should have been looked at in 2017 when it was noted. He said they were being asked to make recommendations without enough nor balanced information. He said it was fundamentally wrong that they did not have clarity even whether two Commissioners could participate. He said for another study session in December that the applicant could poll two cities to the north and two to the south and get that information and do some kind of community outreach in the area. He said next time they saw this he would want more clarity as to what was being put in place.

Commissioner Riggs said among their comments he heard that the applicant could come back with a different proposal and a general direction that the proposal would lift the cap on retail signage but limit individual maximum sign sizes.

Commissioner Harris rejoined the meeting.

H. Informational Items

H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

- Regular Meeting: November 1, 2021
- Regular Meeting: November 15, 2021

Planner Sandmeier said the November 1st agenda would include the General Plan Amendment and Rezoning at 105-155 Constitution Drive and 1395 Chrysler Drive.
Commissioner Barnes asked if at the next meeting staff could provide a report back on the next steps related to the study session tonight.

Commissioner DeCardy asked if at the next meeting staff could report on whether the two Commissioners could participate in items related to the Specific Plan.

J. Adjournment

Chair Doran adjourned the meeting at 9:38 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Brenda Bennett
Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve a use permit to partially demolish, remodel, and construct first-floor additions to an existing nonconforming one-story, single-family residence in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district, at 730 Ivy Drive. The value of the proposed work would exceed 75 percent of the replacement value of the existing nonconforming structure in a 12-month period. The recommended actions are included as Attachment A.

Policy Issues
Each use permit request is considered individually. The Planning Commission should consider whether the required use permit findings can be made for the proposal.

Background
Site location
The subject property is located on the southern side of Ivy Drive between Sevier Avenue and Hollyburne Avenue in the Belle Haven neighborhood. All surrounding properties are also located in the R-1-U zoning district. This block of Ivy Drive features mostly older, one-story ranch and bungalow style homes, with an occasional two-story residence. A location map is included as Attachment B.

Analysis
Project description
The applicant is proposing to partially demolish the existing one-story, single-family residence, remodel, and construct first floor additions. A data table summarizing parcel and project characteristics is included as Attachment C. The project plans and project description letter are included as Attachments D and E, respectively.

The existing residence is a nonconforming, one-story residence constructed in a ranch style with a flat roof. The house is nonconforming with regard to the right side setback for the whole length of the house on the right side. The house is nonconforming with regard to the left side setback at the front of the house, however the left side wall is constructed at a slight angle, so the left side wall becomes conforming at the rear of the residence. The site plan and elevations incorrectly show that the entire left side of the house as conforming to the required side setback. Staff has included project-specific condition of approval 4.a
requiring the applicant to revise the building permit plan set to correctly show the nonconformity on the left side of the house and to confirm that the new eaves would comply with the maximum 18-inch encroachment into the side setback.

The proposed residence would change from a three-bedroom residence to a four-bedroom residence, but would remain a one-story house. In addition to the new bedroom, the kitchen would be expanded and living space in the existing dining room would be converted into a master bathroom. The existing residence includes a one-car garage and the property does not have a second conforming uncovered parking space, and therefore, the property is considered to have a nonconforming parking situation. Existing equipment in the garage, such as the water heater, washer, and dryer would be relocated in the garage, but the remainder of the garage would be largely untouched. Historically, nonconforming parking situations have been allowed to remain in these situations. The existing 16-foot-wide driveway would remain and could serve as an unofficial, second parking space. The proposed residence would meet other Zoning Ordinance requirements for lot coverage, floor area limit (FAL), daylight plane, and height. Of particular note, the project would have the following characteristics with regard to the Zoning Ordinance:

- The proposed floor area would be far below the maximum FAL with 1,797 square feet proposed where 2,800 square feet is the maximum.
- The proposed project would be constructed below the maximum lot coverage with 35 percent proposed where 40 percent is the maximum.
- The proposed residence would be constructed below the maximum height, at 13.7 feet proposed where 28 feet is the maximum.
- The nonconforming areas on the left and right sides of the existing residence would be retained, but the proposed additions would comply with the required five-foot side setbacks.

The proposed residence would have a front setback of 20 feet, 11 inches and a rear setback of 22 feet, where 20 feet is required in either case. The required interior side setback in the R-1-U district is 10 percent of the minimum lot width, with a minimum of five feet. With a minimum lot width of 46 feet, the required side setback is five feet. The rear, left side portion of the existing residence is located five feet, one inch from the side property line, and the left side addition will continue in line with the exiting residence. The rear, right side of the existing residence is nonconforming and located four feet, one inch from the right side property line. The area of addition on the rear right side would be stepped in to five feet, one inch, where five feet is required, in order to comply with the minimum setback requirement.

**Design and materials**

The existing residence is a one-story, ranch style residence with a flat roof and horizontal wood siding. The applicant states that the proposed remodel would create a “California” style residence. The existing siding would be replaced with stucco siding. The exiting flat roof would be reconstructed to a traditional gable roof with composition shingle roofing material. The existing garage door would be replaced with a new wood and metal garage door. The front entry would feature a new covered porch to create a more inviting front elevation. The rear addition would feature two sliding glass doors with new wood trellises above each door.

Staff believes that the design and materials of the proposed residence are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed architectural style would be generally attractive and add to the mix of...
architectural styles in the area.

**Valuation**

For projects involving existing nonconforming structures, the City uses standards established by the Building Division to calculate the replacement and new construction costs on which the use permit threshold is based. The City has determined that the replacement cost of the existing structure would be $216,360, meaning that the applicant would be allowed to propose new construction and remodeling at this site totaling no more than $162,270 (or 75 percent) in any 12-month period without applying for a use permit. The City has determined that the value of the proposed work would be approximately $256,590. Based on this estimate, the proposed project exceeds 75 percent of the replacement cost of the existing structure, at approximately 118.6 percent, and therefore requires use permit approval by the Planning Commission.

**Trees and landscaping**

The property is relatively bare, with only one small apricot tree in the rear left corner of the lot, which is proposed to remain. The proposed addition is not within the tree protection zone of any heritage trees, and therefore no impacts to heritage trees are expected. The existing front yard would be repaved with new driveway and walkway pavers, and new shrubs would be planted. An existing concrete wall, three feet, six inches in height, would remain. The concrete wall complies with the maximum height of fences and walls within the front setback. The existing five-foot, eight-inch wood fence would remain in the areas outside the front setback. No new trees are proposed.

**Correspondence**

The applicant does not indicate any outreach to neighboring property owners in the project description letter. Staff has not received any direct correspondence at the time of staff report publication.

**Conclusion**

Staff believes that the design and materials of the proposed residence are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed architectural style would be generally attractive and add to the mix of architectural styles in the area. Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the proposed project.

**Impact on City Resources**

The project sponsor is required to pay Planning, Building and Public Works permit fees, based on the City’s Master Fee Schedule, to fully cover the cost of staff time spent on the review of the project.

**Environmental Review**

The project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, “Existing Facilities”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.
Public Notice
Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Public notification also consisted of publishing a notice in the local newspaper and notification by mail of owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius of the subject property.

Appeal Period
The Planning Commission action will be effective after 15 days unless the action is appealed to the City Council, in which case the outcome of the application shall be determined by the City Council.

Attachments
A. Recommended Actions
B. Location Map
C. Data Table
D. Project Plans
E. Project Description Letter

Disclaimer
Attached are reduced versions of maps and diagrams submitted by the applicants. The accuracy of the information in these drawings is the responsibility of the applicants, and verification of the accuracy by City Staff is not always possible. The original full-scale maps, drawings and exhibits are available for public viewing at the Community Development Department.

Exhibits to Be Provided at Meeting
None

Report prepared by:
Chris Turner, Assistant Planner

Report reviewed by:
Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner
### 730 Ivy Drive– Attachment A: Recommended Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION: 730 Ivy Drive</th>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2021-00020</th>
<th>APPLICANT: Marjorie Andino</th>
<th>OWNER: Marjorie Andino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROPOSAL:** Use Permit/Marjorie Andino/730 Ivy Drive: Request for a use permit to partially demolish, remodel, and construct first-floor additions to an existing nonconforming one-story, single-family residence in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The proposed work would exceed 75 percent of the replacement value of the existing nonconforming structure in a 12-month period and requires use permit approval by the Planning Commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission</th>
<th>DATE: December 13, 2021</th>
<th>ACTION: TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**VOTE:** TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Kennedy, Riggs, Harris, Tate)

### ACTION:

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 1 (Section 15301, “Existing Facilities”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.

3. Approve the use permit subject to the following **standard** conditions:
   
   a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (December 13, 2022) for the use permit to remain in effect.

   b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Los Reyes Architecture, consisting of six plan sheets, dated received October 27, 2021 and approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2021, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.

   c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies’ regulations that are directly applicable to the project.

   d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.

   e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.

   f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.

   g. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.
LOCATION: 730 Ivy Drive  
PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2021-00020  
APPLICANT: Marjorie Andino  
OWNER: Marjorie Andino

PROPOSAL: Use Permit/Marjorie Andino/730 Ivy Drive: Request for a use permit to partially demolish, remodel, and construct first-floor additions to an existing nonconforming one-story, single-family residence in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The proposed work would exceed 75 percent of the replacement value of the existing nonconforming structure in a 12-month period and requires use permit approval by the Planning Commission.

DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission  
DATE: December 13, 2021  
ACTION: TBD

VOTE: TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Kennedy, Riggs, Harris, Tate)

ACTION:

h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.

i. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an Erosion Control Plan and construction detail sheet that documents all erosion control measure implemented during the course of construction including, but not limited to, straw waddles, silt fence, temporary construction entrances, inlet protection, check dams, tree protection fencing, etc.

j. Required frontage improvements include but not limited to: Construct a new concrete curb and gutter along entire project frontage conforming to the adjacent properties.

4. Approve the use permit subject to the following project-specific conditions:

a. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall revise the site plan and elevation drawings to correctly show the existing nonconformity on the left side of the residence. Additionally, the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed eaves will comply with the maximum allowed eave encroachments on the left side. The applicant shall note that that existing nonconforming portions of the wall may not be removed, and if they are removed, that they cannot be rebuilt in their existing location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>PROPOSED PROJECT</strong></th>
<th><strong>EXISTING CONDITIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>ZONING ORDINANCE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot area</td>
<td>5,520 sf</td>
<td>5,520 sf</td>
<td>7,000 sf min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width</td>
<td>46 ft.</td>
<td>46 ft.</td>
<td>65 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth</td>
<td>120 ft.</td>
<td>120 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>28.1 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>22.1 ft.</td>
<td>37.9 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (left)</td>
<td>4.4 ft.</td>
<td>4.4 ft.</td>
<td>5 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (right)</td>
<td>4.1 ft.</td>
<td>4.1 ft.</td>
<td>5 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building coverage</td>
<td>1,931 sf</td>
<td>1,294 sf</td>
<td>2,208 sf max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 %</td>
<td>23.4 %</td>
<td>40.0 % max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAL (Floor Area Limit)</td>
<td>1,797 sf</td>
<td>1,294 sf</td>
<td>2,800 sf max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square footage by floor</td>
<td>1,549 sf/1st</td>
<td>995 sf/1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>248 sf/garage</td>
<td>248 sf/garage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134 sf/porches</td>
<td>51 sf/shed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square footage of buildings</td>
<td>1,931 sf</td>
<td>1,294 sf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height</td>
<td>13.7 ft.</td>
<td>9.3 ft.</td>
<td>28 ft. max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1 covered</td>
<td>1 covered</td>
<td>1 covered/1 uncovered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Areas shown highlighted indicate a nonconforming or substandard situation.

### Trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heritage trees</th>
<th>Non-Heritage trees</th>
<th>New Trees</th>
<th>Total Number of Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage trees proposed for removal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Non-Heritage trees proposed for removal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total Number of Trees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXISTING / DEMO ELEVATIONS

REAR ELEVATION

RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

FRONT ELEVATION

LEFT SIDE ELEVATION

EXISTING/DEMO ELEVATIONS KEYNOTES

1. Electrical and gas works location
2. Existing wood fence location
3. Post holes and position to be moved to
4. Door to be replaced with new door
5. Support for roof to support new second floor

PROPOSED ELEVATIONS KEYNOTES

1. Electrical and gas works location
2. Existing wood fence location
3. New fence to be installed
4. New window to be installed
5. New roof to be installed

PROPOSED ELEVATIONS AND DAY LIGHT PLAN

FRONT ELEVATION

RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION

REAR ELEVATION

LEFT SIDE ELEVATION
Chris Tuner  
Assistant Planner  
City Hall – 1st Floor  
701 Laurel St.  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Project Description

Purpose of the proposal:

The proposed work would exceed 75 percent of the existing replacement value in a 12-month period and requires use permit approval by the Planning Commission.

Scope of Work:

The addition of a bedroom; The extension of the kitchen and a bedroom to become a Master Bedroom with a full bathroom, by adding 608 Sq. Ft. into the existing house. The remodel of a closet into a bathroom and the addition of 134 Sq. Ft. front Porch.

Also, the addition of a new gable roof structure over the existing flat roof over an area of 1,243 Sq. Ft. to accommodate new roof line design, and the exterior wall finish replacement from wood siding into stucco.

Architectural style, material, color, and construction methods:

We are creating a California style with composition shingles roof finish and stucco wall finish with terracotta color.

Basis for site layout:

The foot print layout will be maintained and the addition will align with the existing except at the area where we have to comply with the set back required.

Existing and proposed uses:

The existing use is the residence of the property’s owner and will continue been the residence of the owners

Outreach to neighboring properties:

Our effort in our remodel & addition is to improved and be in connection with our neighborhood
STAFF REPORT

Planning Commission
Meeting Date: 12/13/2021
Staff Report Number: 21-063-PC

Public Hearing: Use Permit and Variance/Rasoul Oskouy/671 Live Oak Avenue

Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve a use permit to demolish an existing one-story, single-family residence and detached accessory buildings, and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width and area in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district. The project also includes a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) above the attached garage, which is a permitted use, and not subject to discretionary review. Staff also recommends that the Planning Commission approve a variance for the new residence to encroach into the required 20-foot separation distance between main buildings located on adjacent lots. The recommended actions are included as Attachment A.

Policy Issues
Each use permit and variance request is considered individually. The Planning Commission should consider whether the required use permit and variance findings can be made for the proposal.

Background

Site location
The subject property is located on the eastern side of Live Oak Avenue near the El Camino Real corridor. The surrounding properties to the south and across the street to the west are also within the R-3 zoning district. Properties to the north of the subject site are located in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (SP-ECR/D) area. The surrounding residences in the R-3 district feature a mix of single-family residences and multi-family developments, with both one- and two-story designs, and range in architectural styles from traditional ranch style, to more modern craftsman styles. A newly-completed mixed-use development with a contemporary design is located to the northwest of the subject property at 650 Live Oak Avenue, and an existing commercial building is located directly to the north. A location map is included as Attachment B.

Analysis

Project description
The subject parcel is currently developed with a single-story, single-family residence in the front of the property and a second unit in the rear of the property. Assessment records of the property show the rear
unit as a garage. Lack of supporting documents such as building permits or plans suggest that the garage was converted into a second living unit without a building permit at some point in time. The applicant is proposing to demolish the main residence, the second unit, and other accessory buildings and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage.

The proposed residence would be a four-bedroom, four and a half-bathroom home. Three of the bedrooms would be located on the second floor and one bedroom would be located on the first floor. The remainder of the first floor would be comprised of common areas including the kitchen, living room, dining room, and family room. The residence would have an attached, two-car garage, accessed by a new 20-foot-wide driveway, which would satisfy the project’s parking requirements.

A new attached ADU at the front of the second story would include an additional bedroom and bathroom with separate living and kitchen areas. The ADU would be accessed by an enclosed staircase on the left side of the proposed residence with a side setback of five feet, five inches. Attached ADUs are allowed to be constructed with a four-foot side setback and are not subject to the separation distance requirement in the R-3 zoning district. Since the project site is within one-half mile of the Caltrain station, the ADU is exempt from onsite parking requirements. The ADU is a permitted use and not part of the use permit and variance request. The ADU meets all applicable standards.

Of particular note with regard to Zoning Ordinance requirements:

- The parcel is substandard with regard to lot width, at 50 feet where 70 feet is required.
- The parcel is substandard with regard to lot area, at 5,645 square feet where 7,000 square feet is required.
- The parcel is standard with regard to lot depth at 112.9 feet where 100 feet is required.
- The residence would be developed near the maximum FAR of 2,540 square feet, with 2,471.7 square feet proposed. The ADU would be an additional 799.1 square feet which is permitted to exceed the allowed maximum FAR square footage.
- The residence would be developed near the maximum building coverage with 29.9 percent proposed where 30 percent is the maximum. Since the ADU is proposed on the second floor, the proposed building coverage includes the area of the ADU.
- The residence would be 30 feet in height, where 35 feet is the maximum permitted.

The proposed project would conform to the development standards of the R-3 zoning district except for a variance request to build within the minimum 20-foot separation distance between main buildings on the subject property and the main buildings on an adjacent property. The variance is discussed further in a later section. A data table summarizing parcel and project attributes is included as Attachment C. The project plans and the applicant’s project description letter are included as Attachments D and E, respectively.

**Design and materials**

The applicant states that the proposed residence would have a contemporary design with traditional hipped roofs. The residence would feature smooth stucco siding, asphalt composition shingle roofing, and a painted wood accent band to break up the first and second story massing. The windows would be
bronze-colored aluminum windows with wood window trim on the bottom of each window. The applicant states that the windows would be simulated divided lites, but does not specify if they would be simulated true divided lites with interior and exterior muntins and spacer bars between panes. The garage door would be bronze-colored aluminum to match the windows and frosted glass. The rear balcony guard rail would consist of stainless steel wire and posts for the guardrail.

The second-story windows on the sides would have varying sill heights between three feet and five feet to reduce privacy impacts on neighboring residences. The second story would be built up to the required 10-foot side setbacks on both sides of the residence. Compliance with the minimum 20-foot separation distance between the proposed residence and the neighboring residence on the right side should alleviate privacy impacts. The proposal includes a variance request to build within the 20-foot separation distance between main buildings on the left side. However, the neighboring property on the left is an existing commercial building where privacy impacts are anticipated to be minimal.

Staff believes that the architectural style of the residence would be generally attractive and well-proportioned. The wood accents between the first and second story would help minimize the perception of mass. The contemporary-style design would be consistent with the styles in the surrounding neighborhood.

**Variance request**

As part of this proposal, the applicant is requesting a variance to build within the required 20-foot separation distance between main buildings on adjacent properties. The applicant proposes to build the residence with a separation distance of 15 feet from the neighboring building on the left side of the property. The right side of the proposed residence would comply with the minimum 20-foot separation distance. The applicant has provided a variance request letter that is included as Attachment F. The required variance findings are evaluated below in succession. All findings are required to be addressed in order for a variance to be granted.

1. That a hardship peculiar to the property and not created by any act of the owner exists. In this context, personal, family or financial difficulties, loss of prospective profits and neighboring violations are not hardships justifying a variance. Further, a previous variance can never have set a precedent, for each case must be considered only on its individual merits;

The applicant indicates that the specific property is substandard in width. The property is 50 feet in width which is 20 feet narrower than the standard with of 70 feet in the R-3 district. The narrowness of the lot, combined with the required side setbacks already limits the buildable area on the lot. Additionally, the applicant states that the adjacent office building is nonconforming with regard to the applicable setbacks for its zoning district, which is a condition not of their making, and further limits their buildable area.

In staff's view, the substandard width of the lot itself is not a unique hardship, as many lots within the R-3 district are substandard. However, the substandard width in conjunction with the nonconformity of the neighboring building is a hardship unique to this lot. The neighboring property is located in the SP-ECR-D (El Camino Real/Downtown specific Plan) zoning district, more specifically in ECR-SW (El Camino Real Southwest) sub-district. In the Specific Plan area, rear setback regulations apply to property lines that abut
different zoning districts. The required rear setback for properties in this section of the Specific Plan area is 20 feet. With an existing setback of approximately five feet, the neighboring building is severely nonconforming, which is a condition not created by the owner, and necessitates a larger setback than what would typically be required on an R-3 lot. If the neighboring building conformed to the applicable setback, the applicant would be allowed to build to a standard 10-foot setback without a variance.

2. That such variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights possessed by other conforming property in the same vicinity and that a variance, if granted, would not constitute a special privilege of the recipient not enjoyed by his/her neighbors;

The applicant states that the requested variance is necessary in order to enjoy the same development rights as other R-3 properties by being able to build to the typical 10-foot setback line. The applicant further states that enforcement of the 20-foot separation distance would negatively impact the development potential of their property due to the nonconformity of the adjacent building.

From staff’s perspective, the outcomes that would be gained by the variance are property rights possessed by other conforming property in the same vicinity. Since the standard interior side setbacks are 10 feet in the R-3 District, other conforming properties in the R-3 would have the ability to both build to the 10-foot setback line and meet the 20-foot separation distance between main buildings on adjacent properties. However, due to the nonconformity of the adjacent building the subject property is deprived of the right to build to the 10-foot setback. If the neighboring building were built to the required setback, the variance would not be necessary. Granting of the variance would not constitute a special privilege to the recipient because the proposed residence would meet the standard 10-foot side setback enjoyed by other R-3 properties.

3. That the granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property; and

The applicant indicates that the proposed encroachment is not detrimental to the public, nor does it impair the adjacent property’s supply of light and air.

Staff agrees with this statement, as the neighboring property is a commercial building, not a residence, where the majority of time would be spent indoors. The proposed residence would still provide 15 feet between it and the neighboring building, providing adequate light and air for the commercial use.

4. That the conditions upon which the requested variance is based would not be applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification.

The applicant indicates that the conditions on which the variance is requested are not generally applicable to the R-3 district because relatively few R-3 properties abut the Specific Plan zoning district on the side.

Similar to the discussion on findings #1 and 2, staff believes there are unique aspects of the parcel’s size and orientation that create a unique situation that would not be generally applicable to other properties in the R-3 district. While several R-3 properties abut the Specific Plan district, most of these properties abut the Specific Plan district along their rear property lines where there is a greater required setback making this type of conflict between the adjacent property’s buildings less likely. A variance would allow the
residence to fit within the development pattern of adjacent residences and other properties in the R-3 zoning district.

5. That the condition upon which the requested variance is based is an unusual factor that was not anticipated or discussed in detail during any applicable Specific Plan process.

The property is not within any Specific Plan area. Hence, a finding regarding an unusual factor does not apply.

Based on the above findings, staff is recommending approval of the variance request, and has included findings to that effect in the recommended actions.

_Trees and landscaping_

The applicant has submitted an arborist report and arborist report addendum (Attachments G and H, respectively) detailing the species, size, and conditions of the trees on and near the subject property. There are a total of 22 trees on and around the subject property. There are 14 trees on the subject property, seven street trees in front of the property, and one tree on the neighboring property to the left. Of these trees, only three are heritage in size (Trees #11-13). Tree #11 is the only heritage tree located on the subject property, and is located in the rear of the property. Tree #12 is located on the property to the left, and Tree #13 is a street tree located in a planning strip to the left of the existing driveway. The arborist report indicates that demolition of the existing accessory building and driveway could have significant impacts to Trees #11 and #13, and includes mitigation measures to help alleviate the potential impacts of development. Tree #12 is located relatively far from the proposed development, and only minor impacts are anticipated. None of the heritage trees are proposed for removal.

Of the seven street trees in front of the property, six are located in a planting strip to the right of the existing driveway, directly in front of the proposed residence. None of these six trees are heritage in size, and according to the City Arborist, many of the trees were not planted by the City. Five of the six trees (Trees #S-1-4 and S-6) are proposed for removal to accommodate the new driveway. Tree #S-5, a small coast live oak, is proposed to remain. Due to the size of the planting strip and an overabundance of existing trees on the property, the City Arborist would only require one replacement tree. One 24-inch box Chinese pistache would be placed in the front yard of the subject property, rather than in the public right-of-way, in order to provide enough room for Tree #S-5 to grow.

The majority of the trees on the subject property are proposed to remain. Of the 14 trees on the property, only three spall lemon trees and a privet (Trees #7, 8, A-1, and A-3) are proposed for removal. The four trees along the left property line (Trees #1-3 and A-2), three trees along the right property line (Trees #4-6), and three trees along the rear (Trees # 9-11) are proposed to remain. The existing wood fence would be removed and a new wood fence, seven feet in height, would be constructed along the rear and sides of the property outside of the front setback. As part of the project review process, the arborist report was reviewed by the City Arborist. Implementation of all recommendations to mitigate impacts to existing heritage trees identified in the arborist report would be ensured as part of condition 3.g.
Correspondence
Staff has not received any items of correspondence for the project. The applicant indicates that they performed outreach as part of the use permit process in addition to the City’s standard noticing, and generally received positive feedback from the neighbors who responded.

Conclusion
Staff believes that the design, scale and materials of the proposed residence are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The contemporary architectural style of the proposed residence would be generally attractive and well-proportioned. Staff believes that the variance findings can be made due to the fact that the variance would allow the proposed residence to fit within the development pattern of adjacent residences and other properties in the R-3 zoning district. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the use permit and variance.

Impact on City Resources
The project sponsor is required to pay Planning, Building and Public Works permit fees, based on the City’s Master Fee Schedule, to fully cover the cost of staff time spent on the review of the project.

Environmental Review
The project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Public Notice
Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Public notification also consisted of publishing a notice in the local newspaper and notification by mail of owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius of the subject property.

Appeal Period
The Planning Commission action will be effective after 15 days unless the action is appealed to the City Council, in which case the outcome of the application shall be determined by the City Council.

Attachments
A. Recommended Actions
B. Location Map
C. Data Table
D. Project Plans
E. Project Description Letter
F. Variance Letter
G. Arborist Report
H. Addendum to Arborist Report
Disclaimer
Attached are reduced versions of maps and diagrams submitted by the applicants. The accuracy of the information in these drawings is the responsibility of the applicants, and verification of the accuracy by City Staff is not always possible. The original full-scale maps, drawings and exhibits are available for public viewing at the Community Development Department.

Exhibits to Be Provided at Meeting
None

Report prepared by:
Chris Turner, Assistant Planner

Report reviewed by:
Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner
LOCATION: 671 Live Oak Avenue

PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2020-00039

APPLICANT: Rasoul Oskouy

OWNER: Rasoul Oskouy

REQUEST: Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story, single-family residence and detached accessory buildings, and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width and area in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district. The proposal includes a request for a variance for the new residence to encroach into the required 20-foot separation distance between main buildings located on adjacent lots. The project also includes a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) above the attached garage, which is a permitted use, and not subject to discretionary review.

DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission

DATE: December 13, 2021

ACTION: TBD

VOTE: TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Harris, Kennedy, Riggs, Tate)

ACTION:

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.

3. Make the following findings as per Section 16.82.340 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the approval of the variance:

   a. The combination of lot shape and the nonconformity of the adjacent building are unique hardships to this lot. The adjacent building is excessively nonconforming, which affects the placement of the proposed residence. The location of the adjacent building and shape of the subject property are circumstances not created by the owner of the property and create a hardship for creating a livable residence.

   b. The outcomes that would be gained by the variances are property rights possessed by other conforming property in the same vicinity as other conforming properties in the R-3 district would have the right to build to a standard 10-foot side setback. The setback regulations of the adjacent property and existing building effectively create a 15-foot side setback on the subject property, which is 50 percent greater than requirements on other R-3 lots.

   c. The encroachments into the 20-foot separation requirement between main buildings on adjacent lots would comply with the standard 10-foot side setback in the R-3 district. A 15-foot separation distance would remain between the two structures and would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, and would not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property.

   d. Similar to the discussion on findings a and b, staff believes there are unique aspects of the parcel’s shape and orientation that create a unique situation that would not be generally applicable to other single-family homes in the same zoning district. A variance would allow the residence to fit within the development pattern of adjacent residences and other properties in the R-3 zoning district.
LOCATION: 671 Live Oak Avenue  
PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2020-00039  
APPLICANT: Rasoul Oskouy  
OWNER: Rasoul Oskouy

REQUEST: Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story, single-family residence and detached accessory buildings, and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width and area in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district. The proposal includes a request for a variance for the new residence to encroach into the required 20-foot separation distance between main buildings located on adjacent lots. The project also includes a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) above the attached garage, which is a permitted use, and not subject to discretionary review.

DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission  
DATE: December 13, 2021  
ACTION: TBD

VOTE: TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Harris, Kennedy, Riggs, Tate)

ACTION:

   e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area. Hence, a finding regarding an unusual factor does not apply.

4. Approve the use permit and variance subject to the following standard conditions:

   a. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Daryl Fazekas, consisting of 10 plan sheets, dated received November 15, 2021, and approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2021, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.

   b. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies’ regulations that are directly applicable to the project.

   c. Prior to building permit issuance; the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.

   d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.

   e. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division.

   f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits.

   g. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance, the arborist report prepared by Colony Landscape and Maintenance, dated July 15, 2021, and the addendum to the arborist report prepared by Colony Landscape and Management, dated July 16, 2021.
671 Live Oak Avenue– Attachment A: Recommended Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION: 671 Live Oak Avenue</th>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2020-00039</th>
<th>APPLICANT: Rasoul Oskouy</th>
<th>OWNER: Rasoul Oskouy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**REQUEST:** Request for a use permit to demolish an existing one-story, single-family residence and detached accessory buildings, and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with an attached garage on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width and area in the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district. The proposal includes a request for a variance for the new residence to encroach into the required 20-foot separation distance between main buildings located on adjacent lots. The project also includes a new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) above the attached garage, which is a permitted use, and not subject to discretionary review.

**DECISION ENTITY:** Planning Commission  
**DATE:** December 13, 2021  
**ACTION:** TBD

**VOTE:** TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Harris, Kennedy, Riggs, Tate)

**ACTION:**
### PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot area</th>
<th>5,645 sf</th>
<th>5,645 sf</th>
<th>7,000 sf min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot width</td>
<td>50.0 ft.</td>
<td>50.0 ft.</td>
<td>70 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth</td>
<td>112.9 ft.</td>
<td>112.9 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Setbacks**
- **Front**: 20 ft. 14.7 ft. 20 ft. min.
- **Rear**: 22 ft. 61.5 ft. 15 ft. min.
- **Side (left)**: 10 ft. 16.3 ft. 10 ft. min.
- **Side (right)**: 10 ft. 5.4 ft. 10 ft. min.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building coverage*</th>
<th>1,950.7 sf</th>
<th>1,704 sf</th>
<th>1,693.5 sf max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.6 %</td>
<td>30.2 %</td>
<td>30.0 % max.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAR (Floor Area Ratio)*</th>
<th>3,270.8 sf</th>
<th>1,074 sf</th>
<th>2,540.3 sf max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>57.9 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>45.0 % max.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscaping</th>
<th>3,272.9 sf</th>
<th>3,066 sf</th>
<th>2,822.5 sf min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>58 %</td>
<td>54.3 %</td>
<td>50.0 % min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square footage by floor</th>
<th>1,251.9 sf/1st</th>
<th>984 sf/1st</th>
<th>630 sf/garage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,219.8 sf/2nd</td>
<td>433.9 sf/garage</td>
<td>90 sf/shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>183.2 sf/porch*</td>
<td>656.6 sf/ADU living*</td>
<td>81.7 sf/ADU entry 1st floor*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>433.9 sf/garage</td>
<td>656.6 sf/ADU living*</td>
<td>81.7 sf/ADU entry 1st floor*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.8 sf/ADU entry 2nd floor*</td>
<td>60.8 sf/ADU entry 2nd floor*</td>
<td>60.8 sf/ADU entry 2nd floor*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square footage of buildings</th>
<th>3,887.9 sf</th>
<th>1,074 sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building height</th>
<th>30 ft.</th>
<th>12 ft.</th>
<th>35 ft. max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>2 covered</th>
<th>2 covered</th>
<th>1 covered/1 uncovered per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Note:** Areas shown highlighted indicate a nonconforming or substandard situation.

### Trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage trees proposed for removal</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Non-Heritage trees proposed for removal</th>
<th>19***</th>
<th>New Trees</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total Number of Trees              | 14 | **The applicant is allowed to exceed the maximum FAR and building coverage by up to 800 square feet in order to accommodate an ADU. The portions of the building indicated with this asterisk are counted as part of the ADU gross floor area and building coverage.**

**Of these trees, one is on the subject property, one is in the public right-of-way, and one is on a neighboring property.**

**Of these trees, 13 are on the subject property and six are in the public right-of-way.**

**Of these trees, four are on the subject property and five are in the public right-of-way.**
### Project Information

- **Lot Area:** 5845 SF
- **1st Floor:** 1296 SF
- **2nd Floor:** 1089 SF
- **Total EFA:** 2413 SF

#### Coverages
- **MAX 65% + 40%**
- **MAX 60%**

- **Balcony:** 72 SF

#### Landscaping
- **MAX 800 SF**

#### Setbacks
- **Front Setback:** 27' 6" MIN 20' 0"
- **Left Setback:** 17' 6" MIN 10' 6"
- **Right Setback:** 22' 6" MIN 17' 6"
- **Rear Setback:** 22' 6" MIN 17' 6"

#### Covered Parking
- **2 UNCOVERED 0**

### Existing Tree List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>DAI</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Saved</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>LOQUAT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>LOQUAT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>LOQUAT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>LOQUAT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>LOQUAT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>LEMON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td>LEMON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>#9</td>
<td>LEMON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>#10</td>
<td>FLOWERING PLUM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>#11</td>
<td>VALLEY OAK</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>#12</td>
<td>DEODAR CEDAR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>#13</td>
<td>28&quot; CAROB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>#A-1</td>
<td>VARIEGATED PRIVET</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>#A-2</td>
<td>MEDITERRANEAN CYPRESS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>#A-3</td>
<td>9.8&quot; LEMON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>#B-2</td>
<td>AMERICAN SWEETGUM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>#B-3</td>
<td>3.5&quot; COAST LIVE OAK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>#B-4</td>
<td>3.5&quot; COAST LIVE OAK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>#B-5</td>
<td>3&quot; COAST LIVE OAK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>#B-6</td>
<td>BALD CYPRESS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INITIALLY SURVEYED TREES**

**TREES SURVEYED AFTER INITIAL PLAN REVIEW**

**STREET TREES**

**HERITAGE TREE**
# = Initially Surveyed Trees
#A = Trees Surveyed after Initial Plan Review
#S = Street Trees
* = Trees not included on initial Topographic Survey
Project Description

TRC Live Oak LLC Property
671 Live Oak Avenue
Menlo Park, CA

The proposed project is to construct a new two-story single-family residence with an attached ADU for TRC Live Oak LLC represented by Mr. & Mrs. Oskouy. Although the lot is in the R-3 apartment district, it is smaller than the minimum requirements for the district. While R-3 lots are required to have a minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet, the subject property is only 5,646 square feet in area. In addition, R-3 parcels under 10,000 square feet are required to be at least 70 feet wide but the subject parcel is constrained and only 50 feet wide. Due to its substandard lot size and lot width of 50 ft, developing the lot with the permitted two dwelling units would be difficult, especially since two new dwelling units would require four non-tandem, off-street parking spaces not located in the required front or side yards. The project is seeking a use permit and variance for a two-story single-family residence with an attached ADU on substandard lot.

Currently, there is a single-story dwelling with a detached 2nd dwelling at the rear of the property. The existing structures are to be demolished and replaced with a new two-story single-family residence with an attached ADU. There is also an existing shed on the property that will be demolished.

Two car covered garage is allocated for the main house and no parking is allocated to the ADU since the residence is within .25 miles to closest public transit.

The existing neighborhood composition is a mix of single family, duplex, and apartment buildings. This development is consistent with the existing pattern of development in this neighborhood.

The design is a contemporary home with hip roofs. The mass and bulk are mitigated with decorative cornices at the front one-story elements.

At the sides, the two-story walls are broken up by recessing the first-floor walls 10 inches back from the second-floor walls. A trim element is added at the second-floor level to match the front trim. This creates a horizontal shadow the full length of the side walls. Internal grids are shown on all windows. The garage door is a contemporary design with frosted glass and heavy bronze aluminum frames to match the windows and sliding glass doors.

The rear facade of the house is broken up by a 4’ deep balcony. It provides a good shadow line, and it includes a stainless-steel wire railing, which is a feature of contemporary homes. There are 42” high solid half walls on each end of the balcony, providing privacy for the side neighbors.

Privacy
Due to the narrow 50’ wide lot, and the 10’ side setbacks, we have a maximum width of only 30’. As a result, the two kids’ bedrooms need to face the sides, instead of facing the front or back. On the right side, we show the minimum sized fire egress bedroom window 6’ wide and 36” off the floor.
The ADU bedroom faces the front, with no side windows. The rest of the side windows are 5'-0" above the floor, making looking down into the neighbor’s yard difficult.

At the rear of the house, a large oak tree provides privacy for the rear neighbor. Additional trees can be planted there as well.

As part of initial permit use application, the City of Menlo Park has notified the neighbors within 500-mile radius of permit application in file. Additionally, the applicant has handed a set of plans to next door neighbor at 677 Live oak to let them know of new application permit. The 677 neighbor is very enthusiastic of our project and looking forward to new construction. They have extended their support as need be towards permit. Additionally, several attempts were made by the applicant to reach out to next door commercial medical building at 166 Live oak, that currently is vacant, but not able to contact the owner. We reached out to the neighbor in the rear of the subject property at 684 Roble Avenue (the street in parallel to Live Oak). The building is a rental property. We spoke with renters and asked them to convey our message to property owner for any questions they may have on architecture design. Regardless, we made best effort to reach out to adjacent neighbors including our next-door residential neighbor at 671 Live Oak that have a copy of Architecture design for review. We also sent mail notices to our neighbors (see attached) to let them know of our availability for any questions they may have and left our phone number and email address to contact us for review of the plan and feedback.

We have worked with staff to include up to 800 sf ADU on the second floor over the garage. We designed a side entrance and stairs to the one-bedroom ADU. The main house has 10' side setbacks on both sides, while the ADU has 5.5' setbacks on the left side next to the office building. By placing the ADU on the second floor, rather than in the backyard, we achieve a large yard for the family while providing more landscape for the neighborhood to enjoy.

The right side has minimum of 10' setbacks and ample landscaping to benefit the neighboring house. We meet the landscaping requirements of 50%. This would not be possible with a detached ADU.

Within the scope of this project, we have adhered to, and maintained all required setbacks. However, there are non-conformities with respect to the structural separation between the neighboring structures. The building separation issue is with the office building at 661 Live Oak Ave. In conjunction with the Use Permit Application, a Variance request is being made to address the structural separation issue.

Sincerely,
Daryl Fazekas, Architect
Request for Variance – Building Separation

TRC Live Oak LLC Property
671 Live Oak Avenue
Menlo Park, CA

As part of this proposal, the applicant is requesting a variance for the new residence to encroach into the required 20-foot separation between main buildings located on adjacent lots. Although the lot is in the R-3 apartment district, it is smaller than the minimum requirements for the district. While R-3 lots are required to have a minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet, the subject property is only 5,646 square feet in area. In addition, R-3 parcels under 10,000 square feet are required to be at least 70 feet wide but the subject parcel is constrained and only 50 feet wide. Due to its substandard lot size and lot width of 50 ft, developing the lot with the permitted two dwelling units would be difficult, especially since two new dwelling units would require four non-tandem, off-street parking spaces not located in the required front or side yards. The above-referenced property is being developed in a R-3 zoned district potentially as the residence for Oskouy’s family members. A variance is sought for the required building separation with respect to the adjacent structures, the office building at 661 Live Oak Ave. The proposed development conforms to all zoning regulations applicable to the site. However, the 20’ structural separation requirement between adjacent buildings and a substandard lot of 50 ft width constitutes a particular hardship not of our own creation. The non-conformity of the adjacent structures, the office building at 661 Live Oak Ave. to the current zoning requirements, and such nonconformity’s Impact on the separation requirement, will cause the utility of the site to be severely diminished, and, for that reason, we request a variance.

Variance

The attached site plan of the subject property shows 10 ft separation from the ADU portion of the property to adjacent parcel, the office building at 661 Live Oak Ave. on the left side. Also, along 2 foot of the left side of the main house has 15 ft separation; the remaining meets the 20 ft guideline. To follow the 20 ft building separation requirement with existing building at 661 Live Oak at 5 ft setback would constraint the 671 Live Oak buildable area to be narrower, approximately 25’ in buildable lot width versus proposed 30’.

The required variance findings are evaluated below in succession:

1. That a hardship peculiar to the property and not created by any act of the owner exists. In this context, personal, family, or financial difficulties, loss of prospective profits and neighboring violations are not hardships justifying a variance. Furthermore, a previous variance can never have set a precedent, for each case must be considered only on its own merits.

On this narrow 50 ft lot width, the R-3 Zoning District requires an additional 6’ of combined setbacks (12% of the lot width) to achieve conformity with the building separation codes. For reference, The R-3 Zoning District requires 20’ of separation distance between main buildings. The proposed home is 15’ from the office building. Thus, an additional 5’ would be required to bring the main home into compliance.

As stated above, the building separation code and narrow 50 ft lot width pose a hardship on this lot because the adjacent property on the left, the office building at 661 Live Oak Ave., is not in conformance with the current setback requirements. Therefore, if forced to adhere to the building separation requirements, the reduction in width would severely impact the utility, use and enjoyment of the property. Furthermore, the off-center massing of the structure would negatively impact the aesthetics of the design and, in tum, the neighborhood itself. Please see attached information.

2. That such variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights possessed by other conforming property in the same vicinity and that a variance, if granted, would not constitute a special privilege of the recipient not enjoyed by his/her neighbors.
This variance will not constitute a special privilege for this property/site. Particularly with respect to the adjacent property, the office building at 661 Live Oak Ave., the properties in the vicinity of the site are currently permitted to enjoy a substantial benefit by way of non-conformance to the setback requirements, and as stated above, that non-conformance greatly and negatively impact the development and use of this site and deprives the site of the same benefit.

3. That the granting of the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property; and

The granting of the requested variance is not detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare of any adjacent property. The supply of adequate light and air to the adjacent property, the office building at 661 Live Oak Ave., will not be impaired.

4. That the conditions upon which the requested variance is based would not be applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification.

As is often cited, the Issuance of a variance cannot be a justification for granting a similar variance. Notwithstanding the above, this variance is being requested on its own grounds. This project has been designed within the stated zoning guidelines- specifically, the setback guideline- and, therefore, it is not detrimental to any other development. In the future, should a separation issue arise for the neighboring properties, it would be caused fully by their own non-conformance.

5. That the condition upon which the requested variance is based is an unusual factor that was not anticipated or discussed in detail during any applicable Specific Plan process.

The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding an unusual factor is required to be made.

In sum, although the adjacent properties' non-conformities exist due to the age of those developments, compliance with the new zoning ordinances is achieved through new development such as the project in question. Therefore, it is our hope that the commission will look favorably upon our request for variance and permit us to construct our new home, which has been created in conformance with all applicable zoning guidelines, as designed.

Sincerely,
Rasoul Oskouy,
Owner
2 FT of the main house @ 15', building separation, the remaining @ 20'.

ADU at 10.5 FT (5+5') x 2 PT

Set Back

Adjacent media office building
Dear Rasoul Oskouy:

Recently, you requested that I perform a tree survey and provide an arborist report to submit in tandem with your plans to develop the site 671 Live Oak into a space that is more conducive to habitation.

Arborist Report Survey: map of tree locations is meant for reference only and does not substitute a topographic survey, civil plans, or official landscape plans.

Site Description: The lot at 671 Live Oak sits on 5,650 square ft and exists in a rectangle: three sides hedged in by adjacent home sites, and the final front side opening out to Live Oak Ave. The entryway is an asphalt driveway runs down the north side of the lot. There is a house, guest cottage, and shed. The front of the house is approximately 25’ from the Live Oak Ave. The rear fence is approximately 120’ from the street. Most of the plantings are around the edges of the lot and act as a screen. Three heritage trees exist on or within proximity to the lot, one near the guest cottage, one at 661 Live Oak and one is a street tree. The home was initially built in 1955, though most trees appear to have been planted within the last 25 years.

Description of Development: Based on most recent plan set. Oskouy 671 Live Oak revised 7/14/21.

Method: All inspections were made from the ground; no aerial inspections were conducted. The trees of interest are indicated on the attached map. The trees were first measured for diameter at 54 inches above ground level (DBH or diameter at breast height). Diameter for multi-trunk trees was calculated using the following formula (Unless otherwise stated) in which D=tree diameter and S=stem diameter:

\[ D = \sqrt{(S_1^2 + S_2^2)} \]

Only Trees with a diameter greater than 6” were included in the report and survey. Some trees were then designated as Heritage, based on the City of Menlo Park’s guidelines. All heritage and street trees were appraised. If construction causes irreparable damage to a heritage tree, the tree replacement must equal the appraised value. A condition rating (CON) has been provided using 50 percent vigor and 50 percent structure, using the following scale:

- 1 - 29 Very Poor
- 30 - 49 Poor
- 50 - 69 Fair
- 70 - 89 Good
- 90 - 100 Excellent

If demolition or development is to occur within the dripline of heritage trees. Critical Root Zone (CRZ) or 70% root area, should be calculated based on a ratio of 1” diameter equals 1’ root area. Based on this collected data, it was then determined which trees were suitable for preservation, and - if they are to be preserved - specific corrective actions to reduce overall risk are described. The trees that are to be removed due to development were appraised.
Potential Impacts: Construction and Tree Failure

**Branch Damage:** Mechanical damage from construction equipment breaking and tearing of low hanging branches potentially impacting branch bark collar. Tree branch failure impacting construction workers, new buildings, and eventual occupants.

**Trunk Damage:** Mechanical damage from construction equipment scarring wood, allowing potential for decay. Large limb or trunk failure impacting construction workers, new buildings, and eventual residence.

**Root Damage:** Ideally during construction root impact percentages should be kept beneath 20-30% to prevent negative long-term health effects. Two main ways to damage roots are root zone compaction from frequent foot or equipment traffic and root cutting due to excavation, grade changes, or hardscape/foundation demolition. Damage to more than 30% of the root zone can lead to whole tree failure or decline within 5 years following construction completion.

**Tree Protection Plan and Impact Mitigation Documentation:** Any time development-related work is recommended to be supervised by a Project Arborist; The Project Arborist shall provide a follow-up letter documenting how the mitigation has been completed to specification.

**Alternative Construction Methods**

If work must occur within or near the dripline, a Critical Root Zone (CRZ) be calculated and if more than 30% of the root zone will be impacted, the project arborist should be consulted, and alternative methods of construction may be recommended to prevent root damage. Asphalt or concrete hardscape and driveway can be replaced by previous pavers. Instead of a concrete slab foundation use a grade beam foundation. Footings can be constructed on piers for walkways, and landscaped areas. (Fig 1) Another option is to install a layer of large gravel rocks over the current soil level, covering the area to be constructed on, ideally not covering more than 20% of the area within the dripline and 10-15' away from the base of the trunk. Within this larger gravel layer, trenches should be created. Perforated pipes should be inserted into the trenches. These pipes should be insulated with base rock and wrapped in plastic mesh. Occasional ports to the surface of the new grade should be installed. These vents can be used to deliver water, fertilizer, and oxygen to the buried root system. (Figure 2 + 3) The pipes act as conduits and should run the length of the area to be constructed over. Oxygen will need to be pushed through the pipes on occasion. A blower or vacuum can be used to clear the pipes. Large gravel rocks should be placed over the pipes, then a layer of straw, followed by mulch or woven plastic, and finally the soil to create a new grade. Hardscape, walkways, and landscaping can then be installed within this newly created area.

---

**Figure 1:** Elevated Walkway

**Figure 2:** Grade Change Illustration

**Figure 3:** Perforated Piping System

PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES
Trees adapt to their current environment. Therefore, any site changes will impact tree health. To prepare the trees for their upcoming fight, soil amendments to the root zone area least likely to be impacted by the construction should be made. This will help to improve soil nutrient availability in these regions.

1) Clear leaf litter, water in 22-14-14 fertilizer, and aerate soil by deep root watering.
2) Place and maintain 2-3 inches of mulch.
3) Ensure trees receive adequate water, a deep watering during the dry season. 1-2 times per month, run a drip system (may be temporary) 12-18 hrs. or place soaker hose for 1hr.
4) Prune or remove trees to reduce risk to acceptable levels.
5) Install Tree Protection Fencing. Tree protection fencing requirements:
   a. Six (6)-foot tall chain link fencing mounted on eight (8)-foot tall, two (2)-inch diameter galvanized posts, driven 24 inches into the ground and spaced no more than 10 feet apart.
   b. Posted with signs saying “TREE PROTECTION FENCE - DO NOT MOVE OR REMOVE WITHOUT APPROVAL FROM CITY ARBORIST”.
   c. The City requires that tree protection fencing be installed before any equipment comes on site and inspected by the Project Arborist, who shall submit a verification letter to the City before issuance of permits.
   d. Tree protection fencing to be inspected by City Arborist prior to building removal and/or building permit issuance.
   e. Tree protection fencing is required to remain in place throughout construction and may only be moved or removed with written authorization from the City Arborist. The Project Arborist may authorize modification to the fencing when a copy of the written authorization is submitted to the City.

*The location for the protection fencing should be as close to the dripline (Fig 4-5) as possible unless otherwise stated

Figure 4: Diagram of Dripline

Figure 5: Example of Tree Protection Fencing

DURING CONSTRUCTION

Precautions During Demolition/Removal and Construction
If construction is to occur outside the dripline (see Figure 4), tree protection fencing should be maintained. If demolition or construction occurs within the dripline, Project Arborist should be notified, critical root zone calculated, and adequate mitigation efforts must be implemented and documented. If demolition uncovers root systems; project arborist should be notified, and root cutting guidelines followed. This is to prevent root zone compaction, root damage and mechanical damage to the tree.

To minimize these risk factors, the impacted root area should be kept below 30% (Every 1’’ trunk diameter equals 1’ root zone radius). To facilitate this, follow the following procedure:
1) Any area underneath but not critical for construction should maintain tree protection fencing.
2) The trunk of the tree should be wrapped with straw wattle or 2x4s and, to a height of 8-10’, and held in place by snow fencing. (Fig 6)
3) Any low-hanging branches should be pruned by an ISA certified arborist or supervised crew to allow clearance of any construction machinery.
4) A layer of mulch 8-10’’ deep should be placed where construction crews are walking to prevent soil compaction and replaced as needed over the course of construction.
5) If heavy equipment is used, at least two layers of 1’’1/8’’ plywood or a trench plate should be placed on top of the mulch layer where the equipment will be sitting.
6) Following construction, the plywood or trench plate should be removed. If compaction has occurred (Figure 9), the layer of mulch should be removed, and the soil aerated. If a soil probe is used, mulch can be placed into the newly created spaces.
7) The layer of mulch should then be reapplied and maintained to a depth of 2-3’’.
8) Reinstall Tree Protection zone fences.

Additional Tree Protection Zone Requirements
No materials or equipment should be stored or cleaned inside the tree protection zones.

Soil Compaction impacts the fine root system of all trees. Roots rely on pore space (the area in-between soil particles) for oxygen. (Fig 7) While the process of photosynthesis releases oxygen into the atmosphere, it does not transfer it throughout the tree. The cells within the root system need to respire to produce the energy required for their vital functions of nutrient and water acquisition. If their supply of oxygen is restricted due to soil compaction, the tree will fail. This can occur through compaction of existing soil or soil additions.

Figure 6: Example Trunk Protection
Figure 7: Illustration of Compaction
Root Cutting Guidelines

No trenching or excavation should occur within the dripline if this work must occur within the dripline the project Arborist should be notified. If needed root zone impact percentage should be calculated, and adequate mitigation efforts must be implemented and documented. If any trenches or posts are installed into the soil and encounter roots greater than 1” in diameter, Project Arborists should be consulted, and trenches or post holes can be moved to accommodate roots or tunneling underneath the roots may be permitted. Trenching for irrigation, electrical, drainage or any other reason should be hand dug when beneath the driplines of protected trees. (Fig 8) Hand digging and carefully laying pipes below or beside protected roots will dramatically reduce root loss of desired trees, thus reducing trauma to the entire tree. Any roots smaller than 1” in diameter may be pruned but only with adherence to the following guidelines. (Fig 9)

(1) Clear soil completely away from where cutting occurs.
(2) Make a clean cut: prevent any ripping or tearing of the root by using a sharpened hand, electric, gas-powered saw, or other pruning instrument (such as loppers).
(3) Replace soil around the roots. Roots to be left exposed for a period should be covered with layers of burlap and kept moist. Trenches should be backfilled as soon as possible with native material and compacted to near its original level. Trenches that must be left exposed should also be covered with layers of burlap or straw wattle and kept moist. Plywood over the top of the trench will also help protect exposed roots below.
(4) Never remove more than 30% of a tree’s roots. If any trenching or grade changes occur, root cutting in sections greater than 4’ in length should be avoided and gaps of equal distance should be created to prevent large sections of root zone destruction.

Any roots to be cut should be monitored and documented. Large roots or large masses of roots to be cut should be inspected by the Project Arborist. The Project Arborist may recommend fertilizing or irrigation if root cutting is significant.

Figure 8: How not to trench

Figure 9: Proper Root Pruning
Tree Maintenance

1) Normal irrigation should be maintained throughout the entire length of the project. During the summer months, the Heritage trees on this site should receive deep watering two times a month. During the fall and winter, reduce watering to once a month and suspend watering during periods of heavy rain.

2) Maintain 2-3 inches of mulch within the root zone of protected trees this will help the soil retain moisture, thus reducing water consumption, and improve soil nutrient levels.

3) Follow Project Arborist recommendations for fertilization and risk reduction work as trees continue to grow and change over the course of the site’s development.

AFTER CONSTRUCTION

Continue tree maintenance regime and monitor for decline of tree health especially important as it takes 3-5 years for root zone damage to appear as canopy decline.

Construction Impact Prevention Guidelines:

Keep construction out of the dripline of trees. Exact critical root zone (CRZ) can be calculated based off the percent of root zone to be impacted (keep beneath 30%). Three Trees have specific guidelines all other trees should have PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES followed with specific attention to items 2) and 5).

Three heritage trees are within the construction zone and thus specific recommendations must be followed. Two had critical root zone or 70% of total root area calculated. (fig 10) Construction is occurring within this area so specific guidelines listed below must be followed.

Tree #11: CRZ radius 13.3’. Demolition is planned to occur west of this tree. Prior to demolition construction fencing should be placed as far from trunk as possible and tree wrapped in straw wattle and insulated with 2x4s to a height of 6’. After destruction of wood structure and prior to foundation demolition half circle should be marked 13.3’ from the trunk. Within in this zone demolition should occur by hand to preserve any roots present. Following the demolition; tree protection fencing should be installed in half circle at 13.3’ and tied back into existing border fence. The newly exposed areas should have items 1-2 within Prior to Construction Guidelines followed.

Tree #12: CRZ radius N/A. Place construction fencing along edge of driveway closest to tree, notify equipment operators of potential for roots, if any roots greater than 1” exposed project arborist must be notified, and an assessment performed prior to root cutting. Any roots smaller than 1” may be cut with strict adherence to Root Cutting Guidelines.

Tree #13: CRZ radius 23.4’. As long as construction is limited to 50% root area CRZ is 17.72’ Prior to construction commencement wrap tree in straw wattle and insulate with 2x4s to a height of 6’. Prior to Driveway demolition half circle should be marked 17.72’ from the trunk. Within in this zone demolition should occur by hand to preserve any roots present. If any roots greater than 1” exposed project arborist must be notified, and an assessment performed prior to root cutting. Any roots smaller than 1” may be cut with strict adherence to Root Cutting Guidelines.

Following the demolition; half circle at 17.72’ should be marked with construction stakes and painted black. The newly exposed areas should have items 1-2 within Prior to Construction Guidelines followed.

Tree S-5: CRZ Radius 2'. Place Sign or marker with written instruction: Tree to Be Preserved, ' , follow
Prior to construction guidelines, when trenching for waterline use hand tool to avoid damaging root
system, if roots are damaged follow Root cutting Guidelines

Tree Removal:
No Heritage trees are to be removed. Five street trees are proposed to be removed S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-6

Tree Planting:

Follow the city of Menlo Park’s recommended species replacement guide. Focus on native Oak species such as
Valley, Coast live, black, or blue oak which are not only drought tolerant, suited to battle erosion, but also
majestic in structure.

Note: follow all previous recommendations regarding tree maintenance. Especially important are the first few
years following transplant, the newly imported oak trees on this site will require flood style irrigation (deep
watering) during the warm season months and depending on the seasonal rainfall some irrigation during
winter.
Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

1. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified as far as possible. The Arborist can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of the information provided by others.

2. Various diagrams, sketches and photographs in this report are intended as visual aids and are not to scale, unless specifically stated as such on the drawing. These communication tools in no way substitute for nor should be construed as surveys, architectural or engineering drawings.

3. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.

4. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior written or verbal consent of the Arborist.

5. This report is confidential and to be distributed only to the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any or all of the contents of this report may be conveyed to another party only with the express prior written or verbal consent of the consultant. Such limitations apply to the original report, a copy, facsimile, scanned image or digital version thereof.

6. This report represents the opinion of the Arborist. In no way is the Arborist’s fee contingent upon a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.

7. The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services as described in the fee schedule, an agreement or a contract.

8. Information contained in this report reflects observations made only to those items described and only reflects the condition of those items at the time of the site visit. Furthermore, the inspection is limited to visual examination of items and elements at the site, unless expressly stated otherwise. There is no expressed or implied warranty or guarantee that problems or deficiencies of the plants or property inspected may not arise in the future.

Disclosure Statement

Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training, and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist, or to seek additional advice. Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms that fail in ways we do not fully understand. Conditions are often hidden within trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period of time. Likewise, remedial treatments, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed. Treatment, pruning, and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborist’s services such as property boundaries, property ownership, site lines, disputes between neighbors, and other issues. An arborist cannot take such considerations into account unless complete and accurate information is disclosed to the arborist. An arborist should then be expected to reasonably rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided. Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled. To live near trees is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate the trees.

Sincerely,

Robert Wiszowaty

Tree Division Manager Colony Landscape
B.S Environmental Horticulture and Urban Forestry
ISA Certified Arborist #WE-11553A
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
# = initially surveyed trees
#A = Trees surveyed after initial plan review
#S = Street Trees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag #</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>DBH (Inches)</th>
<th>Height / Spread (Feet)</th>
<th>Comments / Items of concern</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lemon Tree</td>
<td>Citrus × limon</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>6''</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Good vigor, Fair form</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Liquidambar</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>6''</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Good vigor, Fair form</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>6''</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Good vigor, Fair form</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lemon Tree</td>
<td>Citrus × limon</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>6''</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Good vigor, Fair form</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Liquidambar</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>6''</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Good vigor, Fair form</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>6''</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Good vigor, Fair form</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>6''</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Good vigor, Fair form</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>6''</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Good vigor, Fair form</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>6''</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Good vigor, Fair form</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Action**

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed

- **Before demolition and construction:**
  - **Structural prune and crown clean removing deadwood 1/2'' or greater**
  - **Preserve:**
    - Crown reduction to reduce likihood of codominant stem failure
    - Elevate lower lateral limbs to allow 5' of clearance from roofline
    - Potential to cause severe impact, if guidelines followed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>DBH (Inches)</th>
<th>Health/Structure AVG</th>
<th>Ht./Spread (Feet)</th>
<th>Comments/Items of concern</th>
<th>Appraisal Value</th>
<th>Construction Impact</th>
<th>Probation Measures for construction</th>
<th>Suitability for preservation</th>
<th>Recommended Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Bald Cypress</td>
<td>Taxodium distichum</td>
<td>Not Heritage</td>
<td>Street</td>
<td>2''</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>Fair vigor, Good Form, sapling</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Moderate during demolition</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Remove: Criterion 5 Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum sinense</td>
<td>Not Heritage</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>11.5''</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15/10</td>
<td>Poor form , Good Vigor, located within 18'' of house, multiple trunks diverging just above grade</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Protect individually shade trees or circle around trunk per beyond the aerial crown. Shade trees also possible. Follow Prior to Construction Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Mediterranean Cypress</td>
<td>Cupressus sempervirens</td>
<td>Not Heritage</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>7.5''</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10/8</td>
<td>Fair vigor, Poor form, located within 18'' of house, multiple trunks diverging just above grade</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Protect individually shade trees or circle around trunk per beyond the aerial crown. Shade trees also possible. Follow Prior to Construction Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Lemon Tree</td>
<td>Citrus × limon</td>
<td>Not Heritage</td>
<td>Onsite</td>
<td>5.5''</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10/5</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
- # = Initially Surveyed Trees
- #A = Trees Surveyed after initial plan review
- #S = Street Trees

G11
July 16th, 2021

Attn: Rasoul Oskouy
671 Live Oak Dr
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Subject: Street Tree Removal Update

Dear Rasoul Oskouy:

Recently you requested an update to the initial plans for removing for street tree #S-1, this tree is still being requested for removal. In a change to the initial HTR request trees #S-2, #S-3, #S-4, and #S-6 are being requested for removal. This is done at the recommendation of the city’s planning department to install a straight rather than curved driveway. This more centered access will also increase in the permeable surface area near heritage trees #12 and #13.

**Tree and Planting Island Specifications:**
Tree #1 American Sweet gum *Liquidambar styraciflua* (#S-1) with a Height of 16’, a Spread of 6’, and a DBH of 9.8” (when measured below the primary union near grade) (Image 1). It is located at the northern end of the planting strip. The tree has two codominant stems which split just above grade. The house drop from the powerlines runs through its upper canopy, and the upper reaches of its branching are beginning to crowd a nearby Carob tree (#13) (Images 2-4). Within the planting island, there are a total of six trees, three of which are native Coast Live Oaks *Quercus agrifolia* (Image 5).

The four additional street trees to be removed all have diameters below 6”, two are Coast Live Oaks, one is an American sweetgum, and one is a Bald Cypress.

**Construction Description:**
Plans involve demolition of the current buildings at 671 Live Oak Drive and the construction of a new home. The most recent plans specify a two-car garage on the north side of the property. The issue is connecting the planned garage to the existing driveway. Currently, the City’s planting strip blocks all direct access to the planned garage. The existing driveway runs directly under a heritage Carob *Ceratonia siliqua* (#13) and within the dripline of a neighbor’s heritage Deodar cedar *Cedrus deodara* (#12) on the northside of the property. The current driveway is built from cement and suffers numerous cracks and upheavals from the nearby roots. (Image 4) The current driveway will be demolished, and a new driveway installed through the center of the existing planting strip. Please see the Arborist Report for Development for specific precautions during demolition of the existing driveway.

**Replacement Species and Location:**
Due to the overcrowded nature of the planting strip, it is recommended to replace the removed trees (#S-1, #S-2, #S-3, #S-4, #S-6) elsewhere on the property (See Landscape Plan). The five replacement trees will be 24” box Saratoga Laurels *Laurus nobilis* 'Saratoga'.
Image 1: American Sweetgum (#S-1)

Image 2: American Sweetgum Codominant stem

Image 3: Crowding between Carob (#13) and American Sweetgum (#S-1)

Image 4: Carob #13 and Existing

### Tree Tag # | Common Name | Scientific Name | Designation | Location | DBH (Inches) | Health/Structure AVG | Height/Spread (Feet) | Comments/Items of concern |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Deodar cedar (No Tag)</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Neighboring Lot</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65/30</td>
<td>Good vigor, poor form, in neighbor’s yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Carob (No Tag)</td>
<td>Ceratonia siliqua</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>28&quot;</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45/40</td>
<td>Good vigor, poor form, along street beneath power lines, follow root zone preservation recommendations during demolition and construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>American Sweetgum</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Not Heritage</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>Measured at 54” S1:4.8 S2:5 DBH:6.9” Measured below Union DBH:9.8”</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16/6</td>
<td>Good vigor, poor form, crowded by neighboring Carob Tree (#13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Not Heritage</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>3.5&quot;</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>Good vigor, good form, sapling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3</td>
<td>American Sweetgum</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
<td>Not Heritage</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>5.2&quot;</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10/4</td>
<td>Good vigor, fair form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Not Heritage</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>3.5&quot;</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>Good vigor, good form, sapling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-5</td>
<td>Coast Live Oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>Not Heritage</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>Good vigor, good form, sapling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>Bald Cypress</td>
<td>Taxodium distichum</td>
<td>Not Heritage</td>
<td>Street Tree</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>Fair vigor, good Form, sapling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

1. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible. The Arborist can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of the information provided by others.

2. Various diagrams, sketches and photographs in this report are intended as visual aids and are not to scale, unless specifically stated as such on the drawing. These communication tools in no way substitute for nor should be construed as surveys, architectural or engineering drawings.

3. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.

4. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior written or verbal consent of the Arborist.

5. This report is confidential and to be distributed only to the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any or all of the contents of this report may be conveyed to another party only with the express prior written or verbal consent of the consultant. Such limitations apply to the original report, a copy, facsimile, scanned image or digital version thereof.

6. This report represents the opinion of the Arborist. In no way is the Arborist’s fee contingent upon a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.

7. The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services as described in the fee schedule, an agreement or a contract.

8. Information contained in this report reflects observations made only to those items described and only reflects the condition of those items at the time of the site visit. Furthermore, the inspection is limited to visual examination of items and elements at the site, unless expressly stated otherwise. There is no expressed or implied warranty or guarantee that problems or deficiencies of the plants or property inspected may not arise in the future.

Disclosure Statement

Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training, and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist, or to seek additional advice. Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms that fail in ways we do not fully understand. Conditions are often hidden within trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period of time. Likewise, remedial treatments, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed. Treatment, pruning, and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborist’s services such as property boundaries, property ownership, site lines, disputes between neighbors, and other issues. An arborist cannot take such considerations into account unless complete and accurate information is disclosed to the arborist. An arborist should then be expected to reasonably rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided. Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled. To live near trees is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate the trees.

Sincerely,
Robert Wiszowaty

Tree Division Manager Colony Landscape
B.S Environmental Horticulture and Urban Forestry
ISA Certified Arborist #WE-11553A
ISA Tree Risk Assessment Qualified
Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the request for a use permit and architectural control to construct a 1,440-square-foot temporary modular office in the C-1 (Administrative and Professional District, Restrictive) zoning district. The applicant requests that the office module be placed on the property for a period of three years to accommodate additional temporary staff associated with the completion of the Stanford Hospital expansion as well as additional space to accommodate social distancing. The office module will occupy nine parking spaces, decreasing the number of parking spaces from 90 to 81 spaces where 77 spaces are required. Recommended actions are included as Attachment A.

Policy Issues
Each use permit and architectural control request is considered individually. The Planning Commission should consider whether the required use permit and architectural control findings can be made for the proposal.

Background

Site location
The subject property is located at 66 Willow Place. Willow Place is a cul-de-sac off of Willow Road. Using Willow Road in a north-south orientation, the project site is located at the southern end of a cul-de-sac off the east side of Willow Road between Waverly Street to the south and Middlefield Road to the north. The adjacent parcels along the street are also located within the C-1 (Administrative and Professional District, Restrictive) zoning district. Parcels across Willow Road are part of the R-3 (Apartment) zoning district, and contain a mix of apartments, and some single-family residences. Additional single-family residences are located on the parcels farther south along Willow Road on parcels zoned R-1-U (Single-Family Residential, Urban) and R-1-S (Single-Family Residential, Suburban). The area represents a variety of architectural styles, including Mediterranean, traditional, ranch, and modern buildings for the residential buildings and a mix of contemporary and traditional office buildings. A location map is included as Attachment B.

Analysis

Project description
The proposed use permit and architectural control would enable the applicant to install a 1,440-square-foot temporary modular office in the rear parking lot of the subject site and utilize the structure for a period of three years. The existing site features include a single-story office building, outdoor patio at the rear of the building and a surface parking lot with 90 stalls. The applicant has indicated the modular office would
provide additional space for up to twelve staff performing professional and administrative office work currently performed at the existing building on site, though fewer individuals would likely occupy the space during the pandemic. The hours of operation would be consistent with those of the existing use, approximately 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. The modular office would be delivered to the site. An accessible ramp and stairs providing access to the structure would be installed as well as bollards to protect the access ramp from vehicular traffic in the parking lot. An accessible path of travel connecting the modular office to the existing structure would be created along the side of the existing parking lot. In addition to the temporary modular office, a light pole is proposed to be installed. The proposed location of the modular office would meet the required setbacks for the zoning district and maintain a minimum separation distance of 60 feet from the existing office building. Project-specific condition of approval 5(a) would ensure the modular office and all temporary site improvements are removed three years after the date of final inspection or temporary occupancy, if granted, for the building permit allowing the temporary site improvements. Project plans and the applicant’s project description letter are included as attachments D and E respectively. The proposed project would comply with all Zoning Ordinance development regulations and related requirements. Of particular note:

- The total proposed floor area ratio (FAR) for the parcel would be 13.3 percent (15,391 square feet of gross floor area) where 30 percent (34,697 square feet of gross floor area) is allowed;
- The total proposed building coverage for the parcel would be 13.3 percent (15,391 square feet) where 40 percent is allowed (46,263 square feet); and
- The height of the proposed structure would be approximately 10 feet four inches, where 35 feet is allowed.

**Design and materials**

The proposed temporary office structure would be rectangular in shape and feature vertical treated engineered wood siding in a neutral brown color with a metal roof. Four windows on each of the long sides of the structure with sill heights of three feet, six inches would provide natural light. Access to the modular office would meet accessibility requirements from the California Building Standards code and would be reviewed by the Building Division to ensure compliance. The modular office would contain ten work stations arranged in cubicles as well as two private offices. A maximum of twelve additional employees could occupy the structure.

The proposed modular office would be screened from view from the public right-of-way by the many trees on site. The existing office building is also rectangular in shape with a traditional material palate. The primary materials of the existing office building are brick, appearing arranged upon the façade to imitate columns with aluminum windows in between. Light-colored stucco has been applied beneath and above the windows. The composition shingle roof slopes gradually to a ridge at the center of the building. Between the building and the parking lot at the rear of the building there is an outdoor patio with tables and chairs for passive use. Staff believes the design would be compatible with the existing building on site.

**Trees and landscaping**

The site is heavily wooded. The existing building is surrounded on all sides by a mix of 130 heritage and non-heritage trees on the subject site and adjacent properties. The applicant’s arborist report (Attachment F) indicates 27 of the trees are on adjacent neighboring properties. No trees are proposed for removal and all existing trees would be protected. Pruning would be required to facilitate the delivery as well as the proposed final location of the modular office. The proposed pruning and tree protections were evaluated by the City Arborist to confirm they would not damage the trees and would not require a heritage tree removal permit for pruning more than 25 percent of the canopy of any tree. The arborist report includes the original arborist report with a tree inventory completed in 2018 by Robert Booty with Arborist OnSite Horticultural
Consulting, Inc. and root map. This report surveyed the size, location and species of all trees on site. As this report was completed over a year ago, an updated inventory was required. The applicant indicated the original arborist was not available to perform the work and an updated arborist report from Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting that assessed the trees in the project vicinity and pruning requirements was commissioned for the project. This report includes reference notes from the original report as well as a root map. The original report is included as the last 27 pages of the attachment for reference. Protection of the trees in accordance with the arborist report and the Heritage Tree Ordinance would be ensured through standard condition of approval 4(i).

Parking
The subject property has a total of 90 parking spaces including accessible parking stalls. The required parking rate for the C-1 zoning district is one space per 200 square feet of gross floor area. A total of 77 parking spaces are required for the existing building and the proposed modular office. The modular office would occupy nine parking spaces during the three year duration of the use permit. A total of 81 spaces would be available, including accessible stalls. Existing bicycle storage lockers holding eight bicycles would be preserved. The Transportation Division has reviewed and tentatively approved the proposed site configuration.

Correspondence
At the time of drafting this report staff have not received any items of correspondence related to this item. The applicant has indicated they send a mailer out to neighboring properties within 300 feet in April, 2021. The applicant’s mailer has been included as Attachment G.

Conclusion
Staff believes the proposed modular office would be aesthetically compatible with the existing structure. The site has sufficient parking capacity to accommodate the additional gross floor area during the use of the modular office and the site would be returned to the original condition at the end of the term of the use permit. The existing trees on site would screen the modular office from view from the public right-of-way and would be protected during its installation and use. Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the proposed project.

Impact on City Resources
The project sponsor is required to pay Planning, Building and Public Works permit fees, based on the City’s Master Fee Schedule, to fully cover the cost of staff time spent on the review of the project.

Environmental Review
The project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Public Notice
Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.
**Appeal Period**
The Planning Commission action will be effective after 15 days unless the action is appealed to the City Council, in which case the outcome of the application shall be determined by the City Council.

**Attachments**
A. Recommended Actions  
B. Location Map  
C. Data Table  
D. Project Plans  
E. Project Description Letter  
F. Arborist Report  
G. Project Mailer

**Disclaimer**
Attached are reduced versions of maps and diagrams submitted by the applicants. The accuracy of the information in these drawings is the responsibility of the applicants, and verification of the accuracy by City Staff is not always possible. The original full-scale maps, drawings and exhibits are available for public viewing at the Community Development Department.

**Exhibits to Be Provided at Meeting**
None

Report prepared by:  
Ori Paz, Associate Planner

Report reviewed by:  
Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner
LOCATION: 66 Willow Place
PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2019-000050
APPLICANT: Stanford Healthcare
OWNER: GEORGE N FRYKBERG TR

PROPOSAL: Request for a use permit and architectural control to construct a 1,440-square-foot temporary modular office in the C-1 (Administrative and Professional District, Restrictive) district. The applicant requests that the office module be placed on the property for a period of three years to accommodate additional temporary staff associated with the completion of the Stanford Hospital expansion. The office module will occupy nine parking spaces, decreasing the number of parking spaces from 91 to 82 spaces where 77 spaces is required.

DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission
DATE: December 13, 2021
ACTION: TBD

VOTE: TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Harris, Kennedy, Riggs, Tate)

ACTION:

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.

3. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
   a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
   b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the city.
   c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
   d. The development would not modify the previously approved adequate parking as required in all applicable city ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
   e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.

4. Approve the use permit and architectural control subject to the following standard conditions:
   a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by December 13, 2022) for the use permit to remain in effect.
   b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by PHd Architects, Inc. consisting of 14 plan sheets, received December 3, 2021 and approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2021, subject to review and approval by the Planning Division.
   c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies’ regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
   d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.
   e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.
LOCATION: 66 Willow Place  
PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2019-00050  
APPLICANT: Stanford Healthcare  
OWNER: GEORGE N FRYKBERG TR

PROPOSAL: Request for a use permit and architectural control to construct a 1,440-square-foot temporary modular office in the C-1 (Administrative and Professional District, Restrictive) district. The applicant requests that the office module be placed on the property for a period of three years to accommodate additional temporary staff associated with the completion of the Stanford Hospital expansion. The office module will occupy nine parking spaces, decreasing the number of parking spaces from 91 to 82 spaces where 77 spaces is required.

DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission  
DATE: December 13, 2021  
ACTION: TBD

VOTE: TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Harris, Kennedy, Riggs, Tate)

ACTION:

f. All applicable public right-of-way improvements, including frontage improvements and the dedication of easements and public right-of-way, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division prior to building permit final inspection.

g. Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. The applicant's design professional shall evaluate the Project's impact to the City's storm drainage system and shall substantiate their conclusions with drainage calculations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building permit issuance.

h. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall provide documentation indicating the amount of irrigated landscaping. If the project proposes more than 500 square feet of irrigated landscaping, it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.44). Submittal of a detailed landscape plan would be required concurrently with the submittal of a complete building permit application.

i. Heritage and street trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report updated by Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting dated December 8, 2021.

j. If construction is not complete by the start of the wet season (October 1 through April 30), the Applicant shall implement a winterization program to minimize the potential for erosion and sedimentation.

k. Prior to building permit issuance, Applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.

5. Approve the use permit subject to the following project-specific conditions:

   a. The use permit shall expire and the applicant shall remove the modular office and all temporary site improvements three years after the date of the final inspection or issuance of temporary occupancy for the modular office, subject to review and approval by the Planning and Building Divisions.

   b. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit an updated arborist report correcting missing values in the appraised value column subject to review and approval by the Planning Division and City Arborist.
## 66 Willow Place – Attachment C: Data Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>EXISTING DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>ZONING ORDINANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot area</td>
<td>115,658.0 sf</td>
<td>115,658.0 sf</td>
<td>87,120.0 sf min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width</td>
<td>265.2 ft.</td>
<td>265.2 ft.</td>
<td>150.0 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth</td>
<td>365.0 ft.</td>
<td>365.0 ft.</td>
<td>150.0 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Setbacks*

- **Front**: 92.8 ft.
- **Rear**: 57.6 ft.
- **Side (left)**: 41.0 ft.
- **Side (right)**: 78.9 ft.

### Building coverage

- **Proposed**: 15,391.0 sf, 13.3 %
- **Existing**: 13,951.0 sf, 12.1 %

### FAR (Floor Area Ratio)

- **Proposed**: 15,391 sf, 13.3 %
- **Existing**: 13,951.0 sf, 12.1 %

### Square footage by floor

- **Proposed**: 13,951.0 sf/1st floor, 1,440.0 sf/modular office
- **Existing**: 13,951.0 sf/1st floor

### Square footage of buildings

- **Proposed**: 15,391.0 sf
- **Existing**: 13,951.0 sf

### Building height

- **Proposed**: 10.3 ft.
- **Existing**: 15.5 ft.

### Parking

- **Proposed**: 81 uncovered
- **Existing**: 90 uncovered

1 space/200 square feet (77 spaces)

### Trees

- **Heritage trees**: 49
- **Non-Heritage trees**: 87
- **New Trees**: 0

**Heritage trees** proposed for removal: 0  
**Non-Heritage trees** proposed for removal: 0  
**Total Number of Trees**: 130

---

*Proposed setbacks are measured to the proposed modular office. Existing setbacks are measured to the existing office building.

**Includes trees on adjacent properties and three dead trees.

Note: Areas shown highlighted indicate a nonconforming or substandard situation.
AREA CALCULATIONS

LOT AREA = 115,658 SQ. FT.

(E) BUILDING

AREA OF THE BUILDING = 75'-0" x 188'-0" = 14100 SF - (A+B)

ENTRANCE AREA A = 29 SF
ENTRANCE AREA B = 120 SF
TOTAL A + B = 149 SF

TOTAL AREA OF THE BUILDING = 14100.00 SF - 149 SF = 13951 SF

(E) FAR = 13951/115,658 x 100 = 12%

(N) TRAILER

AREA OF THE TRAILER = 24'-0" x 60'-0" = 1440 SF

TOTAL BUILDING AREA = (E) BUILDING + (N) TRAILER

= 13,951 SF + 1440.00 SF = 15,391 SF

PROPOSED FAR = 15,391/115,658 x 100 = 13.3%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Interiors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>I1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>I2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>I3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>I4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>I5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 6</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>I6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 7</td>
<td>A7</td>
<td>P7</td>
<td>I7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 8</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>P8</td>
<td>I8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 9</td>
<td>A9</td>
<td>P9</td>
<td>I9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Area 1: New building
- Area 2: Existing building
- Area 3: Renovation
- Area 4: Expansion
- Area 5: Demolition
- Area 6: Conversion
- Area 7: Refurbishment
- Area 8: Maintenance
- Area 9: Emergency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot Number</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13766552</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766551</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766550</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766549</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766548</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766547</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766546</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766545</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766544</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766543</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766542</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766541</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766540</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766539</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766538</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766537</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766536</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766535</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766534</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766533</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766532</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766531</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766530</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766529</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766528</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766527</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766526</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766525</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766524</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766523</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766522</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766521</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766520</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766519</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766518</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766517</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766516</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766515</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766514</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766513</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766512</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766511</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766510</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766509</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766508</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766507</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766506</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766505</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766504</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766503</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766502</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766501</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766500</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766499</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766498</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766497</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766496</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766495</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766494</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766493</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766492</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766491</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766490</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766489</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766488</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766487</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766486</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766485</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766484</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766483</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766482</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766481</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766480</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766479</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766478</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766477</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766476</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766475</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766474</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766473</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766472</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766471</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766470</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766469</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766468</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766467</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766466</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766465</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13766464</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Solid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SURVEY CONTROL TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT</th>
<th>NORTHING</th>
<th>EASTING</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1991187.59</td>
<td>6078135.74</td>
<td>SET MAG 65.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1991007.67</td>
<td>6078073.09</td>
<td>SET MAG 66.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1991234.75</td>
<td>6077877.23</td>
<td>FND MAG 62.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

SURVEY NOTES

- All points are surveyed to a precision of 4mm.
- All recorded points are referenced to Northing and Easting units.

BENCHMARK

- The benchmark point is referenced to a precision of 4mm.
- The benchmark is surveyed to a precision of 4mm.

FLOOD ZONE

- All points are surveyed to a precision of 4mm.
- The flood zone is referenced to a precision of 4mm.

BOUNDARY NOTE

- All points are surveyed to a precision of 4mm.
- The boundary note is referenced to a precision of 4mm.

SYMBOLS & ABBREVIATIONS

- All symbols and abbreviations are surveyed to a precision of 4mm.

LEGEND

- All legends are surveyed to a precision of 4mm.

---

SURVEY CONTROL TABLE
May 14, 2021

Ori Paz
Planning Division
City of Menlo Park
701 Laurel Street
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Re: Use Permit Revision for 66 Willow Place - Resubmittal
Application #: PLN2019-00050
Applicant: Stanford Health Care | Planning, Design & Construction Department
Address: 66 Willow Place, Menlo Park
APN#: 062-423-080

Dear Ori,

In response to staff comments received on August 17, 2020 related to its application for a use permit revision to accommodate a temporary office trailer, Stanford Health Care (“SHC”) has prepared the following materials:

1. Response to comments matrix;
2. Updated plans showing the existing conditions and proposed improvements;
3. Menlo Park Fire District conditional approval letter and approved plans;
4. Signed approval packet with Recology waste services;
5. Copy of postcards mailed to neighbors on April 27, 2021;
6. Updated project description below.

Updated Description of Proposed Use and Consistency with the Zoning Code
SHC’s Planning, Design & Construction department proposes to locate a 1,440 square-foot temporary modular office in its rear surface parking area for a period of four to five years; this would temporarily increase total floor area on the site to 15,391 square feet.

The need for a temporary increase in space was originally driven by the completion of construction of the new Stanford Hospital and the demobilization of the associated onsite design and construction offices. This was planned to result in relocation of SHC Planning, Design & Construction staff members from their onsite construction offices to the main Planning, Design & Construction offices at 66 Willow Place to support renovation projects within the preexisting Hospital. However, plans have shifted since the onset of the pandemic, with project management staff members now dispersed at offices proximate to their construction sites, or working remotely where possible. While the trailer is no longer required in the immediate term for the originally planned purpose, SHC anticipates that as staff members begin returning to the Planning, Design & Construction main office, additional space will be needed to accommodate social distancing, and for this reason, intends to continue to pursue approval for this additional temporary
office space. Under the continuously shifting landscape, the trailer would provide a flexible space solution to meet the department’s needs.

It was originally anticipated that the modular office would be staffed with approximately twelve (12) full-time employees, including two (2) Design / Construction Directors, and ten (10) project management staff. These staff members would be performing the same types of design and construction project management duties that staff within the existing space at 66 Willow Place currently perform. Given the pandemic, in the near term, it is expected that less than half the original occupancy would be accommodated in this space, but that at some point in the future, the staffing levels originally planned may be reached. Proposed hours of operation would be from approximately 8am to 5pm, in alignment with the existing office use at 66 Willow Place.

The proposed modular office would not be visible from the street and would have very limited, if any, visibility from surrounding properties. On April 27, 2021, community outreach postcards with essential information about the temporary trailer were mailed out to neighbors within 300 ft of the property as provided by the City of Menlo Park. Neighbors were invited to provide feedback to a dedicated email address. To date no comments on the proposed trailer have been received.

The proposed modular office and associated ramping system would occupy 9 parking spaces within the rear parking lot, leaving a total of 81 parking spaces remaining on site. This would exceed the parking count required by Section 16.72.030(1) of the Municipal Code by four (4) parking spaces, and would be sufficient to accommodate existing Planning, Design & Construction operations as well as the additional staff.

While the Arborist report identified two trees on the property that can be removed due to their current health condition (not because of the project), they are not proposed to be removed. Trees that might be impacted by construction will be protected per the Arborist’s recommendations. All temporary equipment installed (bollards, striping etc.) for the trailer will be removed when it is removed at the end of the use permit’s period.

As noted in the preceding section, the proposed use is consistent with the zoning for the site, as professional, executive, and administrative offices are a conditionally permitted use in the C-1 zoning district. (Section 16.30.020).

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Molly Promes Swenson
Sr. Program Manager
Planning, Design + Construction
Stanford Medicine
12/8/2021

Tran Le
Stanford Health Care
300 Pasteur Drive
Stanford, California 94305
(617) 669-1622
tranle@stanfordhealthcare.org

Re: Tree protection for trailer installation at 66 Willow Place, Menlo Park, CA 94025

Dear Tran,

At your request, we have visited the property referenced above to evaluate the trees present with respect to the proposed project. The report below contains our analysis.

Summary

There are 130 trees on and adjacent to this property. Forty-nine are heritage trees, 27 are off-site trees (of which nine are heritage trees), and none are street trees. None are recommended for removal. With proper protection, all currently in good condition are expected to survive and thrive during and after construction.

Assignment and Limits of Report

We have been asked to write a report detailing impacts to trees from the proposed trailer installation on this property. This report may be used by our client and other project members as needed to inform all stages of the project.
Tree inventory information was taken from the report titled “ISA Certified Arborist Report” for this project, written by Robert Booty, dated 1/29/2020. Due to the large number of trees on this property, only trees adjacent to proposed project features were reevaluated by us.

All our observations were made from the ground with basic equipment. No root collar excavations or aerial inspections were performed. No project features had been staked at the time of our site visit.

**Tree Regulations**

In the City of Menlo Park, native oak trees are protected at 10 inches DBH (diameter at breast height, 4.5 feet above grade), and all other trees are protected at 15 inches DBH. Street trees are protected regardless of size.

According to the Heritage Tree Ordinance Administrative Guidelines, the dollar value of replacement trees is determined as follows:

- One (1) #5 container – $100
- One (1) #15 container – $200
- One (1) 24-inch tree box – $400
- One (1) 36-inch tree box – $1,200
- One (1) 48-inch tree box – $5,000
- One (1) 60-inch tree box – $7,000

**Observations**

Trees

There are 130 trees on and adjacent to this property (Images 1-16). Seventy-six are coast live oaks (*Quercus agrifolia*), nine are olives (*Olea europaea*), six are deodar cedars (*Cedrus deodara*), and the remaining 40 are of various species. Twenty-seven overhang the property from adjacent properties. Forty-nine are heritage trees, including nine that overhang from neighboring properties.

Most trees are in good condition. Vigor ratings are given for each tree in the Tree Table, below.

Most trees present are in densely wooded areas around the property perimeter.
Project Features

A modular pre-engineered trailer is proposed to be located in the rear (southeastern) corner of the property. The trailer is noted to be installed at grade, with no excavated foundation proposed. The trailer will be brought in on a built-in chassis with axles and will be 14’ tall during transport. This will be the tallest equipment brought onsite.

New bollards will be installed in front of the trailer.

A new paved walkway is proposed northwest of the trailer, leading from the trailer entrance to the adjacent building.

A new electric light pole is proposed northeast of the trailer, with the exact location noted to be determined in the field at a later date.

An underground sprinkler pipe is proposed to run from the trailer to the adjacent building. Power will be overhead, not underground.

The garbage enclosure northwest of the trailer is proposed to be relocated.

No drainage, grading, or new fences are shown on the plans provided to me.

Potential Conflicts

Trees #1624, 1626, 1633, 1634, 1637, 1650, 1651, 1686-8, 1706, and 1712 all overhang either the proposed trailer location, or driveway locations likely to be accessed by a multi-axle vehicle with a wide turn radius. Less than 25% of each of their canopies lies within the 14 feet of vertical clearance needed for construction equipment.

Trees #1662, 1672, 1685, 1688, 1690, 1712 - these trees overhang construction access routes. Overhead clearance to the lowest branches may possibly be insufficient to accommodate construction equipment.

Trees #1664 and 1669 - the proposed light pole is in the existing pavement within these trees’ TPZs, as well as some construction access routes.

Trees #1689, 1694, 1697 - the proposed sprinkler pipe is within these trees’ TPZs, as well as some construction access routes.
Tree #1673 - several of the proposed bollards lie within this tree's TPZ, in the existing paved area. The construction access route also lies within this tree's TPZ.

Trees #1705, 1706, and 1711 - the proposed paved walkway is within these trees' TPZs.¹

Project features lie outside the TPZs of all other trees.

**Testing and Analysis**

Tree inventory information was taken from the report titled “ISA Certified Arborist Report” for this project, written by Robert Booty, dated 1/29/2020. Due to the large number of trees on this property, only trees adjacent to proposed project features were reevaluated by us.

Tree locations were taken from Mr. Booty's report, and matched to survey locations or onsite observations as practical. Except where matched to the survey, tree locations shown on the map below are approximate.

We visited the site three times, on 8/9/2021, 8/12/2021, and 10/18/2021. All photographs and all original observations in this report were taken at that site visit.

This report is based on the sheets titled “A2: Existing Site Demo Plan” and “A3: Proposed Site Plan” dated 4/13/2021, provided to me electronically by the client.

Trees in wooded areas were not evaluated using the same metrics as ornamental landscape trees. Specifically, when performing appraisals, poor health, structure, and superadequacy² were not considered detrimental due to their negligible effect on ecological value.

**Discussion**

Tree Protection Zones (TPZ's)

Tree roots grow where conditions are favorable, and their spatial arrangement is therefore unpredictable. Favorable conditions vary among species, but generally include the presence of moisture, and soft soil texture with low compaction.

---

¹ Tree protection zones. See Discussion, Tree Map, and Tree Inventory Table for more detail.
² Being too large for a given area
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Contrary to popular belief, roots of all tree species grow primarily in the top two feet of soil, with a small number of roots sometimes occurring at greater depths. Some species have taproots when young, but these almost universally disappear with age. At maturity, a tree’s root system may extend out from the trunk farther than the tree is tall.

The optimal size of the area around a tree which should be protected from disturbance depends on the tree’s size, species, and vigor, as shown in the following table (adapted from Trees & Construction, Matheny and Clark, 1998):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species tolerance</th>
<th>Tree vitality</th>
<th>Distance from trunk (feet per inch trunk diameter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that some roots will almost certainly be present outside the TPZ; however, root loss outside the TPZ is unlikely to cause tree decline.

Some of the tree species present here are not evaluated in Trees & Construction. Our own evaluation of them based on our experience with the species is as follows:

---

3 Matheny & Clark uses tree age, but we feel a tree’s vitality more accurately reflects its ability to handle stress.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Estimated tolerance</th>
<th>Reason for tolerance rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betula pendula</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sensitive to a variety of stressors in the landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnamomum camphora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grows well but is sensitive to a variety of stressors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Citrus trees thrive in a variety of growing conditions, but those on dwarfing rootstock are typically slow growers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heteromeles arbutifolia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Performs well but grows slowly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia indica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Performs well in most landscapes but grows relatively slowly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Performs well in Bay Area, but can be prone to dieback if cultural conditions are less than optimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performs well to the point of weediness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tolerates root loss well, even during transplanting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sensitive to a variety of stressors in the landscape, but most species perform well overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trees whose species cannot be identified are assigned a construction tolerance of 1.

Tree Appraisal Methods

We use the trunk formula technique with discounting for functional and external limitations, as detailed in the second printing of the 10th Edition of the Guide for Plant Appraisal (Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers, 2019).
Tree Pruning Limits

According to ANSI A300 (Part 1) - 2017 Pruning, no more than 25% of a healthy tree’s foliage should be removed in any given pruning cycle. Removing more than this amount can result in increased sprouting and can negatively impact tree health.

Pruning cuts should also be kept relatively small, as large cuts increase the likelihood of decay and sprouting. The maximum size of pruning cuts varies among species, but three inches is a reasonable maximum for species which compartmentalize reasonably quickly.

Conclusions

Trees #1624, 1626, 1633, 1634, 1637, 1650, 1651, 1686-8, 1706, and 1712 will require clearance pruning to a height of 14 feet to accommodate delivery of the proposed trailer. All will require removal of less than 25% of their foliage, using pruning cuts of three inches or less in diameter. Approximate anticipated percentages of canopy removal needed are given in the tree table, below.

Trees #1662, 1672, 1685, 1688, 1690, 1712 - minor impacts to these trees are likely from construction access. They may require pruning to accommodate construction equipment. It appears that necessary pruning will be minor to moderate.

Trees #1664 and 1669 - minor impacts to these trees are likely from the proposed light pole installation. Minor impacts are likely from construction access.

Tree #1689 - moderate impacts to this tree are likely from the proposed sprinkler pipe installation. Minor impacts are likely from construction access.

Tree #1694 - minor to moderate impacts to this tree are likely from the proposed sprinkler pipe installation. Minor impacts are likely from construction access.

Tree #1697 - minor impacts to this tree are likely from the proposed sprinkler pipe installation and construction access.

Tree #1673 - minor impacts to this tree are likely from installation of the proposed bollards, as well as construction access.
Trees #1705, 1706, and 1711 - moderate impacts to these trees are likely from the proposed paved walkway. Please note that the TPZ of tree #1712 ends just outside the paved walkway area, so this tree is unlikely to experience significant impacts from this feature.

Impacts to other trees are unlikely with proper tree protection measures.

**Recommendations**

**Design Phase**

1. Explore design options that minimize impacts to trees #1705 1706, and 1711 from the proposed paved walkway, including, but not limited to:
   a. Minimizing depth of pavement subbase.
      i. Explore the possibility of “bridging” over roots instead of excavating.
   b. Minimize compaction under walkway.
   c. Using a gravel subbase to minimize root damage over time.
   d. Using permeable paving material. This includes, but is not limited to, pervious concrete.

**Preconstruction Phase**

1. Prune trees #1624, 1626, 1633, 1634, 1637, 1650, 1651, 1686-8, 1706, and 1712 to a height of 14 feet over the driveway and parking areas prior to bringing large equipment onsite.
   a. All pruning shall be performed by a licensed tree care company under the direction of an ISA Certified Arborist.
   b. All pruning shall meet tree care industry standards. In particular:
      i. No more than 25% of any tree's foliage may be removed.
      ii. Pruning cuts shall be about three inches or smaller in diameter for all trees.
2. Install tree protection fencing for trees approximately as shown in the Tree Map, below.
   a. Minimum distances from trunk centers are given on the Tree Map. A larger area may be protected if desired.
b. Where existing barriers which will be retained impede access comparably to tree protection fencing, these barriers are an acceptable substitute for tree protection fencing.

a. Please be aware that tree protection fencing may differ from ideal tree protection zones, and from canopy sizes.

c. Tree protection fencing shall comprise 6’ chain link fabric mounted on 1.5” diameter metal posts driven into the ground.

d. Place a 6” layer of wood chips inside tree protection fencing.

e. Tree protection fencing shall adhere to the requirements in the document titled “Tree Protection Specifications,” available at https://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/90/Tree-Protection-Specifications

Construction Phase

1. Maintain tree protection fencing as detailed above.

2. Trenching for sprinkler pipe AND excavation for paved walkway:
   a. Hand-excavate nearest edge within tree protection zone to the full depth of the feature being installed or to a depth of three feet, whichever is shallower.
   b. Place pipe between roots, retaining as many roots as practical.
   c. If roots over 1” must be severed, do so with a sharp saw or bypass pruners as close to the edge of excavation as possible.
   d. Notify project arborist when excavation is complete. Project arborist shall inspect work to make sure all roots have been cut cleanly.
   e. If excavation will be left open for more than 3 days:
      i. Cover excavation wall nearest tree with several layers of burlap or other absorbent fabric
      ii. Install a timer and soaker hoses to irrigate with potable water twice per day, enough to wet fabric thoroughly.

Post-Construction Phase

1. Provide supplemental irrigation for trees #1689, 1705, 1706, and 1711 to aid in root regrowth for at least three years.
   a. Note that tree #1689 should only be irrigated during the normal wet season (October-May), and only if rainfall is below average.
Supporting Photographs

Image 1: tree #1664
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Image 2: tree #1669
Image 4: tree #1685
Image 5: tree #1688
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Image 8: trees #1706 (right) and 1707
Image 10: tree #1712
Image 11: approximate clearance pruning needed for trees #1624 (left foreground) and 1626 (right background; canopies touching)
Image 12: approximate clearance pruning needed for trees #1633 (left edge), 1634 (left of center), and 1637 (right background, shorter)
Image 13: approximate clearance pruning needed for trees #1650 (left, pruned for line clearance) and 1651 (right, extreme lean over parking; canopies touching)
Image 14: approximate clearance pruning needed for trees #1686-1688
Image 15: approximate clearance pruning needed for tree #1706
Image 16: approximate clearance pruning needed for tree #1712
Terms of Assignment

The following terms and conditions apply to all oral and written reports and correspondence pertaining to the consultations, inspections, and activities of Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting:

1. All property lines and ownership of property, trees, and landscape plants and fixtures are assumed to be accurate and reliable as presented and described to the consultant, either orally or in writing. The consultant assumes no responsibility for verification of ownership or locations of property lines, or for results of any actions or recommendations based on inaccurate information.

2. It is assumed that any property referred to in any report or in conjunction with any services performed by Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting is in accordance with any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or other governmental regulations, and that any titles and ownership to any property are assumed to be good and marketable. The existence of liens or encumbrances has not been determined, and any and all property is appraised and/or assessed as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.

3. All reports and other correspondence are confidential and are the property of Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting and its named clients and their assigns or agents. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply any right of publication or use for any purpose, without the express permission of the consultant and the client to whom the report was issued. Loss, removal, or alteration of any part of a report invalidates the entire appraisal/evaluation.

4. The scope of any report or other correspondence is limited to the trees and conditions specifically mentioned in those reports and correspondence. Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting assumes no liability for the failure of trees or parts of trees, inspected or otherwise. The consultant assumes no responsibility to report on the condition of any tree or landscape feature not specifically requested by the named client.

5. All inspections are limited to visual examination of accessible parts, without dissection, excavation, probing, boring or other invasive procedures, unless otherwise noted in the report, and reflect the condition of those items and features at the time of inspection. No warranty or guarantee is made, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the plants or the property will not occur in the future, from any cause. The consultant shall not be responsible for damages caused by any tree defects, and assumes no responsibility for the correction of defects or tree related problems.

6. The consultant shall not be required to provide further documentation, give testimony, be deposed, or to attend court by reason of this appraisal/report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of additional fees for such services as set forth by the consultant or in the fee schedule or contract.

7. Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting makes no warranty, either expressed or implied, as to the suitability of the information contained in any reports or correspondence, either oral or written, for any purpose. It remains the responsibility of the client to determine applicability to his/her particular case.

8. Any report and the values, observations, and recommendations expressed therein represent the professional opinion of the consultant, and the fee for services is in no manner contingent upon the reporting of a specified value nor upon any particular finding.

9. Any photographs, diagrams, charts, sketches, or other graphic material included in any report are intended solely as visual aids, are not necessarily to scale, and should not be construed as engineering reports or surveys unless otherwise noted in the report. Any reproduction of graphic material or the work product of any other persons is intended solely for clarification and ease of reference. Inclusion of said information does not constitute a representation by Aesculus Arboricultural Consulting as to the sufficiency or accuracy of that information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID (Booth)</th>
<th>Tree # (Booth)</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH (in.)</th>
<th>Vitality (0-3)</th>
<th>Heritage Tree?</th>
<th>Street Tree?</th>
<th>Off-Site Tree?</th>
<th>Suitability for preservation (003)</th>
<th>Remove?</th>
<th>Appraised Value</th>
<th>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</th>
<th>TPZ radius (ideal; ft. from center of trunk)</th>
<th>Expected Impacts</th>
<th>Notes (from Robert Booty’s &quot;ISA Certified Arborist Report,&quot; dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3 X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,500.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Under high voltage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,240.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,460.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$910.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$370.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0 X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3 X</td>
<td>X 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$490.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>In walking trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$420.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$910.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>X 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Possible cabling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>X 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (Booth)</td>
<td>Tree # (Booth)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal; ft from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
<td>Notes (from Robert Booty’s &quot;ISA Certified Arborist Report,&quot; dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Coast redwood</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,090.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Flagging, possible Monterey pine pitch canker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Monterey pine</td>
<td>Pinus radiata</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$630.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Flagging, possible Monterey pine pitch canker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Monterey pine</td>
<td>Pinus radiata</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Flagging, possible Monterey pine pitch canker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Plum</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$910.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,090.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Tree of heaven</td>
<td>Ailanthus altissima</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Invasive tree species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$910.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$910.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 10% anticipated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,800.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 66 Willow Tree Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID (Booth)</th>
<th>Tree # (Booth)</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH (in.)</th>
<th>Vitality (0-3)</th>
<th>Heritage Tree?</th>
<th>Street Tree?</th>
<th>Off-Site Tree?</th>
<th>Suitability for preservation (0=3)</th>
<th>Appraised Value</th>
<th>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</th>
<th>TPZ radius (ideal; ft. from center of trunk)</th>
<th>Expected Impacts</th>
<th>Notes (from Robert Booty’s “ISA Certified Arborist Report,” dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>$1,630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 5% anticipated.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$3,740.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$3,060.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>$13,800.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Tree of heaven</td>
<td>Ailanthus altissima</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>$1,930.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 5% anticipated.</td>
<td>Invasive tree species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Tree of heaven</td>
<td>Ailanthus altissima</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#VALUE!</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 5% anticipated.</td>
<td>Invasive tree species. Mushrooms present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum lucidum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>$910.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (Booth)</td>
<td>Tree # (Booth)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal; ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
<td>Notes (from Robert Booty’s &quot;ISA Certified Arborist Report,&quot; dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 5% anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>White birch</td>
<td>Betula pendula</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3 X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,300.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,460.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,240.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Peruvian pepper</td>
<td>Schinus molle</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$370.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fallen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Bay laurel</td>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,180.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Bay laurel</td>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$910.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (BooTy)</td>
<td>Tree # (BooTy)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>X 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>Quercus lobata</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>5 2</td>
<td>X 3</td>
<td>$1,630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Northern California black walnut</td>
<td>Juglans hindsii</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (Boothy)</td>
<td>Tree # (Boothy)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TRZ radius (ideal; ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$740.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>Minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 5% anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$740.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 5% anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,400.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Eucalyptus</td>
<td>Eucalyptus sp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,900.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (BooTy)</td>
<td>Tree # (BooTy)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal; ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Minor from construction access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Northern California black walnut</td>
<td>Juglans hindsii</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,420.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>Minor from light pole installation and construction access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,510.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>Quercus sp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes (from Robert Booty's "ISA Certified Arborist Report," dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated): Dead/hazard (I disagree with the "hazard" assessment, as this tree is in a low-occupancy wooded area)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID (Booth)</th>
<th>Tree # (Booth)</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH (in.)</th>
<th>Vitality (0-3)</th>
<th>Heritage Tree?</th>
<th>Street Tree?</th>
<th>Off-Site Tree?</th>
<th>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</th>
<th>Remove?</th>
<th>Appraised Value</th>
<th>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</th>
<th>TPZ radius (ideal; ft. from center of trunk)</th>
<th>Expected Impacts</th>
<th>Notes (from Robert Booty’s &quot;ISA Certified Arborist Report,&quot; dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Booty's inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Toyon</td>
<td>Heteromeles arbutifolia</td>
<td>11 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$9,500.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>17 2 X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Booty's inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Bay laurel</td>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Booty's inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (Booth)</td>
<td>Tree # (Booth)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal; ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
<td>Notes (from Robert Booty's &quot;ISA Certified Arborist Report,&quot; dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Booty's inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Booty's inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$420.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$46,500.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Minor from light pole installation and construction access</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$490.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>Minor from construction access</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (Booby)</td>
<td>Tree # (Booby)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal; ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
<td>Notes (from Robert Booty’s &quot;ISA Certified Arborist Report, dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>Minor from bollard installation and construction access</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1674</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,240.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$630.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Tree not accessible</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Tree not accessible</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,100.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,200.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,060.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1682</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (Boothy)</td>
<td>Tree # (Booty)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal, ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Booty's inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Booty's inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Minors from construction access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Minor from construction access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 10% anticipated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (Boothe)</td>
<td>Tree # (Boothe)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal; ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Boothe’s inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Boothe’s inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 5% anticipated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>Minor from construction access and minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 5% anticipated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (Booth)</td>
<td>Tree ID (Booth)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal: ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>Moderate from trenching for sprinkler pipe and construction access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$16,900.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>Minor from construction access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$420.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$8,900.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (Booth)</td>
<td>Tree # (Booth)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal, ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
<td>Notes (from Robert Booty's &quot;ISA Certified Arborist Report,&quot; dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,100.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>Minor to moderate from trenching for sprinkler pipe and construction access. Minor from all other construction activities.</td>
<td>17 stems. DBH estimated in original arborist report. I feel the DBH is significantly underestimated, so I have reduced the TPZ radius to 40 feet from the 102.5 feet yielded by my calculation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,300.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,090.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>Cupressus sp.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,740.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Minor from trenching for sprinkler pipe and construction access</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,300.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,900.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (BooTy)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (In.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-3)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ft from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
<td>Notes (from Robert Booty’s “ISA Certified Arborist Report,” dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Booty's inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$11,100.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Booty's inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Bay laurel</td>
<td>Laurus nobilis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tree not accessible. DBH given as 0 in Mr. Booty's inventory. We do not feel this tree is relevant to the project as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>Southern magnolia</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,460.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ground penetrating radar revealed many roots in the area where the walkway is proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>Southern magnolia</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Moderate to major from paved walkway construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ground penetrating radar revealed many roots in the area where the walkway is proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID (Boothy)</td>
<td>Tree ID (Boothy)</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (in.)</td>
<td>Vitality (0-3)</td>
<td>Heritage Tree?</td>
<td>Street Tree?</td>
<td>Off-Site Tree?</td>
<td>Suitability for preservation (0-5)</td>
<td>Remove?</td>
<td>Appraised Value</td>
<td>Species Construction Tolerance (1 = poor, 3 = good)</td>
<td>TPZ radius (ideal, ft. from center of trunk)</td>
<td>Expected Impacts</td>
<td>Notes (from Robert Booty’s &quot;ISA Certified Arborist Report&quot;, dated 1/29/2020, unless otherwise indicated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>Southern magnolia</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$19,100.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>Moderate to major from paved walkway construction and minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 5% anticipated.</td>
<td>Ground penetrating radar revealed many roots in the area where the walkway is proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Southern magnolia</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4,490.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>Citrus sp.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,430.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>Citrus sp.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$13,300.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>Crape myrtle</td>
<td>Lagerstroemia indica</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,700.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Camphor</td>
<td>Cinnamomum camphora</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$8,800.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>Minor from paved walkway construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,990.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Minor from construction access and minor from pruning for construction equipment access. Canopy loss of about 10% anticipated.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 22, 2020 Stanford Medicine 66 Willow Place Menlo Park, California
Root Scan #1 40.7 feet long 3 feet from Magnolia Tree over soil
January 22, 2020 Stanford Medicine 66 Willow Place Menlo Park, California
Root Scan #2 40.1 feet long from Magnolia Tree over soil
ISA Certified Arborist Report

Submitted To:

Stanford Medicine
66 Willow Place
Menlo Park, California

Project Location:

66 Willow Place
Menlo Park, California

Submitted By:

Robert Booty, Registered Member # 487
ISA Qualified Tree Risk Assessor
The American Society of Consulting Arborists
ISA Certified Arborist WC-4286
January 29, 2020
Assignment

I have been retained by Tran Le who is the project manager at Stanford Health Care in Menlo Park, California. The site is being modified for the construction and installation of an ADA compliant walkway. I have been requested to develop a tree protection plan during construction involving trees that are located within the construction zone. Additionally I have been requested to provide a tree inventory of all accessible trees on the property using ArcGIS satellite technology.

Observations

I visited the site January 13, 2020. The area where the walkway is to be constructed is next to an asphalt parking lot and a chain-link fence. The new walkway will be located on the opposite side next to the fence in a landscaped area of the property. There are 12 trees in the construction zone to be protected. These are identified in a spread sheet on page 6. The temporary construction trailer will be located at the end of a parking lot near the creek. There are two live oak trees at the edge of the creek currently protected with a chain-link fence. Note site map on page 7.

Conclusions

Tree Pruning

The following trees will need to have limbs trimmed and reduced to accommodate the placement of the construction trailer. #1686, 1687 and 1688.

Root Mapping using Ground Penetrating Radar

I conducted two 40 foot line scans on the soil at the site of the proposed ADA walkway. This was an effort to understand root density, and the amount of roots near the surface, as the proposed walkway passed two protected Magnolia trees. The results of these scans indicated an abundance of roots near the surface from these Magnolia trees with larger structural roots to a depth of 33 inches.
Construction of the ADA compliant walkway

The construction of the walkway is proposed to be excavated to a depth of six inches. Our radar imaging of the root systems of trees numbered 1706 and 1705 indicated an abundance of roots at and near the surface within the site of the proposed excavation. These would be smaller absorbing roots and not necessarily structural roots that normally are found deeper. The absorbing roots play a key role involving the health of a tree. My concern is that if these roots are removed to a depth of six inches on one side of both trees, (although not all of them will be removed) the health of the trees could be compromised which we would like to avoid.

We collected our root data about three feet from the trees; this would be too close for any excavation. A much better location for the walkway would be at the edge of the asphalt parking lot about seven or eight feet away from the Magnolia trees near the lockers. This site would require minimal to no root pruning since the existing asphalt is already about a six inch thickness. Any site closer to the trees such as the one originally proposed, the walkway would need to be constructed above existing grade to avoid root damage to the trees. If there is any necessary root pruning during the project it should be performed using loppers or a fine toothed saw; cuts should be straight and clean. Roots must not be left exposed for a long period of time. By end of day they should be covered with soil or protected with burlap and continually kept wet to avoid damage.

Recommendations

1. Construct the walkway at the edge of the asphalt parking lot about seven or eight feet away from trees 1706 and 1705.
2. Follow the recommendations for tree protection during construction found on pages 7-8.
3. Trees #1686, 1687 and 1688 should be trimmed back to accommodate a temporary construction trailer.
4. Trees #1708 and 1711 should be removed.
Menlo Park’s definitions Heritage
(Regulated) Trees are as followed:

a. Any tree having a trunk with a circumference of 47.1 inches (diameter of 15 inches) or more measured at 54 inches above natural grade.

b. Any oak tree native to California, with a circumference of 31.4 inches (diameter of 10 inches) or more measured at 54 inches above natural grade.

c. Any tree or group of trees specifically designated by the City Council of Menlo Park for protection because of its historical significance, special character or community benefit.

d. Any tree with more than one trunk measured at the point where the trunks divide, with a circumference of 47.1 inches (diameter of 15 inches) or more, except for trees that are under twelve (12) feet in height, which are exempt from the ordinance.
Glossary of Terms for protected trees

From the tree inventory header below

**DBH;** trunk diameter measured at breast height (54”) from natural soil grade.

**Crown Radius;** the averaged measurement of the tree crown.

**% Vigor;** this Projects a general rating percentage of tree health, considering current growth rate, leaf size, color, dead wood ect.

**% Structural Condition;** this considers general branch attachments, presence of decay, cavities, cracks ect.

**% Overall Condition;** this is an averaged percentage rating of the vigor and structural condition. This equation is derived from the “condition percentage” factor that is used normally in tree valuations, using the criteria from the *Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers.* This type of data rating is used in the calculation of a trees appraised value.

**Suitability for Preservation;** this is used to determine which trees are to be retained or removed, its broken down into 4 categories, High, Moderate, Low, and Very Low.

**High=** tree is in excellent condition with no defects.

**Moderate=** some problems that can be successfully mitigated.

**Low=** significant problems, that are affecting the life span of the tree.

**Very Low=** tree is near death, or is dead.

### Overall Tree Condition Rating, Evaluation and Analysis

Collected totals from the tree inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Text Description</th>
<th>Quantity of Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% to 25%</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% to 49%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% to 70%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% to 90%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91% to 100%</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number Trees Evaluated within this construction site 12**
The following list includes protected trees, within the construction zone. These are subject to the tree protection measures outlined in this report.

**Tree Inventory Data**

* Indicates multi-Stem trunk  
R Indicates City regulated tree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Tag #</th>
<th>Common Name / Botanical Name</th>
<th>DBH</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Crown Radius</th>
<th>% Vigor</th>
<th>% Structural Condition</th>
<th>% Overall Condition</th>
<th>Suitability for Preservation</th>
<th>Age Evaluation</th>
<th>Observations / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>Southern Magnolia Tree / (Magnolia grandiflora)</td>
<td>25in.</td>
<td>40ft.</td>
<td>46ft.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>Southern Magnolia Tree / (Magnolia grandiflora)</td>
<td>7.5in.</td>
<td>25ft.</td>
<td>17ft.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Located next to fence and proposed walkway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Live Oak Tree / (Quercus agrifolia)</td>
<td>*24in.</td>
<td>25ft.</td>
<td>23ft.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Live Oak Tree / (Quercus agrifolia)</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>45ft.</td>
<td>35ft.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Live Oak Tree / (Quercus agrifolia)</td>
<td>8in.</td>
<td>30ft.</td>
<td>12ft.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Located behind fence and proposed construction trailer. Tree has a lean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>Southern Magnolia Tree / (Magnolia grandiflora)</td>
<td>12in.</td>
<td>25ft.</td>
<td>25ft.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Located in landscaped area next to building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>Southern Magnolia Tree / (Magnolia grandiflora)</td>
<td>8in.</td>
<td>20ft.</td>
<td>*20ft.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>cinnamon camphor / (cinnaomomum camphora)</td>
<td>*19in.</td>
<td>25ft.</td>
<td>17ft.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>crape myrtle / (lagerstroemia indica)</td>
<td>*10in.</td>
<td>15ft.</td>
<td>9ft.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>Lemon Tree / citrus species</td>
<td>*16in.</td>
<td>10ft.</td>
<td>17ft.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708</td>
<td>Lemon Tree / citrus species</td>
<td>*4in.</td>
<td>10ft.</td>
<td>8ft.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Live Oak Tree / (Quercus agrifolia)</td>
<td>13in.</td>
<td>40ft.</td>
<td>24ft.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site Map**

Not to scale

Tree protection fencing

Install chain-link fencing for tree protection

Install portable chain-link fencing around the following trees.

#1711
#1710
#1709
#1708
#1712

Use snow fencing and 2x4's on tree trunks as photo example to the left.

#1706
#1705
#1704
#1707
#1688

Use existing chain-link fencing on the following trees.

#1686
#1687
Tree Protection during Construction

The following mitigation recommendations are intended to reduce the extent of construction damage to acceptable levels, so that retained trees can reasonably be assured of survival without decline.

1. No grading or trenching cuts are to be made within the drip-line of any Protected tree canopies.

2. Fill soil must contain less than 10% clay.

3. Soil compaction must not exceed 80% around protected trees.

4. Install temporary six foot chain-link construction fencing around all protected trees as out-lined in this report, located in such a manner that it protects the drip-line or entire root zone. Fencing must be in place prior to the demolition or arrival of any materials or equipment and must remain in place until all construction is completed and given final approval. Snow fencing and 2x4’s are required on some designated trees. Fencing must not be temporarily moved during construction.

5. There must be no grading, trenching/surface scraping, or roto-tilling within the canopy perimeter of retained trees, or inside the area protected by fencing.

6. Excavated soil may not be piled or dumped (even temporarily) under the canopies of trees.

7. No concrete, chemicals, paints, thinners, or solvents are to be disposed of or cleaning operations performed within or near the drip line of trees.

8. All utilities/irrigation/water lines are to be tunneled around or under roots 1” or greater in an effort to minimize root damage.

9. No large equipment is to be used around trees to protect them from physical damage.

10. Project Arborist must be on site directing the project if it is necessary to work within any protected tree zone.

11. All grading cuts must be designed to ensure that water does not collect at the base of protected trees.

12. Pruning of roots over one inch can only be performed under the direction of the project arborist.

13. Place weather proof signs 2’x 2’ in size on each side of protective chain-link fencing which reads, “TREE PROTECTION ZONE KEEP OUT”
Methodology

How does it work?

Ground-Penetrating Radar (GPR) is an established technology that has been used worldwide for over 30 years. Radar is an object-detection system that uses electromagnetic waves — specifically radio waves — to identify the range, altitude, direction, or speed of both moving and fixed objects. When an electromagnetic wave1 emitted from a small surface transmit antenna / receiver encounters a boundary between objects with different electromagnetic properties, it will reflect, refract, and or diffract from the boundary in a predictable manner. Radar waves or signals are reflected especially well by materials of considerable electrical conductivity.

The radar signals that are reflected back towards the antenna are the desirable ones that create the image and make radar work. When its used for root mapping the signal reflects from the moisture with the roots. Its uses today seem endless. When you look at the weather report, you are looking at a Doppler weather radar scan; it will tell you where the heaviest amounts of rain will fall in your area. It works like this, the radar signal, as it passes through the clouds is reflected back to a transmit receiver antenna that measures the density of the moisture in them and the speed they are traveling. You can then determine approximately when it will start raining and how much rain will fall in a given area. Radar is used in aviation, automobiles, law enforcement and locating objects below ground.

Root Mapping

An Introduction to Below-Ground Tree Root Mapping using Ground – Penetrating Radar (GPR)

Ground-Penetrating Radar used as a method of mapping tree roots has several of the following advantages over other methods of root locating,

1. It is capable of scanning the root systems of multiple trees under field conditions in a short time.
2. It is completely non-invasive and does not disturb the soils or damage the trees being examined, and causes no harm to the environment.
3. Being non-invasive, it allows repeated measurements that reveal long-term root system development.
4. It allows observation of root distribution beneath hard surfaces (concrete, asphalt, and bricks) roads and buildings.

Its accuracy is sufficient to resolve structural roots with diameters from less than 1 cm (0.4 in.) to 3 cm (1.2 in.) or more. It can characterize roots at both the individual tree and stand levels, facilitating correlations with tree and stand level measurements of physiological processes in complex ecological studies.

---

This is how the radar looks at the existing roots, as the antenna is moved along the ground every 2/10ths of an inch a radar signal is released into the soil at a predetermined depth.

As this signal encounters a root it is reflected off its internal moisture and back to a receiver inside the antenna. This returned signal is displayed as an x in the final report indicating the presence of a root, the colored x indicates the depth of the root.

Secondly one can observe all roots within a given soil profile depth, on the following pages you will notice 3 soil profiles depicted. When looking at the virtual trench view of maps keep in mind that each x marks the presence of a root. These roots are connected to the tree or root flare as they grow into the soil and then grow out ward in all directions, some have indicated roots that have no obstructions can travel laterally twice the height of the tree; this is what gives the tree stability.

**The use of green markers**

During the scan markers are placed on the field computer by the technician. These markers are used to identify points of interest along the scan line such as in this case, passing of object landmarks such as a tree root. These manually placed markers show up in the final root analysis and can then be used to compare roots found below ground in relation to the physical concrete crack or landmark such as a tree located above ground.

Green dotted lines are markers physically placed on the field computer by the technician during the scanning.
Virtual Trench View

A way of viewing the root data is as a virtual trench. The following panels represent each of the two individual radar line scans from the site as if they were the walls of a trench. Think of this as if you were excavating a deep trench with a back-hoe. As you dig, tree roots will be encountered at various levels in the soil profile, after you have completed your trench you then are able to walk down and stand in the bottom.

Looking up at the earthen wall you are able to see the severed tree roots from your trenching protruding from the soil at the various depths of your trench. As you look at the following individual 2 virtual trench scans each x on the wall represents a severed root. Each colored x represents a different depth where the root is located.

One advantage of the trench view is that one can look at individual roots within their 3 represented depth zones and see the actual depth of each individual root.
Locations of Root Mapping

Root Scan #1

Root Scan #2
January 22, 2020 Stanford Medicine 66 Willow Place Menlo Park, California

Root Scan #1 40.7 feet long 3 feet from Magnolia Tree over soil

---

Root Depth in Inches

---

Legend:
- Dark Line: Surface location
- Total Scan Length: 40.7 feet
- Top Depth Zone: 0 to 8 in., Root density: 2.36 roots/ft
- Middle Depth Zone: 8 to 15 in., Root density: 0.93 roots/ft
- Bottom Depth Zone: > 16 in., Root density: 1.11 roots/ft
- Total Depth: Root density: 4.40 roots/ft

---

Robert Booty Registered Consulting Arborist 487
ISA Qualified Tree Risk Assessor
Copyright 2020 Arborist OnSite Horticultural Consulting, Inc.
All Rights Reserved
January 22, 2020 Stanford Medicine 66 Willow Place Menlo Park, California
Root Scan #2 40.1 feet long from Magnolia Tree over soil
The following is an inventory of all trees on the property with a trunk diameter of 3 inches or greater.

The GPS satellite located the tree with a White dot, in yellow is the number we physically placed on the tree. If you see a white dot but no yellow number. This means the tree was not accessible due to steep terrain to safely place a number on it or measure its trunk diameter. Trees that are regulated by the city, a red “R” is placed in the notes column in the spread sheet.

On the following spread sheet, the condition column refers to the current overall health rating of the tree. This is obtained from a visual observation of the trees canopy, amount of dead branches or disease. The trunk diameter is measured at 4.5 feet from natural grade and is in inches. Tree height is in feet. Some trees in this inventory are deciduous and have no leaves at this time of the year. This makes it a little more challenging to perform a visual health inspection and identify the species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Health Rating Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Species Distribution

Report universe: All 

Top 20 Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oak.live</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olive.fruiting</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cedar.deodar</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bay.sweet</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnolia.southern</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privet spp</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tree.of-heaven</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citrus.spp.</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pine.monterey</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walnut.black</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birch.eur white</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camphor</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cherry</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crapemyrtle</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cypress.spp.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eucalyptus.spp.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oak.spp</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oak.valley</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pepper.california</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 130
Diameter Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter Class</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 18</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 to 24</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 30</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 36</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 to 42</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43+</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Condition Distribution**

Report universe: All  Subset: 

![Pie chart showing condition distribution]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arborist Disclosure / Performance of Services

1. Disclosure. Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of the trees and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree.

Since trees are living organisms, conditions are often hidden within the tree and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specific period of time. Likewise, remedial treatments cannot be guaranteed. Trees can be managed but they cannot be controlled. To live near trees is to accept some degree of risk and the only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate all trees.

Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

1. Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character nor is any opinion rendered as to the quality of any title.
2. The consultant can neither guarantee nor be responsible for accuracy of information provided by others, information not provided or disclosed.
3. The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this consultation/reports unless subsequent written arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for services.
4. Loss or removal of any part of this report invalidates the entire report/evaluation.
5. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the persons(s) to whom it is addressed without written consent of this consultant.
6. This report represents the opinion of consultant, and the consultant’s fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting upon any pre-determined findings.
7. Sketches, diagrams, graphs, photos, etc., in this report, being intended as visual aids, are not necessarily to scale and should not be construed as engineering reports or surveys.
8. This report has been made in conformity with acceptable evaluation/diagnostic reporting techniques and procedures, as recommended by the International Society of Arboriculture.
9. No tree described in this report was climbed, unless otherwise stated. Arborist OnSite® cannot assume responsibility for any defects which could only have been discovered by climbing. A full root collar or root crown inspection, consisting of excavating the soil around the tree to uncover hidden defects or disease involving the root collar and major buttress roots, was not performed, unless otherwise stated. Arborist OnSite® cannot accept responsibility for any root defects which could only have been discovered by such an inspection.
Certification of Performance

I, Robert Booty, certify:

- That I have personally inspected the tree(s) and/or the property referred to in this report, and have stated my findings accurately. The extent of the evaluation and or appraisal is stated in the attached report and the terms and conditions;

- That I have no current interest in the vegetation or the property that is the subject of this report, and I have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved;

- That the analysis, opinions and conclusions stated herein are my own, and are based on current scientific procedures and facts;

- That my compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party, nor upon the results of the assessment, the attainment of stipulated results, or the occurrence of any subsequent events;

- That my analysis, opinions, and conclusions were developed and this report has been prepared according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices;

- That no one provided significant professional assistance to the consultant, except as indicated within the report.

I further certify that I am a Registered Member of the American Society of Consulting Arborists, and I am an International Society of Arboriculture Certified Arborist. I have been involved in the practice of arboriculture and the care and study of trees for over 50 years.

Signed: __________________________

Date: January 29, 2020
Dear Neighbor,

As a courtesy, we wanted to let you know about a planned addition to our Planning, Design & Construction office at 66 Willow Place in Menlo Park. Specifically, we are proposing to place a temporary office trailer in the rear parking lot of our offices at the beginning of 2022 to accommodate our anticipated staffing needs.

Our goal is to ensure there is no impact to you, our valued neighbors. The trailer will not be visible from the street and will have limited, if any, visibility from surrounding properties.

If you have any questions, please email us at WillowPlaceTempOffice@stanfordhealthcare.org.

Temporary Trailer Details:

**Size:** 1,440 sq. ft.

**Timeline:** We expect the trailer to be installed at the beginning of 2022. The trailer would remain at 66 Willow Place for a period of four to five years.

**Hours of Operation:** 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., in alignment with existing standard office hours.
Notice:
Temporary office trailer planned for 66 Willow Place.

John Doe
101 Your Street
Hometown, CA 90000
Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve an architectural control and use permit request to construct a new entrance along with other modifications to an existing commercial building in the C-1-C (Administrative, Professional, and Research, Restrictive) zoning district, at 2400 Sand Hill Road. The project also includes landscape modifications. The recommended actions are included as Attachment A.

Policy Issues
Each architectural control and use permit request is considered individually. The Planning Commission should consider whether the required architectural control and use permit findings can be made for the proposal.

Background
Site location
The subject property consists of an office complex, hereafter referred to as the Quadrus site, containing nine multi-story buildings (2400, 2420, 2440, 2460, 2480, 2490, 2494, 2498, and 2484 Sand Hill Road) built between 1969 and 2006. The proposed building and landscaping modifications would be located at the 2400 Sand Hill Road Building, also known as Quadrus Building 1. Like much of the surrounding area, the subject property is relatively hilly.

Using Sand Hill Road in the east-west orientation, the subject property is located at the northern side of the street, between Sharon Park Drive to the east and Monte Rosa Drive to the west. The subject property, along with neighboring developments along the northern side of Sand Hill Road, is located in the C-1-C (Administrative, Professional, and Research District, Restrictive) zoning district.

There are mostly single-family residences to the north and west of the project site, along with some higher density residential development to the east. A multifamily residential development at 675 Sharon Park Drive is the closest residential development to the proposed building envelope, and its closest building is located approximately 300 feet to the east. A single-family residence located at 2332 Eastridge Avenue is the closest residential development to the proposed landscaping modifications for the site. The SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory is located across Sand Hill Road, in Unincorporated San Mateo County. A location map is included as Attachment B.
Analysis

Project description
The applicant is requesting to construct a new entrance along with other modifications to an existing commercial building that would split off a portion of the existing building by demolishing portions of the building to create an enhanced courtyard. As part of the proposal, landscaping modifications are also proposed. The overall building footprint would not vary considerably from the current building configuration. The applicant specifically proposes the following exterior changes:

- Grading and landscaping changes to accommodate a new covered northern entrance, with a canopy and expanded deck area at the entrance.
- New parking configuration near the northern entrance to accommodate Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking spaces and access, to meet current Building Code requirements.
- Removal of a cross section of the existing building, near the east elevation (from the basement level to the roof), including an internal stairwell, to accommodate the aforementioned walkway and entrance, and allowing for a separation to the adjacent separated building.
- Creation of a newly separated two-story office building, to accompany the existing building and containing one exterior covered staircase along the south elevation.
- Removal of a portion of uncovered balcony space along the second floor of the existing building, along the north elevation.
- Replacement of an open staircase along the northern elevation and removal of an open staircase along the east elevation.
- Landscape and hardscape improvements in the centralized courtyard between the existing and newly separated buildings.

Along the northern side of the building, a new canopy is proposed across the courtyard to serve the northern entrance and enhance the courtyard. As a result of some modifications to the existing basement and the overall division of the existing building, the gross floor area for the building (and site) would decrease by 248 square feet. The applicant is proposing to remove portions of the basement in order to completely separate the two proposed building masses and also reduce any potential gross floor area increases. In addition, some landscaping modifications, which include some grading and replanting in the vicinity of the new northern entrance, as well as an extension of the northern entrance area deck, are also proposed to improve accessibility to the site in the vicinity of the new canopy. With these modifications, six landscape reserve parking spaces are being relocated to a roundabout south of the southern entrance of the 2400 Sand Hill Road building, and are diagonally oriented to accommodate the required back-up space for the future spaces. Upgrades are also proposed in the adjacent parking lot to provide adequate access and sizing for several ADA parking spaces. The ADA parking space upgrades would provide ADA-compliant parking spaces that enable access to the new northern entrance, along with signage and unique parking space and pathway dimensions. The Transportation and Engineering Divisions have both given their preliminary approval. A project-specific condition, Condition 5a, requires that the applicant record both the emergency vehicle access easement and stormwater operations and maintenance agreement prior to final inspection, subject to Engineering review and approval. The project plans and the applicant’s project description letter are included as Attachments C and D, respectively.

The proposed canopy expansion, along with the new building footprint adjustments, would involve an
increase of building coverage on site. In total, the proposed project would generate 2,888 additional square feet in building coverage, which results in a percentage increase from 15.59 percent to 15.79 percent for the building coverage for the Quadrus site. The maximum allowable gross floor area for the Quadrus site is 178,149 square feet, or 20 percent. Overall, this building coverage expansion is minimal in scale relative to the building and the greater project site.

**Design and materials**

As discussed earlier, the proposed project would involve modifications to the existing commercial building that would split off a portion of the existing building to create two buildings with an enhanced courtyard in the middle. A canopy would be positioned between the two buildings toward the northern entrance. The proposed design elements for the canopy would include wood structural columns with an ipe trellis underneath a sloped wood shake roof. The proposed building design elements would include the following:

- Replace existing board and batten and stucco finishes for both the existing and newly separated building walls.
- Install new steel staircases and metal guardrails.
- Replace wood framed windows and doors with frameless tempered glass doors and anodized aluminum windows.
- Install new anodized aluminum doors for the newly separated building.
- Install heavy shake roofing for the existing and newly separated buildings to match the existing, resulting in slight increases in height. On the existing building, roofing changes would involve patching and repairing any damaged portions of the building’s roofing.
- Install new skylights on the existing and newly separated buildings.

Staff believes these changes would be consistent with the aesthetic of the existing building, with materials and colors used to appropriately align with the appearance of the existing building. In addition, staff believes that the proposed canopy would appropriately replicate the forms and scale of other roofing features throughout the existing building.

**Trees and landscaping**

The applicant has submitted an arborist report (Attachment E) detailing the species, size, and conditions of the heritage and non-heritage trees on site. The report discusses the impacts of the proposed improvements, including temporary construction impacts, and provides recommendations for tree maintenance and the protection of some trees, based on their health. As part of the project review process, the arborist report was reviewed by the City Arborist.

Based on the arborist report, there are 66 existing trees located on the property that are within the vicinity of the proposed area of work, comprising 49 heritage-sized trees and 17 non-heritage-sized trees. The applicant submitted a Heritage Tree Removal permit application for the removal of the following eight heritage trees: three coast live oak trees (trees #8, 10, and 18), two Italian stone pine trees (trees #26 and 27), one Chinese pistache tree (tree #19), one Monterey pine (tree #20), and one coast redwood tree (tree #21). The applicant states that this removal is requested because the redesign of the landscaping and paving, and the construction of the canopy, would require the removal of these trees, along with some
non-heritage trees. Per the arborist report, the work conflicts affecting the building footprint of the newly separated building are requiring the removal of tree #26, which was also identified as high risk. Tree #27 has been found to be interdependent of tree #26, necessitating its removal as well because the removal of tree #26 could subject tree #27 to unaccustomed wind forces. The City Arborist reviewed the application and conditionally approved the removal permit for the eight heritage trees based on Criteria 5 (development) of the Heritage Tree Ordinance. There were no appeals to the decision. The applicant is required to replace the full value of the trees and would achieve this by replanting trees on site at an equal value to the appraised value of the trees to be removed.

The arborist report also describes 17 non-heritage trees located within the subject property near the area of work, and four non-heritage trees are proposed to be removed. These include one blackwood acacia tree (tree #71), one coast redwood tree (tree #25), one olive tree (tree #68), and one Southern magnolia tree (tree #17).

To protect the trees in the vicinity of the proposed project, the arborist report has identified such measures as tree protection fencing, providing clean native topsoil for all backfill and fill soil within tree protection zones, and root buffers.

All recommended tree protection measures identified in the arborist report would be implemented and ensured as part of condition 4h.

**Correspondence**

As described in the project description letter, the applicant prepared a letter for the neighboring properties at 2500 Sand Hill Road and 675 Sharon Park Drive. The applicant states that no reply has been given thus far. The applicant also provided an outreach letter for the tenants located on the greater project site, and the applicant’s project description letter indicates that no tenants provided a response. Staff has not received any items of correspondence on the proposed project.

**Conclusion**

Staff believes that the scale, materials, and proposed design of the newly separated building, the entrance canopy and deck, and the façade modifications would be consistent with the aesthetic of the existing building. The proposed canopy would appropriately add scale and form along the northern entrance. The proposed project would result in a minimal increase in building coverage, along with a decrease in gross floor area, and the modifications to landscape reserve areas are minimal as well. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the proposed project.

**Impact on City Resources**

The project sponsor is required to pay Planning, Building and Public Works permit fees, based on the City’s Master Fee Schedule, to fully cover the cost of staff time spent on the review of the project.

**Environmental Review**

The project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of
Small Structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Public Notice
Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Public notification also consisted of publishing a notice in the local newspaper and notification by mail of owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius of the subject property.

Appeal Period
The Planning Commission action will be effective after 15 days unless the action is appealed to the City Council, in which case the outcome of the application shall be determined by the City Council.

Attachments
A. Recommended Actions
B. Location Map
C. Project Plans
D. Project Description Letter
E. Arborist Report

Disclaimer
Attached are reduced versions of maps and diagrams submitted by the applicants. The accuracy of the information in these drawings is the responsibility of the applicants, and verification of the accuracy by City Staff is not always possible. The original full-scale maps, drawings, and exhibits are available for public viewing at the Community Development Department.

Exhibits to Be Provided at Meeting
None

Report prepared by:
Matt Pruter, Associate Planner

Report reviewed by:
Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner
LOCATION: 2400 Sand Hill Road  
PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2021-00008  
APPLICANT: Paul Turek  
OWNER: Divco West

PROPOSAL: Request for architectural control review and a use permit to construct a new entrance along with modifications to the building exterior of an existing commercial building in the C-1-C (Administrative, Professional, and Research, Restrictive) zoning district. The project also includes landscaping modifications.

DECISION ENTITY: Planning Commission  
DATE: December 13, 2021  
ACTION: TBD

VOTE: TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Harris, Kennedy, Riggs, Tate)

ACTION:

1. Make a finding that the project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

2. Make findings, as per Section 16.82.030 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the granting of use permits, that the proposed use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, and will not be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the City.

3. Adopt the following findings, as per Section 16.68.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, pertaining to architectural control approval:
   a. The general appearance of the structure is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
   b. The development will not be detrimental to the harmonious and orderly growth of the City.
   c. The development will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
   d. The development provides adequate parking as required in all applicable City Ordinances and has made adequate provisions for access to such parking.
   e. The property is not within any Specific Plan area, and as such no finding regarding consistency is required to be made.

4. Approve the use permit and architectural control subject to the following standard conditions:
   a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by December 13, 2022) for the use permit to remain in effect.
   b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Studio G Architects, consisting of 92 plan sheets, dated received December 8, 2021, and approved by the Planning Commission on December 13, 2021, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division.
   c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies’ regulations that are directly applicable to the project.
**LOCATION:** 2400 Sand Hill Road  
**PROJECT NUMBER:** PLN2021-00008  
**APPLICANT:** Paul Turek  
**OWNER:** Divco West

**PROPOSAL:** Request for architectural control review and a use permit to construct a new entrance along with modifications to the building exterior of an existing commercial building in the C-1-C (Administrative, Professional, and Research, Restrictive) zoning district. The project also includes landscaping modifications.

**DECISION ENTITY:** Planning Commission  
**DATE:** December 13, 2021  
**ACTION:** TBD

**VOTE:** TBD (Barnes, DeCardy, Doran, Harris, Kennedy, Riggs, Tate)

**ACTION:**

- **d.** Prior to building permit issuance, the applicants shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project.

- **e.** Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering, and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes.

- **f.** Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a hydrology report for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The hydrology report shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition, or building permits.

- **g.** Post-construction runoff into the storm drain shall not exceed pre-construction runoff levels. The applicant's design professional shall evaluate the Project's impact to the City's storm drainage system and shall substantiate their conclusions with drainage calculations to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to building permit issuance.

- **h.** Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by Tree Management Experts, dated received September 20, 2021.

- **i.** Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay all applicable City fees. Refer to City of Menlo Park Master Fee Schedule.

5. Approve the use permit and architectural control subject to the following **project-specific** condition:

- **a.** Prior to final inspection, the applicant shall record both the emergency vehicle access easement and stormwater operations and maintenance agreement, subject review and approval by the Engineering Division.
A. BUILDING 2400 REAR - LEA INC.

B. BUILDING 2400 REAR - CONFERENCE CENTER DECK

E. BUILDING 2400 FRONT - COURTYARD ENTRANCE

M. BUILDING 2460 - ENTRANCE

L. BUILDING 2400 - COURTYARD

N. BUILDING 2440 - ENTRANCE

G. BUILDING 2400 FRONT - MAIN ENTRANCE

K. BUILDING 2400 - COURTYARD

F. BUILDING 2400 FRONT

D. BUILDING 2400 SIDE - SOUTHEAST END

H. BUILDING 2400 FRONT - FITNESS CENTER END

C. BUILDING 2400 REAR - COURTYARD ENTRANCE

B. BUILDING 2400 REAR - CONFERENCE CENTER DECK
PARKING ANALYSIS

PARKING SPACES REQUIRED
(4 SPACES / 1,000SF GFA) 891 SPACES
PARKING SPACES PROVIDED 891 SPACES
(E) TOTAL PARKING AREA 243,100 SF
(E) TOTAL PARKING COVERAGE 27.29%
* NO CHANGE IN TOTAL NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES

PARKING STALL DIMENSIONS

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE MINIMUM DIMENSIONS FOR ALL PROPOSED PARKING STALLS

STANDARD STALL - 90° 8.5'W X 16.5'L
ADA STANDARD STALL 9'W X 18'L AISLE
ADA VAN STALL 12'W X 18'L AISLE
PARALLEL STALL 7'W X 22'L

ANALYSIS CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS AREA</th>
<th>EXISTING SURFACE STALLS</th>
<th>ADDED SURFACE STALLS</th>
<th>EXISTING RESERVE STALLS</th>
<th>ADDED RESERVE STALLS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NO CHANGE IN TOTAL NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES

LEGEND

- AREA OF BLUE DEMOLITION
- NEW ROOF/CANOPY OUTLINE
- EXISTING BUILDING FOOTPRINT
- EXISTING ROOF OUTLINE
- TIMBER COLUMNS
- AREAS TO BE CHANGED
- EXISTING SETBACK LINE
- EXISTING SURFACE PARKING STALLS TO BE REMOVED
- EXISTING LANDSCAPE RESERVOIR STALLS TO BE REMOVED
- PARALLEL SURFACE PARKING STALLS
- CAMPUS AREA SECTION DIVIDE LINE
- NUMBER OF EXISTING LANDSCAPE RESERVATION STALLS
- NUMBER OF EXISTING SURFACE PARKING STALLS
- NUMBER OF NEW LANDSCAPE RESERVATION STALLS
- NUMBER OF NEW SURFACE PARKING STALLS
**PARKING ANALYSIS**

- **Parking Spaces Required**: 891 spaces
- **Parking Spaces Provided**: 891 spaces

**Parking Covered Area**
- Total Parking Area: 243,100 SF
- Total Parking Coverage: 27.29%

*No change in total number of parking spaces*

**Parking Stall Dimensions**

The following are the minimum dimensions for all proposed parking stalls:

- **Standard Stall - 90°**
  - 8.5' W x 16.5' L

- **ADA Standard Stall**
  - 9' W x 18' L

- **AdA Van Stall**
  - 12' W x 18' L

- **Parallel Stall**
  - 7' W x 22' L

**Analysis Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Section</th>
<th>Existing Surface Stalls</th>
<th>Existing Reserve Stalls</th>
<th>Added Surface Stalls</th>
<th>Added Reserve Stalls</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Removed Surface Stalls</th>
<th>Removed Reserve Stalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>623</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>691</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In graph are total number of parking spaces.

**Legend**

- Area of blue demarcation
- Area of canopy/umbrella
- Existing building footprint
- Existing exterior line
- Existing property line
- Campus area section line

**SITE PARKING PROPOSED**

- No change in total number of parking spaces
PARKING ANALYSIS

PARKING SPACES REQUIRED 891 SPACES
PARKING SPACES PROVIDED 891 SPACES
(E) TOTAL PARKING AREA 243,100 SF
(E) TOTAL PARKING COVERAGE 27.29%
* NO CHANGE IN TOTAL NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES

PARKING STALL DIMENSIONS

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE MINIMUM DIMENSIONS FOR ALL PROPOSED PARKING STALLS

- STANDARD STALL - 90°: 8.5' W X 16.5' L
- ADA STANDARD STALL: 9' W X 18' L
- 5' W X 18' L AISLE
- ADA VAN STALL: 12' W X 18' L
- 5' W X 18' L AISLE
- PARALLEL STALL: 7' W X 22' L

ANALYSIS CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>EXISTING SURFACE STALLS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EXISTING LANDSCAPE RESERVED STALLS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF NEW SURFACE STALLS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF NEW LANDSCAPE RESERVED STALLS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6625</td>
<td></td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NO CHANGE IN TOTAL NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES

PARKING STALL DIMENSIONS

- STANDARD STALL - 90°: 8.5' W X 16.5' L
- ADA STANDARD STALL: 9' W X 18' L
- ADA VAN STALL: 12' W X 18' L
- PARALLEL STALL: 7' W X 22' L

LEGEND

- AREA OF BLUEDEMOLITION
- AREA NON/CAMPOUTLINE
- EXISTING BUILDINGS FOOTPRINT
- EXISTING DEMOLISH LINE
- EXISTING PROPERTY LINE
- CAMPUS SURFACE PARKING
- CAMPUS AREA SECTION DIVIDE LINE

ARCHITECTS
ALL DESIGNS, DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIALS INDICATED HEREIN ARE THE WORK AND PROPERTY OF STUDIO G ARCHITECTS. THIS DOCUMENT MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, REUSED OR DISCLOSED BY ANY METHOD WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF STUDIO:G ARCHITECTS. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
Concrete
Asphalt

BUILDING #1
2400 SHR
46,909 SF

AREA OF WORK

NOT IN SCOPE

TYP1
TYP2
TYP3
TYP4
TYP5
TYP6
TYP7
TYP8

TREE 18 - 12.1" QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA (E) HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED

TREE 8 - 11.6" QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA (E) HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED

TREE 10 - 10.5" QUERCUS AGRIFOLIA (E) HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED

TREE 21 - 25" SEQUOIA SEMPERVIRENS (E) HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED

TREE 20 - 42.1" PINUS RADIATA (E) HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED

TREE 19 - 15" PISTACHIA CHINENSIS (E) HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED

TREE 26 - 25" PINUS PINEA (E) HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED

TREE 27 - 21.4" PINUS PINEA (E) HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED

Keynotes

1. Indicated by x on the plans.
2. AREA OF WORK
3. AREA NOT IN SCOPE OF WORK
4. DEMOLISH EXISTING AC PAVING
5. DEMOLISH EXISTING PAVERS
6. EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN
7. DEMO EXISTING HERITAGE TREE
8. FOR REFERENCE ONLY.
9. SEE CIVIL AND LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS FOR MORE INFORMATION.

Legend

- AREA OF WORK
- AREA NOT IN SCOPE OF WORK
- DEMOLISH EXISTING AC PAVING
- DEMOLISH EXISTING PAVERS
- EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN
- DEMO EXISTING HERITAGE TREE

FOR REFERENCE ONLY.
SEE CIVIL AND LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS FOR MORE INFORMATION.
GENERAL NOTES

1. ALL EXISTING BUILDING RATINGS ASSUMED TO MEET BUILDING CODES STANDARDS. THE ARCHITECT CAN NOT BE HELD LIABLE FOR
   B.
   1. ALL EXISTING FACILITIES TO REMAIN UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED TO BE REMOVED AND/OR RELOCATED.
   C.
   2. ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING SCOPE OF DEMOLITION SHALL BE CLARIFIED WITH ARCHITECT PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH WORK.
   D.
   3. CONTINUING OCCUPANCY AND OPERATION OF THE BUILDING.
   E.
   4. CONTRACTOR'S PRICE SHALL INCLUDE ANY COSTS THAT WILL BE INCURRED TO MEET ALL CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE
      OWNER WITH RESPECT TO DEMOLITION, CONTROL OF NOISE, REFUSE, SCREENING FOR DUST, AND GENERAL DISRUPTION TO
      CONTINUING OCCUPANCY AND OPERATION OF THE BUILDING.

2. DEMOLITION.
   A.
   1. REMOVE ALL EXISTING FLOOR FINISHES AND BASE, U.O.N. REMOVE ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS WHICH CAUSE RISES OR
      LOWS IN THE FINISH. REMOVE ALL SUSPENDED CEILING GRID, TILES, DIFFUSERS, RETURNS, LIGHTS, BRANCH HVAC DUCTS, SPEAKERS, NON
      REQUIRED DRAFT STOPS. ETC. U.O.N.
   B.
   2. MAINTAIN BUILDING SECURITY, ALL LIFE SAFETY/FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS AND EXIT PASSAGES AT ALL TIMES. U.O.N.
   C.
   3. THE DESIGN INTENT IS TO PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURAL SYSTEM. IF PLYWOOD, CONCRETE, OR
      STRUCTURAL STEEL IS ENCOUNTERED DURING DEMOLITION, CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY ARCHITECT AND/OR BUILDING OWNER
      PRIOR TO PROCEEDING. ALL BEARING WALLS, SHEAR WALLS, BRACE FRAMES, STRUCTURAL COLUMNS AND BEAMS TO REMAIN,
      U.O.N.

3. DEMOLITION WORK.
   A.
   1. REFER TO MECHANICAL, PLUMBING, AND ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS FOR EXTENT OF MECHANICAL, PLUMBING AND ELECTRICAL
      DEMOLITION WORK.

4. REMOVAL OF (E) CMU SILL WALL UNDER WINDOW.
   A.
   1. REMOVE PORTION OF (E) CMU SILL WALL UNDER WINDOW.

5. EXTERIOR WALL TO REMAIN. REMOVE EXTERIOR STUCCO FINISH THROUGHOUT THIS FACADE.
   A.
   1. REMOVE (E) EXTERIOR WALL TO REMAIN. REMOVE EXTERIOR BOARD AND BATTEN FINISH THROUGHOUT THIS FACADE.
   B.
   2. REMOVE (E) INTERIOR WALL.
   C.
   3. REMOVE (E) INTERIOR DOOR AND FRAME COMPLETELY.
   D.
   4. REMOVE (E) INTERIOR WALL TO REMAIN. PREP AS REQUIRED FOR LEVEL AND SMOOTH FINISH. PROTECT DURING CONSTRUCTION.
   E.
   5. REMOVE (E) INTERIOR WALL TO REMAIN. CLEAN, PATCH, REPAIR & PREP AS REQ'D FOR LEVEL 4 & SMOOTH FINISH TO RECEIVE
      NEW PAINT & WALL BASE AS REQ'D.
   F.
   6. REMOVE (E) EXTERIOR WALL TO REMAIN. REMOVE EXTERIOR STUCCO FINISH THROUGHOUT THIS FACADE.
   G.
   7. REMOVE (E) EXTERIOR WALL TO REMAIN. CLEAN, PATCH, REPAIR & PREP AS REQ'D FOR LEVEL 4 & SMOOTH FINISH TO RECEIVE
      NEW PAINT & WALL BASE AS REQ'D.
A. All existing building ratings assumed to meet building codes standards. The architect can not be held liable for any discrepancies in existing construction.

B. All existing utilities to remain unless otherwise noted to be removed. Cap and identify exposed utilities. Contractor's work associated with disconnecting, removing and capping utility services within areas of demolition is included in scope of work. Contractor's price shall include any costs that will be incurred to meet all conditions and requirements of the continuing occupancy and operation of the building.

C. Coordinate selective demolition and repair of existing surfaces as required for installation of electrical and communication conduits as required.

D. Must match existing veneer that remains. Contractor to determine best method for match.

E. Salvage of existing to be removed for install or use of new brick veneer that has been treated as required to look aged and matches existing. Infill/patch areas shall not appear different than existing to remain areas. Additionally all infill/patched areas shall not show a vertical or horizontal 'cut' seam, existing veneer shall be removed as required on a full brick/course so that the infill appears seamless.

F. Remove all existing partitions, furring, equipment, fixtures, flooring, etc. down to the building shell as required.

G. The design intent is to preserve the integrity of the existing structural system. If plywood, concrete, or structural steel is encountered during demolition, contractor shall notify architect and/or building owner prior to proceeding. All bearing walls, shear walls, brace frames, structural columns and beams to remain, U.O.N.

H. Discoveries during construction. The contractor shall isolate the affected area and contact the owner for further instructions before proceeding.

I. Remove all existing floor finishes and base, U.O.N. Remove all existing conditions which cause rises or depression in flooring surface such as fasteners, outlet cores, mounded cover plates, resilient flooring, carpet, carpet pad, flash patch, concrete fill, plywood, etc. to ensure floor is smooth and level. Prepare for new construction.

J. Remove all existing partitions, furring, equipment, fixtures, flooring, etc. down to the building shell as required.

K. General contractor to verify existing conditions and report and discrepancies to architect before start of demolition.

L. In areas of demolition remove all suspended ceiling grid, tiles, diffusers, returns, lights, branch HVAC ducts, speakers, non required draft stops, etc. U.O.N.

M. Maintain building security, all life safety/fire protection systems and exit passages at all times. (E) Fire sprinklers to remain. Retrofit as required for new work.

N. Patch remaining portions of walls and finished surfaces as required for new finishes. Refer to mechanical, plumbing, and electrical drawings for extent of mechanical, plumbing and electrical.

O. Remove all existing elevators and associated attachments.

P. Demolition areas to be removed for new construction as required.

Q. Remove all existing conditions which cause rises or depression in flooring surface such as fasteners, outlet cores, mounded cover plates, resilient flooring, carpet, carpet pad, flash patch, concrete fill, plywood, etc. to ensure floor is smooth and level. Prepare for new construction.
A2.7

- ALL EXISTING FACILITIES TO REMAIN UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED TO BE REMOVED AND/OR RELOCATED.
- ALL EXISTING UTILITIES TO REMAIN UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED TO BE REMOVED.
- ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING SCOPE OF DEMOLITION SHALL BE CLARIFIED WITH ARCHITECT PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH WORK.
- CONTRACTOR'S WORK ASSOCIATED WITH DISCONNECTING, REMOVING AND CAPPING UTILITY SERVICES WITHIN AREAS OF DEMOLITION IS INCLUDED IN SCOPE OF WORK.
- CONTRACTOR'S PRICE SHALL INCLUDE ANY COSTS THAT WILL BE INCURRED TO MEET ALL CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE OWNER WITH RESPECT TO DEMOLITION, CONTROL OF NOISE, REFUSE, SCREENING FOR DUST, AND GENERAL DISRUPTION TO CONTINUING OCCUPANCY AND OPERATION OF THE BUILDING.
- CONTRACTOR MUST MATCH EXISTING VENEER THAT REMAINS. CONTRACTOR TO DETERMINE BEST METHOD FOR MATCH SALVAGE OF EXISTING TO BE REMOVED FOR INSTALL OR USE OF NEW BRICK VENEER THAT HAS BEEN TREATED AS REQUIRED TO LOOK AGED AND MATCHES EXISTING. INFILL/PATCH AREAS SHALL NOT APPEAR DIFFERENT THAN EXISTING TO REMAIN AREAS. ADDITIONALLY ALL INFILL/PATCHED AREAS SHALL NOT SHOW A VERTICAL OR HORIZONTAL 'CUT' SEAM, EXISTING VENEER SHALL BE REMOVED AS REQUIRED ON A FULL EXISTING FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM TO REMAIN. PROTECT AND MAINTAIN DURING CONSTRUCTION. CONTRACTOR'S PRICING SHALL INCLUDE ANY COSTS THAT WILL BE INCURRED TO MEET ALL CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE OWNER WITH RESPECT TO DEMOLITION, CONTROL OF NOISE, REFUSE, SCREENING FOR DUST, AND GENERAL DISRUPTION TO CONTINUING OCCUPANCY AND OPERATION OF THE BUILDING.
- MAINTAIN BUILDING SECURITY, ALL LIFE SAFETY/FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS AND EXIT PASSAGES AT ALL TIMES. FIRE SPRINKLERS TO REMAIN. RETROFIT AS REQUIRED FOR NEW WORK.
- PATCH REMAINING PORTIONS OF WALLS AND FINISHED SURFACES AS REQUIRED FOR NEW FINISHES.
- REFER TO MECHANICAL, PLUMBING, AND ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS FOR EXTENT OF MECHANICAL, PLUMBING AND ELECTRICAL DEMOLITION WORK.
- REMOVE ALL EXISTING FLOOR FINISHES AND BASE. REMOVE ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS WHICH CAUSE RISES OR DEPRESSION IN FLOORING SURFACE SUCH AS FASTENERS, OUTLET CORES, MOUNDED COVER PLATES, RESILIENT FLOORING, NEW FINISHES.
- FOR THE NEW WORK U.O.N. PREPARE SURFACES FOR THE NEW WORK.
- THE DESIGN INTENT IS TO PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURAL SYSTEM. IF PLYWOOD, CONCRETE, OR STRUCTURAL STEEL IS ENCOUNTERED DURING DEMOLITION, CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY ARCHITECT AND/OR BUILDING OWNER PRIOR TO PROCEEDING. ALL BEARING WALLS, SHEAR WALLS, BRACE FRAMES, STRUCTURAL COLUMNS AND BEAMS TO REMAIN, U.O.N. REMOVE (E) WINDOW.
- REMOVE (E) INTERIOR WALL.
- REMOVE (E) INTERIOR DOOR AND FRAME COMPLETELY.
- REMOVE (E) ELEVATOR AND ASSOCIATED ATTACHMENTS.
- REMOVE (E) RAILING.
- REMOVE (E) EXTERIOR WALL. REMOVE (E) FLOOR. REMOVE (E) EXTERIOR DOOR AND HARDWARE.
- REMOVE (E) FLOORING FINISH THROUGHOUT. INCLUDING ADHESIVE & ASSOCIATED ATTACHMENTS. PREP FLOOR AS REQUIRED TO RECEIVE NEW FLOORING FINISH.
- (E) RESTROOM TO REMAIN. REMOVE (E) BALCONY FRAMING, DECKING, FASCIA & ALL ASSOCIATED ASSEMBLIES. PREP AS REQ'D FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION.
- REMOVE (E) INTERIOR WALL TO REMAIN: CLEAN, PATCH, REPAIR & PREP AS REQ'D FOR LEVEL 4 & SMOOTH FINISH TO RECEIVE EXISTING WALL TO REMAIN: CLEAN, PATCH, REPAIR & PREP AS REQ'D FOR LEVEL 4 & SMOOTH FINISH TO RECEIVE EXISTING NON-STRUCTURAL WALL TO BE REMOVED.
- REMOVE (E) DOOR & FRAME TO REMAIN; CLEAN & PREP AS REQ'D FOR NEW & FINISHED LOOK.
- REMOVE (E) DOOR & FRAME TO BE REMOVED. PATCH & REPAIR RELATED AREAS AFFECTED BY DEMOLITION & PREP AS REQ'D FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION.
- REMOVE (E) AREA TO BE REMOVED FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AS REQUIRED. SEE PLANS AND STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
- EXISTING AREA TO BE REMOVED FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION AS REQUIRED. SEE PLANS AND STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
- EXISTING WALL TO REMAIN: CLEAN, PATCH, REPAIR & PREP AS REQ'D FOR LEVEL 4 & SMOOTH FINISH TO RECEIVE EXISTING WALL TO REMAIN: CLEAN, PATCH, REPAIR & PREP AS REQ'D FOR LEVEL 4 & SMOOTH FINISH TO RECEIVE EXISTING NON-STRUCTURAL WALL TO BE REMOVED.
- REMOVE (E) DOOR & FRAME TO REMAIN; CLEAN & PREP AS REQ'D FOR NEW & FINISHED LOOK.
ALL EXISTING BUILDING RATINGS ASSUMED TO MEET BUILDING CODES STANDARDS. THE ARCHITECT CAN NOT BE HELD LIABLE FOR ANY DISCREPANCIES IN EXISTING CONSTRUCTION.

ALL EXISTING FACILITIES TO REMAIN UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED TO BE REMOVED AND/OR RELOCATED.

ALL EXISTING UTILITIES TO REMAIN UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED TO BE REMOVED.

CAP AND IDENTIFY EXPOSED UTILITIES. CONTRACTOR’S WORK ASSOCIATED WITH DISCONNECTING, REMOVING AND CAPPING UTILITIES SERVICES WITHIN AREAS OF DEMOLITION IS INCLUDED IN SCOPE OF WORK.

CONTRACTOR’S PRICE SHALL INCLUDE ANY COSTS THAT WILL BE INCURRED TO MEET ALL CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE OWNER WITH RESPECT TO DEMOLITION, CONTROL OF NOISE, REFUSE, SCREENING FOR DUST, AND GENERAL DISRUPTION TO CONTINUING OCCUPANCY AND OPERATION OF THE BUILDING.

CONTRACTOR’S PRICE SHALL INCLUDE ANY COSTS THAT WILL BE INCURRED TO MEET ALL CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS OF THE CONTINUING OCCUPANCY AND OPERATION OF THE BUILDING.

COORDINATE SELECTIVE DEMOLITION AND REPAIR OF EXISTING SURFACES AS REQUIRED FOR INSTALLATION OF ELECTRICAL AND COMMUNICATION CONDUITS AS REQUIRED.

EXISTING EXTERIOR WALL WITH BRICK VENEER TO REMAIN, PATCH/REPAIR AS REQUIRED. ANY NEW BRICK INFILL OR PATCH MUST MATCH EXISTING VENEER THAT REMAINS. CONTRACTOR TO DETERMINE BEST METHOD FOR MATCH SALVAGE OF EXISTING TO BE REMOVED FOR INSTALL OR USE OF NEW BRICK VENEER THAT HAS BEEN TREATED AS REQUIRED TO LOOK AGED AND MATCHES EXISTING. INFILL/PATCHED BRICK/COURSE SO THAT THE INFILL APPEARS SEAMLESS.

EXISTING FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM TO REMAIN. PROTECT AND MAINTAIN DURING CONSTRUCTION. CONTRACTOR’S PRICING SHALL REVISES INCLUDING ADA

GENERAL CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY EXISTING CONDITIONS AND REPORT AND DISCREPANCIES TO ARCHITECT BEFORE START OF DEMOLITION.

IN AREAS OF DEMOLITION REMOVE ALL SUSPENDED CEILING GRID, TILES, DIFFUSERS, RETURNS, LIGHTS, BRANCH HVAC DUCTS, SPEAKERS, NON REQUIRED DRAFT STOPS. ETC. U.O.N.

MAINTAIN BUILDING SECURITY, ALL LIFE SAFETY/FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS AND EXIT PASSAGES AT ALL TIMES. (E) FIRE SPRINKLERS TO REMAIN. RETROFIT AS REQUIRED FOR NEW WORK.

PATCH REMAINING PORTIONS OF WALLS AND FINISHED SURFACES AS REQUIRED FOR NEW FINISHES.

REFER TO MECHANICAL, PLUMBING, AND ELECTRICAL DRAWINGS FOR EXTENT OF MECHANICAL, PLUMBING AND ELECTRICAL DEMOLITION WORK.

REMOVE ALL ABANDONED ELECTRICAL AND LIGHT U.O.N.

REMOVE ALL EXISTING FLOOR FINISHES AND BASE, U.O.N. REMOVE ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS WHICH CAUSE RISES OR DEPRESSION IN FLOORING SURFACE SUCH AS FASTENERS, OUTLET CORES, MOUNDED COVER PLATES, RESILIENT FLOORING, CARPET, CARPET PAD, FLASH PATCH, CONCRETE FILL, PLYWOOD, ETC. TO ENSURE FLOOR IS SMOOTH AND LEVEL. PREPARE FOR NEW FINISHES.

REMOVE ALL EXISTING PARTITIONS, FURRING, EQUIPMENT, FIXTURES, FLOORING, ETC. DOWN TO THE BUILDING SHELL AS REQUIRED FOR THE NEW WORK U.O.N. PREPARE SURFACES FOR THE NEW WORK.

THE ARCHITECT HAS NO KNOWLEDGE OF AND SHALL NOT BE HELD LIABLE FOR ANY ASBESTOS OR OTHER HAZARDOUS MATERIALS DISCOVERED DURING CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ISOLATE THE AFFECTED AREA AND CONTACT THE OWNER FOR FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE PROCEEDING.

THE DESIGN INTENT IS TO PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURAL SYSTEM. IF PLYWOOD, CONCRETE, OR STRUCTURAL STEEL IS ENCOUNTERED DURING DEMOLITION, CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY ARCHITECT AND/OR BUILDING OWNER PRIOR TO PROCEEDING. ALL BEARING WALLS, SHEAR WALLS, FRAME FRAMES, STRUCTURAL COLUMNS AND BEAMS TO REMAIN, U.O.N.

FREE EXISTING ROOF.

EXISTING ROOF TO REMAIN. REPAIR LEAKS AND REPLACE DAMAGED ELEMENTS AS REQUIRED.

REMOVE EXISTING ROOF.
NEW FULL HEIGHT WALL

A. ALL EXISTING TO REMAIN AND NEW WALL SURFACES TO RECEIVE SMOOTH LEVEL 4 FINISH.
B. REPAIR SURFACES TO MATCH ADJACENT OR ADJOINING SURFACES WHEREVER REQUIRED. THESE SURFACES SHALL BE ALIGNED AND Sanded smooth. ALL WORK SHALL BE ERected AND INSTALLED PLUMB, LEVEL, SQUARE AND TRUE, AND IN PROPER ALIGNMENT.
C. ALL PARTITIONS ARE DIMENSIONED FROM FINISH FACE TO FINISH FACE, U.O.N. ALL CLEAR DIMENSIONS ARE NOT ADJUSTABLE.
D. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE MOISTURE RESISTANT GYP. BD. IN BATHROOMS AS NOTED. SHOWER AREAS EXPOSED TO GREATER CONCENTRATIONS OF MOISTURE TO RECEIVE TILE BACKER BOARD.
E. EXISTING EXTERIOR WALL WITH BRICK VENEER TO REMAIN, U.O.N. PATCH/REPAIR AS REQUIRED. ANY NEW BRICK INFILL OR PATCH MUST MATCH EXISTING VENEER THAT REMAINS. CONTRACTOR TO DETERMINE BEST METHOD FOR MATCH-
SALVAGE OF EXISTING TO BE REMOVED FOR INSTALL OR USE OF NEW BRICK VENEER THAT HAS BEEN TREATED AS REQUIRED TO LOOK AGED AND MATCHES EXISTING. INFILL/PATCH AREAS SHALL NOT APPEAR DIFFERENT THAN EXISTING TO REMAIN AREAS. ADDITIONALLY ALL INFILL/PATCHED AREAS SHALL NOT SHOW A VERTICAL OR HORIZONTAL 'CUT' SEAM, EXISTING VENEER SHALL BE REMOVED AS REQUIRED ON A FULL BRICK/COURSE SO THAT THE INFILL APPEARS SEAMLESS.
F. EXISTING FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM TO REMAIN. PROTECT AND MAINTAIN DURING CONSTRUCTION. CONTRACTOR'S PRICING SHALL REVISIONS INCLUDING ADA. CONTRACTOR WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DRAWINGS, SUBMITTAL, AND APPROVAL OF ANY FIRE
G. EXISTING PARTITIONS/EXTERIOR WALLS PATCH/REPAIR GYP. BD. AS NECESSARY. (TAPE, MUD, SAND TO LEVEL 4 FINISH). PATCH AND SKIM BASE OF WALLS WHERE BASE IS REMOVED. PREPARE FOR (N) N.I.C. FINISHES.
H. FINISH FACES SHALL ALIGN AT JUNCTION OF NEW AND EXISTING CONSTRUCTION U.O.N.
I. LIGHTING/SIGNAGE SHALL COMPLY WITH CBC SECTION 1011.
J. MAINTAIN ALL EXISTING RATED CONSTRUCTION UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON PLANS. PATCH AND REPAIR AS REQUIRED TO INSURE
K. PATCH AND REPAIR ALL AREAS THAT ARE AFFECTED DURING CONSTRUCTION.
L. PENETRATIONS OF FIRE-RATED CONSTRUCTION TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT CBC.
M. PRESERVE AND MAINTAIN EXISTING EXITS THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION.

THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL ESTABLISH THE LOCATION OF ALL NEW WALLS IN THE FIELD ON THE FLOOR, EITHER WITH CHALK LINES OR TAPE AS APPROPRIATE. THEN GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL ARRANGE A WALK OF THE ENTIRE PROJECT AREA WITH THE OWNER AND ARCHITECT TO CONFIRM THAT THE SIZE, SHAPE, AND PLACEMENT OF ALL ROOMS RECEIVES OWNER APPROVAL PRIOR TO FRAMING ANY NEW WALLS. IF THE OWNER REQUESTS ANY CHANGE, GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH SUCH CHANGE.


GENERAL NOTES

A. All dimensions shown are rough and are not to be used for engineering drawing. The floor plan and elevations are not to be used for construction purposes. All dimensions are approximate and should be verified by the contractor.
B. All tolerances are ±1/8" unless otherwise specified.
C. All information shown on this drawing is subject to change without notice. The contractor shall verify all dimensions and tolerances.
D. All work shall be performed in accordance with the applicable building codes and standards.
E. All existing conditions shown on this drawing are approximate and may not be accurate. The contractor shall verify all existing conditions.
F. The contractor shall be responsible for coordinating with all utilities, including but not limited to electrical, plumbing, and gas, to ensure that all work is done in accordance with the applicable codes and standards.
G. The contractor shall provide all necessary materials and labor for the construction of the new walls and partitions.
H. The contractor shall complete all work in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.
I. The contractor shall provide all necessary permits and approvals for the construction of the new walls and partitions.
J. The contractor shall provide all necessary submittals and documentation for the construction of the new walls and partitions.
K. The contractor shall provide all necessary insurance and bonding for the construction of the new walls and partitions.
L. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper disposal of all waste materials generated during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
M. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper maintenance of all existing buildings during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
N. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all trades during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
O. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all utilities during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
P. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all code officials during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
Q. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all dimensional surveys during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
R. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all test and inspection during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
S. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all punch lists during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
T. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all warranty during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
U. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all records during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
V. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all certifications during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
W. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all payments during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
X. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all lien notices during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
Y. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all legal actions during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
Z. The contractor shall be responsible for the proper coordination of all claims during the construction of the new walls and partitions.
A. ALL EXISTING TO REMAIN AND NEW WALL SURFACES TO RECEIVE SMOOTH LEVEL 4 FINISH.

B. ALL GYP. BD. PARTITIONS SHALL BE TAPED AND SANDED SMOOTH TO A LEVEL 4 FINISH. CONTRACTOR SHALL PATCH AND REPAIR SURFACES TO MATCH ADJACENT OR ADJOINING SURFACES WHEREVER REQUIRED. THESE SURFACES SHALL BE ALIGNED AND SANDED SMOOTH. ALL WORK SHALL BE ERECTED AND INSTALLED PLUMB, LEVEL, SQUARE AND TRUE, AND IN PROPER ALIGNMENT.

C. WITHOUT ARCHITECTS APPROVAL.

D. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE MOISTURE RESISTANT GYP. BD. IN BATHROOMS AS NOTED. SHOWER AREAS EXPOSED TO GREATER CONCENTRATIONS OF MOISTURE TO RECEIVE TILE BACKER BOARD.

E. EXISTING EXTERIOR WALL WITH BRICK VENEER TO REMAIN, U.O.N. PATCH/REPAIR AS REQUIRED. ANY NEW BRICK INFILL OR PATCH MUST MATCH EXISTING VENEER THAT REMAINS. CONTRACTOR TO DETERMINE BEST METHOD FOR MATCH - BE REMOVED FOR INSTALL OR USE OF NEW BRICK VENEER THAT HAS BEEN TREATED AS REQUIRED TO LOOK AGED AND MATCHES EXISTING. INFILL/PATCH AREAS SHALL NOT APPEAR DIFFERENT THAN EXISTING TO REMAIN AREAS. ADDITIONALLY ALL INFILL/PATCHED AREAS SHALL NOT SHOW A VERTICAL OR HORIZONTAL 'CUT' SEAM, EXISTING VENEER SHALL BE REMOVED AS REQUIRED ON A FULL BRICK/COURSE SO THAT THE INFILL APPEARS SEAMLESS.

F. EXISTING FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM TO REMAIN. PROTECT AND MAINTAIN DURING CONSTRUCTION. CONTRACTOR'S PRICING SHALL INCLUDE MODIFYING THE EXISTING FIRE SPRINKLER AND FIRE ALARM SYSTEMS AS REQUIRED FOR NEW PLAN LAYOUT AND CODE REVISIONS INCLUDING ADA. CONTRACTOR WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DRAWINGS, SUBMITTAL, AND APPROVAL OF ANY FIRE SPRINKLER AND FIRE ALARM WORK AS A DEFERRED SUBMITTAL.

G. EXISTING PARTITIONS/EXTERIOR WALLS PATCH/REPAIR GYP. BD. AS NECESSARY. (TAPE, MUD, SAND TO LEVEL 4 FINISH). PATCH AND REPAIR ALL AREAS THAT ARE AFFECTED DURING CONSTRUCTION. PENETRATIONS OF FIRE-RATED CONSTRUCTION TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT CBC.

H. FINISH FACES SHALL ALIGN AT JUNCTION OF NEW AND EXISTING CONSTRUCTION U.O.N.

I. LIGHTING/SIGNAGE SHALL COMPLY WITH CBC SECTION 1011.

J. INTEGRITY OF EXISTING FIRE RATINGS.
NEW FULL HEIGHT WALL

ALL EXISTING TO REMAIN AND NEW WALL SURFACES TO RECEIVE SMOOTH LEVEL 4 FINISH.

B. ALL GYP. BD. PARTITIONS SHALL BE Taped AND SANDED SMOOTH TO A LEVEL 4 FINISH. U.O.N. CONTRACTOR SHALL PATCH AND REPAIR SURFACES TO MATCH ADJACENT OR ADJOINING SURFACES WHEREVER REQUIRED. THESE SURFACES SHALL BE ALIGNED AND

C. ALL PARTITIONS ARE DIMENSIONED FROM FINISH FACE TO FINISH FACE. U.O.N. ALL CLEAR DIMENSIONS ARE NOT ADJUSTABLE WITHOUT ARCHITECT’S APPROVAL.

E. EXISTING EXTERIOR WALL WITH BRICK VENEER TO REMAIN, U.O.N. PATCH/REPAIR AS REQUIRED. ANY NEW BRICK INFILL OR PATCH 67’ - 4” MUST MATCH EXISTING VENEER THAT REMAINS. CONTRACTOR TO DETERMINE BEST METHOD FOR MATCHING.

F. EXISTING FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM TO REMAIN. PROTECT AND MAINTAIN DURING CONSTRUCTION. CONTRACTOR’S PRICING SHALL INCLUDE MODIFYING THE EXISTING FIRE SPRINKLER AND FIRE ALARM SYSTEMS AS REQUIRED FOR NEW PLAN LAYOUT AND CODE REVISIONS INCLUDING ADA. CONTRACTOR WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DRAWINGS, SUBMITTAL, AND APPROVAL OF ANY FIRE SYSTEMS.

G. EXISTING PARTITIONS/EXTERIOR WALLS PATCH/REPAIR GYP. BD. AS NECESSARY. (TAPE, MUD, SAND TO LEVEL 4 FINISH). PATCH AND SKIM BASE OF WALLS WHERE BASE IS REMOVED. PREPARE FOR (N) N.I.C. FINISHES.

H. LIGHTING/SIGNAGE SHALL COMPLY WITH CBC SECTION 1011.

J. MAINTAIN ALL EXISTING RATED CONSTRUCTION UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON PLANS. PATCH AND REPAIR AS REQUIRED TO INSURE INTEGRITY OF EXISTING FIRE RATINGS.

M. PRESERVE AND MAINTAIN EXISTING EXITS THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION.
A. VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS IN FIELD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. NOTIFY ARCHITECT OF ANY DISCREPANCIES.

B. "ALIGN" SHALL MEAN TO ACCURATELY LOCATE FACES IN THE SAME PLACE.

C. "SIMILAR" MEANS COMPARABLE CHARACTERISTICS FOR THE CONDITIONS NOTED. VERIFY DIMENSIONS AND ORIENTATION ON PLANS AND ELEVATIONS.

D. U.L. APPROVED DETAILS OF RATED ASSEMBLY PENETRATIONS ARE TO BE PROVIDED BY INDIVIDUAL SUBTRADES AS REQUIRED BY CURRENT CBC SEC. 712.

E. AT ALTERED CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR CUT EDGES, REPLACE CONSTRUCTION AND FIT NEW TO EXISTING CONSTRUCTION AS REQUIRED TO MATCH EXISTING WORK. MAKE JOINTS OF NEW AND EXISTING PATCHES SMOOTH, EVEN, AND PRACTICALLY INVISIBLE. WHERE NEW PAINT OR OTHER FINISHES ARE JOINED, CARRY TO NEAREST BREAK IN SURFACES, CORNER, OR OTHER BREAK IN CONSTRUCTION AS REQUIRED FOR NEAT FINISHED APPEARANCE.

F. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE GIVEN TO FACE OF FINISHED SURFACE, TYPICAL UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE. STRUCTURAL GRID COLUMN DIMENSIONS ARE TAKEN TO CENTERLINE OF COLUMN. DIMENSIONS ARE NOT TO BE SCALED FROM ARCHITECTURAL PRINTS. ALL MEASUREMENTS MUST BE FIELD VERIFIED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. NOTIFY ARCHITECT OF ANY DISCREPANCIES.

G. CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE ALL WORK WITH MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL, AND PLUMBING DRAWINGS, AND REPORT TO ARCHITECT OR BUILDING OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE ANY DISCREPANCIES FOR CORRECTION OR ADJUSTMENT. NO ALLOWANCE WILL BE MADE FOR INCREASED COSTS INCURRED DUE TO LACK OF PROPER COORDINATION.

H. PATCH AND REPAIR ALL AREAS THAT ARE AFFECTED DURING CONSTRUCTION.

I. CONTRACTOR MUST COORDINATE WITH STRUCTURAL ENGINEER ON HVAC EQUIPMENT LOCATIONS PRIOR TO INSTALLING ANY NEW EQUIPMENT ON THE ROOF.

J. CONTRACTOR TO COORDINATE WITH PLUMBING DRAWINGS FOR DRAIN AND RAINWATER LEADER LOCATIONS. NOTE: RAIN WATER LINES FROM ROOF TO TIE IN UNDERGROUND SYSTEM, ALL LINES TO BE LOCATED INSIDE WALL CAVITIES (NOT VISIBLE). SEE STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS FOR PENETRATION OF FOOTINGS. SEE CIVIL AND PLUMBING DRAWINGS FOR INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR OF BUILDING.
EXISTING PAINT FINISHES

WALLS: SW 6184 CYANITE SAGE

WINDOWS, DOORS & TRIM: SW 6184 RELAXED KHAKI

EAVES: SW 8310 UNIVERSAL KHAKI

COLUMNS: SW 9155 CONNECTED GRAY

BEAMS & RAFTERS: SW 7087 CITYSCAPE

RAILINGS: SW 7088 GRIZZLE GRAY

SHAKE ROOF

WALL PANEL CLADDING

BLACKENED STEEL, EVEN FINISH AT NEW EXTERIOR WALL

WALL FINISH

BOARD AND BATTEN, PAINTED AT NEW WALL

WALL FINISH

NEW SMOOTH STUCCO, PAINTED

ROOFING

SHAKES ROOF, CAMPAUS SANDHILLS AT NEW ROOF, MATCHING EXISTING

RAILING & GUARDRAIL

BLACK STEEL RAILING, FINISH TO MATCH WINDOW MILLION WITH GLASS/PLEXIGLASS GUARDRAIL

DECKING & ROOF EAVES

BLACK STEEL / DARK BRONZE ANODIZED ALUMINUM AT STREET/FRONT, ALT STEEL FRAMES

DOOR & WINDOW FRAMES

NEW TEMPERED LOW-E CLEAR GLASS

COLUMN PAINT

PAINT AT NEW STRUCTURAL COLUMN

TRELLIS

IFE AT NEW TRELLIS
1 SOUTHWEST ELEVATION - EXISTING

2 SOUTHWEST ELEVATION - PROPOSED

3 COURTYARD EAST - EXISTING

4 COURTYARD EAST - PROPOSED

KEYNOTES

- Columbus Bet with Metalado and Metalado. 
- Decks: ROOF EAVES
- Ship Lapped Joint; IPE Oil w/ UV Protection, 3 Existing Beams & Rafters
- Existing Eaves
- Blackened Steel
- TBD
- Door & Window Frames/ Mullions
- TYP XP6
- Eggshell
- Sherwin SW 7061 Night Owl
- TBD
- Board & Batten
+ Existing
- TYP 6
- XF 1
- TBD
- 4
- TYP 7
- TBD
- Painted
- Existing
- XP 6
- Sherwin
- Existing Beams & Rafters
- Paint #5
- Eggshell
- Trim
- Existing
- TYP XP 2
- Cedar Shake Roof
- Eggshell
- Wood #1
- Eggshell
- Sherwin
- Existing Beams & Rafters
- Paint #5
- Eggshell
- Trim
- Existing
- TYP XP 8
- XF 2
- TYP 24
- Cedar Shake Roof
- Eggshell
- Wood #1
- Eggshell
- Sherwin
- Existing Beams & Rafters
- Paint #5
- Eggshell
- Trim
- Existing
- TYP XP 1
- XF 1
- TYP RF 1
- TBD
- 6 (N) Painted Metal Trellis.
- 8 (N) Feature Roof At Entrance With Heavy Wood shakes.
- 9 (N) Wood Structural Column, Painted.
- 14 (E) Exterior Door With Painted Wood Trims.
- 21 (E) Exterior Wall With Stucco Finish.

FINISH LEGEND - EXISTING

- Color: ERF 1
- Type: PAINT #2
- Install: MFGR: WILLIAMS TYP EX 2
- Color: BEYOND 6
- Type: PAINT #6
- Color: TYP XP 8
- Install: MFGR: WILLIAMS TYP EX 2

ELEVATION LEGEND

- EXISTING WALL WITH BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH
- BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH WALL.
- PAINTED COLOR AS SHOWN IN ELEVATION.

FINISH LEGEND

- Color: ERF 1
- Type: PAINT #2
- Install: MFGR: WILLIAMS TYP EX 2
- Color: BEYOND 6
- Type: PAINT #6
- Color: TYP XP 8
- Install: MFGR: WILLIAMS TYP EX 2

NOTE:

- REMOVE EXISTING WALL WITH BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS AND STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
- PAINTED COLOR AS SHOWN IN ELEVATION. SEE PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS SET (NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION) FOR MORE DETAILED INFORMATION.

KEY PLAN

EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
EXISTING WALLS

- XP1 32'
- TYPRF1 BOARD FORMED CONCRETE
- TYPXR2
- XP7 SEE SHEET A2.2

WALL FINISH
- SHERWIN GALZING #1
- BLACKENED STEEL

EXISTING COLUMNS
- XP1 TBD

GENERAL EXTERIOR

- ROOF #1 WOOD
- SW 6149 RELAXED KHAKI N/A
- TYPXR5
- SEE SHEET A2.2

- XP1 DARK BRONZE ANODIZED ALUMINUM
- XP7 TYPXR2 TYPXR2 TYPXR1 TBD

EXTERIOR GLAZING

DECK/ROOF EAVES
- SHERWIN DECK

1 COURTYARD NORTH - EXISTING

2 COURTYARD NORTH - PROPOSED

3 COURTYARD WEST - EXISTING

4 COURTYARD WEST - PROPOSED

KEYNOTES

- EXTERIOR WALLS EXISTING - REMOVE EXISTING BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH ONLY, STRUCTURAL WALL TO REMAIN. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS.
- EXTERIOR WALLS PROPOSED - NEW BLACKENED STEEL FINISH PANEL/CLADDING. SEE PROPOSED PLANS & STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
- EXTERIOR DECKS PROPOSED - REMOVE EXISTING BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH ONLY, STRUCTURAL WALL TO REMAIN. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS.

FINISH LEGEND - EXISTING

- TYPE
- COLOR
- MFGR

FINISH LEGEND

- TYPE
- COLOR
- MFGR

ELEVATION LEGEND

- TYPE
- COLOR
- FINISH

EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
1 COURTYARD SOUTH - EXISTING

2 COURTYARD SOUTH - PROPOSED
Indicated by x on the plans.

1. REMOVE (E) EXTERIOR WALL WITH BOARD AND BATTEN FINISH.
2. REMOVE (E) ROOF.
3. REMOVE (E) RAILING.
4. REMOVE (E) ROOF.
5. REMOVE (E) RAMP & CURB.
6. REMOVE (E) EXTERIOR DOOR AND HARDWARE.
7. REMOVE (E) WINDOW.
8. REMOVE (E) STAIRS AND ALL ASSOCIATED ATTACHMENTS.
9. REMOVE PORTION OF (E) EXTERIOR WALL WITH STUCCO FINISH.
10. (E) EXTERIOR CMU WALL WITH STUCCO FINISH TO REMAIN. PROTECT DURING CONSTRUCTION.
11. REMOVE PORTION OF (E) EXTERIOR WALL WITH BOARD AND BATTEN FINISH.
12. REMOVE (E) SKYLIGHT.
13. REMOVE (E) FAN & ASSOCIATED UN-USED EQUIPMENTS.
14. REMOVE (E) PLANTER & PLANTER WALLS. SEE CIVIL/ LANDSCAPE DWGS.
15. REMOVE (E) RAMP & CURB.
16. REMOVE (E) COLUMN.
17. (E) EXTERIOR WALL WITH STUCCO FINISH TO REMAIN. PROTECT DURING CONSTRUCTION.
18. REMOVE (E) EXTERIOR WALL WITH STUCCO FINISH.
19. REMOVE PORTION OF (E) CMU SILL WALL UNDER WINDOW.

NORTH EAST ELEVATION - DEMOLITION

SOUTHEAST ELEVATION - DEMOLITION

SOUTHWEST ELEVATION - DEMOLITION

COURTYARD EAST - DEMOLITION

KEYNOTES

1. REMOVE EXISTING WALL WITH BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH ONLY, STRUCTURAL WALL TO REMAIN. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS.
2. REMOVE EXISTING WALL WITH BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS AND STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
3. REMOVE EXISTING STUCCO FINISH ONLY, STRUCTURAL WALL TO REMAIN. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS.
4. REMOVE EXISTING WALL WITH STUCCO FINISH. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS AND STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
5. REMOVE EXISTING SHINGLE ROOF & STRUCTURAL FRAMING. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS AND STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
6. REMOVE EXISTING SHINGLE ROOF TO REMAIN. PROTECT DURING CONSTRUCTION. SEE DEMOLITION ROOF PLANS.
7. REMOVE EXISTING BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH ONLY, STRUCTURAL WALL TO REMAIN. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS.
8. REMOVE EXISTING WALL WITH BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS AND STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
9. REMOVE EXISTING BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH WALL.
10. PAINTED COLOR AS SHOWN IN ELEVATION. SEE PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS.
11. NEW BLACKENED STEEL FINISH PANEL/ CLADDING. SEE PROPOSED PLANS & STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
12. PAINTED COLOR TO MATCH BLACKEND STEEL.
13. SEE PROPOSED ROOF PLANS & STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
14. Thomas Board Foreman CONCRETE. SEE PROPOSED FINISH & STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
15. SEE PROPOSED FINISH & STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.
EXISTING WALL BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH TO REMAIN. PROTECT DURING CONSTRUCTION. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS.

REMOVE EXISTING WALL WITH BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS AND STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.

EXISTING WALL WITH STUCCO FINISH TO REMAIN. PROTECT DURING CONSTRUCTION. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS.

REMOVE EXISTING STUCCO FINISH ONLY, STRUCTURAL WALL TO REMAIN. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS.

REMOVE EXISTING WALL WITH STUCCO FINISH. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS AND STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.

EXISTING SHINGLE ROOF TO REMAIN. PROTECT DURING CONSTRUCTION. SEE DEMOLITION ROOF PLANS.

REMOVE EXISTING SHINGLE ROOF & STRUCTURAL FRAMING. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS AND STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.

REMOVE EXISTING BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH ONLY, STRUCTURAL WALL TO REMAIN. SEE DEMOLITION PLANS.

BOARDS & BATTENS FINISH WALL.

PAINTED COLOR AS SHOWN IN ELEVATION. SEE PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS.

STUCCO FINISH WALL, PAINTED COLOR AS SHOWN IN ELEVATION. SEE PROPOSED PLANS.

NEW SHINGLE ROOF OVER NEW STRUCTURAL FRAMING, 3:12 SLOPE, MATCHING EXISTING CAMPUS STANDARDS. SEE PROPOSED ROOF PLANS & STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.

NEW BLACKENED STEEL FINISH PANEL/CLADDING. SEE PROPOSED PLANS & STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.

NEW VERTICAL BOARD FORMED CONCRETE. SEE PROPOSED PLANS & STRUCTURAL DRAWINGS.

WOOD TRIM, PAINTED COLOR TO MATCH BLACKENED STEEL.
TO B.O. RAFTERS
14' - 5" MAX
9' - 0" MIN.
TO B.O. RAFTERS
12' - 1" MAX
BASEMENT
8' - 7"
TO T.O. ROOF RIDGE
30' - 0"
TO T.O. SKYLIGHT
30' - 0"

± 10' - 11"
± 8' - 10"
KEY PLAN

1 AREA_2450-BASEMENT
2 AREA_2450-1ST FLOOR
3 AREA_2450-2ND FLOOR

BASEMENT AREA
EXISTING 3,421 SF
REMOVED - 516 SF
INFILLED - 753 SF
ADDED +42 SF
NEW TOTAL 2,194 SF

1ST FLOOR AREA
EXISTING 5,506 SF
REMOVED - 399 SF
INFILLED 0 SF
ADDED +1,035 SF
NEW TOTAL 6,142 SF

2ND FLOOR AREA
EXISTING 5,574 SF
REMOVED - 904 SF
INFILLED 0 SF
ADDED +1,247 SF
NEW TOTAL 5,917 SF

TOTAL BUILDING AREA (IN AREA OF WORK)
EXISTING 14,901 SF
REMOVED - 1,819 SF
INFILLED - 753 SF
ADDED +2,324 SF
NEW TOTAL 14,253 SF

GFA REDUCED: -248 SF
2400 & 2450 SHR - OVERALL 2ND FLOOR

BUILDING 2400 / 2450 COVERAGE

EXISTING COVERAGE (BUILDING 2400) 30,249 SF
EXISTING COVERAGE (BUILDING 2450) 6,458 SF
REMOVED AREA (SHARED) - 948 SF
ADDED AREA (BUILDING 2400) + 41.75 SF
ADDED AREA (BUILDING 2450) + 909.06 SF
ADDED AREA (SHARED) + 3,884.79 SF

NEW BUILDING COVERAGE 39,594 SF
BUILDING COVERAGE INCREASE 2,888 SF

NOTE:
BUILDING COVERAGE OF 2400 AND 2450 WILL BE COMBINED BECAUSE THE TWO BUILDINGS WOULD APPEAR CONNECTED THROUGH THE NEW ENTRY OVERHANG.

SITE AREA: 890,743 SF (20.4 ACRES)

SITE BUILDING COVERAGE

(E) TOTAL BUILDING COVERAGE: 141,744 SF / 890,743 SF = 15.91%
(N) TOTAL BUILDING COVERAGE: 144,632 SF / 890,743 SF = 16.24%
QUADRUS CONFERENCE CENTER
2400-2450 SAND HILL ROAD
MENLO PARK, CA

SCOPE OF WORK

The Scope of Work includes improvements to the landscaped areas of the Quadrus Conference Center at 2400 and 2450 Sand Hill Road. Proposed improvements include the removal of existing hardscape and plantings to be replaced with a new entry plaza and functional, sägered space. New and existing plantings will receive drought-tolerant landscaping with drip irrigation. Paving types include natural gray concrete, interlocking pavers, gravel, and drought-tolerant turf. Parking will be modified for accessibility compliance.

APN(S): 074-270-170, 074-170-260, 074-270-270, 074-270-280

PROJECT LOCATION: 2400-2450 SAND HILL ROAD

APPROX IMPROVED AREA: 10,407 SF

APPROX TOTAL IMPERVIOUS AREA: 2517 SF

PROJECT ADDRESS: 2400-2450 SAND HILL ROAD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

ARCHITECT
STUDIO G ARCHITECTS
299 BASSETT STREET, SUITE 250
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
STUDIO G ARCHITECTS
299 BASSETT STREET, SUITE 250
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

SCOPES OF WORK

1. Entry Plaza
2. Functional Courtyard
3. Drought-Tolerant Landscaping
4. Drip Irrigation
5. New and Existing Plantings
6. Natural Gray Concrete
7. Interlocking Pavers
8. Gravel
9. Drought-Tolerant Turf

AREA DISTURBED: 0.48 AC

TOTAL NEW IMPERVIOUS AREA: 8014 SF
TOTAL REPLACED IMPERVIOUS AREA: 10679 SF

LEGOENDS

- Site Plan
- Aerial View
- Section View
- Elevation View

SYMBOLS LEGEND

- West (W)
- North (N)
- East (E)
- South (S)

ABBREVIATIONS

A. Asphalt
B. Building
C. Concrete
D. Drain
E. Existing
F. Fire
G. Grade
H. Grill
I. Irrigation
J. Lighting
K. Pedestrian
L. Parking
M. Storm Drain
N. Street
O. Tunnel
P. Water
Q. Sewer
R. Drainage
S. Utility
T. Tree
U. Sign
V. Valley
W. Wall
X. Roof
Y. Foundation
Z. Structure

COVER SHEET

SHEET TITLE: C0.0
SHEET NO.: CO.0

PROJECT TEAM

STUDIOG ARCHITECTS
299 BASSETT STREET, SUITE 250
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

ARCHITECTS
ALL DESIGNS, DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIALS INDICATED HEREIN ARE THE WORK AND PROPERTY OF STUDIO G ARCHITECTS. THIS DOCUMENT MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, REUSED OR DISCLOSED BY ANY METHOD WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF STUDIO G ARCHITECTS. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

C38
GENERAL NOTES:

1. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE DESIGNER OF RECORD BEFORE ALL DEMOLITION ACTIVITIES COMMENCE.

2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REPLACE OR REPAIR, AT THEIR OWN EXPENSE, ANY DAMAGED, REMOVED, OR DISTURBED ELEMENTS CAUSED FROM CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

3. CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE ALL SURFACE ELEMENTS WITHIN THE AREA TO BE DEMOLISHED, AND NOTIFY THE GOVERNING CITY OR COUNTY AND OBTAIN ANY AND ALL PERMITS REQUIRED FOR TEMPORARY LANE CLOSURE OR DIVERSION.

4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE DESIGNER OF RECORD PRIOR TO ANY WORK AROUND EXISTING UTILITIES.

5. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES SHALL BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL OSHA REGULATIONS.

6. UNLESS SPECIFIED OTHERWISE, ALL DEMOLISHED MATERIAL SHALL BE REMOVED FROM THE PROPERTY OF STUDIO G ARCHITECTS.

7. IN THE EVENT THAT HUMAN REMAINS AND/OR CULTURAL MATERIALS ARE FOUND, ALL PROJECT-RELATED CONSTRUCTION SHALL CEASE WITHIN A 100-FT RADIUS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL, PURSUANT TO SECTION 653.20 OF THE HEALTH & SAFETY CODE, NOTIFY THE CORONER IMMEDIATELY.

8. ALL CITY WATER METER BOXES SHALL BE PREPARED FOR DEMOLITION PRIOR TO INSTALLATION OF THE CUSTOM-MADE METER BOXES.

9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL WORK PRIOR TO CONTRACT EXECUTION.

10. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

11. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

12. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 12 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

13. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

14. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

15. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

16. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

17. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

18. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

19. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

20. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

21. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

22. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

23. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

24. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

25. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

26. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

27. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

28. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

29. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.

30. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE PROJECT INSPECTOR A MINIMUM OF 24 HOURS PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.
1. TOP OF VERTICAL CURB (TVC)
2. #3 REBAR @ 18" O.C.
3. CONCRETE PAVING (4" MIN)
4. AGGREGATE BASE ROCK PER GEOTECH REPORT (4" MIN)
5. TALL CURB
6. KEY INTO NATIVE SOIL (12" MIN)
7. TOP OF CURB & GUTTER
   LIP OF GUTTER
   FILL LIME
   ALL 4" AWA
   NATIVE SOIL
8. CURB & GUTTER
9. AGGREGATE BASE ROCK 9" MIN
   NATIVE SOIL
10. TALL CURB

IDENTIFICATION SIGN W/ ISA SYMBOL COMPLYING WITH ADA WARNING SURFACE, SEE SEPARATE DETAIL

1  DEPRESSED CURB OR DEPPRRESED CURB & GUTTER
2  ISA SYMBOL, 36" X 36"
3  6" MIN CLEAR LANDING - RAMP WIDTH, 48" DEEP MIN
4  VERTICAL CURB (6" W x 6" T TYP)
5  TRANSITION CURB (6" TO 0" TYP)
6  ADA PARKING STRIPES, 4" WIDE BLUE STRIPES
7  STRIPING LAYOUT FOR VAN SIZE ADA PARKING STALLS ONLY
8  SUPPORT: 2" DIA STEEL PIPE W/ TOP CAP
9  TRANSITION BETWEEN THE DRIVEABLE SURFACE AND SIDEWALK
10  DEPRESSED CURB OR DEPPRRESED CURB & GUTTER
11  ADA PARKING SPACES
12  ADA PARKING TOWAWAY SIGNAGE, TYP
13  SUPPORT POST - STD GALV STEEL CHANNEL "U POST"
14  DETECTABLE WARNINGS SHALL BE LOCATED SO THE EDGE NEAREST THE CURB IS 6" MINIMUM AND 8" MAXIMUM FROM THE FACE OF THE CURB ADJACENT TO THE PARKING OR DRIVING SURFACE.

PERPENDICULAR CURB RAMP - FLARED

SCALE 1/4"=1'-0"

PERPENDICULAR CURB RAMP

SCALE 1/4"=1'-0"

PARALLEL CURB RAMP

SCALE 1/4"=1'-0"

ADA RESERVED PARKING SIGN, TYP

SCALE 1/4"=1'-0"

ADA PATH OF TRAVEL

SCALE 1/4"=1'-0"
DEMOGRAPHIC PLAN

As indicated 09/17/2021

05/21/2021 PLANNING RESUBMITTAL
07/20/2021 PLANNING RESUBMITTAL
07/20/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL
09/17/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL
09/17/2021 PLANNING RESUBMITTAL
10/28/2021 PLANNING RESUBMITTAL

DEMOGRAPHIC LEGEND

CLEAR & GRUB LANDSCAPE
REMOVE PAVERS
REMOVE AC PAVING
REMOVE CONCRETE WALKWAY
REMOVE CONCRETE STEPS
REMOVE CONCRETE WALL & ASSOCIATED FOOTINGS
REMOVE CONCRETE CURB
REMOVE STRIPING

DEMOGRAPHIC KEYNOTES

1. DEMOLITION PLAN IS INTENDED FOR EXTERIOR SCOPE ONLY, SEE PLANS BY OTHERS FOR BUILDING AND INTERIOR DEMOLITION.
2. SEE LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS FOR TREE REMOVAL AND MITIGATION MEASURES
3. ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPE DEMOLITION MAY BE REQUIRED FOR REPLANTING, SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR PLANTING LIMITS
4. NO ATTEMPT IS MADE TO SHOW ALL ITEMS TO BE REMOVED. IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO REMOVE ALL EXISTING ELEMENTS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK.
5. TREES ARE SHOWN FOR REFERENCE ONLY. SEE LANDSCAPE TREE REMOVAL AND PROTECTION PLAN, SHEET L0.4A-B AND ARBORIST REPORT FOR ADDITIONAL TREE REMOVAL AND PROTECTION INFORMATION.

DEMOGRAPHIC NOTES

1. DEMOLITION PLAN IS INTENDED FOR EXTERIOR SCOPE ONLY, SEE PLANS BY OTHERS FOR BUILDING AND INTERIOR DEMOLITION.
2. SEE LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS FOR TREE REMOVAL AND MITIGATION MEASURES
3. ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPE DEMOLITION MAY BE REQUIRED FOR REPLANTING, SEE LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR PLANTING LIMITS
4. NO ATTEMPT IS MADE TO SHOW ALL ITEMS TO BE REMOVED. IT SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO REMOVE ALL EXISTING ELEMENTS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THE PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK.
5. TREES ARE SHOWN FOR REFERENCE ONLY. SEE LANDSCAPE TREE REMOVAL AND PROTECTION PLAN, SHEET L0.4A-B AND ARBORIST REPORT FOR ADDITIONAL TREE REMOVAL AND PROTECTION INFORMATION.
1. THE INTENT OF THESE PLANS IS TO PROVIDE THE INITIAL CONCEPT FOR TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL UPDATE AND MODIFY THE PLAN TO REFLECT CURRENT SITE CONDITIONS. THE EROSION ENTERING THE STORM DRAIN SYSTEM.

2. THE PLANS PROVIDED ARE BASED ON KNOWN INFORMATION FROM SURVEY OR ADJUSTING, MODIFYING, OR ADDING ADDITIONAL CONTROL MEASURES SHOULD A SITUATION ARISE FROM UNANTICIPATED CIRCUMSTANCES.

3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE LIABLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES TO ANY PUBLICLY AND/OR PRIVATELY OWNED ROAD DUE TO GRADING ACTIVITIES FROM THE PROJECT SITE.

4. DURING THE RAINY SEASON, DEBRIS AND EARTH MATERIAL SHALL BE CLEARED FROM ALL PAVED SURFACES TO PREVENT RUNOFF COLLECTING SEDIMENT AND DISCHARGING INTO THE STORM DRAIN SYSTEM.

5. TEMPORARY STOCKPILES SHALL BE PROTECTED WITH APPROPRIATE EROSION ENSURE SILT DOES NOT LEAVE THE SITE OR ENTER THE STORM DRAIN SYSTEM.

6. TEMPORARY STEEP SLOPES SHALL BE PROTECTED WITH APPROPRIATE EROSION CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE IS A MINIMUM OF 12 TIMES THE LARGEST CONSTRUCTION VEHICLE TIRE

9. TEMPORARY UNPAVED ACCESS ROADS SHALL BE STABILIZED OR WATERED AT LEAST THREE TIMES DAILY TO PREVENT DUST.

10. ALL PAVED SURFACES SHALL BE DRY. ANY WATER ASSOCIATED WITH SWEEPING SHALL NOT ENTER THE STORM DRAIN SYSTEM.

12. TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT SLOPES GREATER THAN THREE FEET HIGH SHALL BE STABILIZED.

13. ANY EXPOSED CONSTRUCTION AREAS WHICH ARE INACTIVE SHALL BE Securing with 4 staples per stake.

15. EROSION AND GROWING ACTIVITIES SHALL BE WALTERched ON ALL UNDISTURBED AREAS IN SCALES FOR HIGH.

16. GRADING IS NOT ALLOWED DURING WINTER STORMS. ACCORDING TO THE PROJECT SITES SHALL BE DRY DAILY, Any water associated with applications shall not enter the storm drain system.

17. TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT EMBANKMENTS GREATER THAN THREE FEET HIGH SHALL BE STABILIZED.

18. ANY VIABLE SEAL MATERIAL PROXIMATE TO PUBLIC STREETS ACCORDING TO THE PROJECT SITE SHALL BE DRY DAILY, Any water associated with applications shall not enter the storm drain system.

19. TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT EMBANKMENTS GREATER THAN THREE FEET HIGH SHALL BE STABILIZED.

20. PERFORMANCE AND MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES ON ANY DRY MATERIALS.

21. THIS PLAN COVERS ONLY THE FIRST WINTER FOLLOWING GRADING WITH ASSUMED SITE CONDITIONS AS SHOWN ON THE EROSION CONTROL PLAN.

22. IF HYDROSEEDING IS NOT USED OR EFFECTIVE BY SEPTEMBER 23, THEN OTHER IMMEDIATE METHODS SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED SUCH AS EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS, OR A THREE STEP APPLICATION OF A) SEED, MULCH, FERTILIZER, B) BLOWN STRAW AND C) TACKIFIER AND MULCH.

23. INLET PROTECTION SHALL BE INSTALLED AT OPEN INLETS TO PREVENT SEDIMENT FROM ENTERING THE STORM DRAIN SYSTEM. INLETS NOT USED UNLESS THE AREA DRAIN IS UNDISTURBED OR STABILIZED.

24. THE CONSTRUCTION BMP'S SHOWN ON THE PLAN ARE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS. THE CITY ENGINEER OR EROSION CONTROL OFFICIALS SHALL BE NOTIFIED OF THE EROSION CONTROL USAGE.

STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE

NOTES:
1. LOCATE FIBER ROLLS ON LEVEL CONTOURS SPACED AS FOLLOWS:
- SLOPES LISTED ARE (H:V)
- USE WOOD STAKES WITH A NOMINAL CLASSIFICATION OF 0.75 BY 0.75 INCHES MINIMUM AND
- IF MORE THAN ONE FIBER ROLL IS PLACED IN A ROW, THE ROLLS SHOULD BE OVERLAPPED,
- IF ROOF PROTECTION IS NOT EFFECTIVE BY SEPTMBER 23, THEN OTHER IMMEDIATE METHODS SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED SUCH AS EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS, OR A THREE STEP APPLICATION OF A) SEED, MULCH, FERTILIZER, B) BLOWN STRAW AND C) TACKIFIER AND MULCH.

SILTFENCE

NOTES:
- INSTALL ROLLS PERPENDICULAR TO WATER MOVEMENT AND PARALLEL TO THE SLOPE CONTOUR
- DRIVE STAKES AT THE END OF EACH FIBER ROLL AND SPACED 4FT MAXIMUM ON CENTER
- JOINING SECTIONS SHALL NOT BE PLACED AT SUMP LOCATIONS
- SANDBAG ROWS AND LAYERS SHALL BE OFFSET TO ELIMINATE GAPS
- BURLAP BAGS FILLED WITH GRADED ROCK (NO FINES).
- THE LAST 8'-0" OF FENCE SHALL BE TURNED UP SLOPE
- 3. ALLOW FOR PROPER MAINTENANCE AND CLEANUP
- 4. BAGS MUST BE REMOVED AFTER ADJACENT OPERATION IS COMPLETE
- 5. USE WOOD STAKES WITH A NOMINAL CLASSIFICATION OF 0.75 BY 0.75 INCHES MINIMUM AND
- 6. PROTECTION CAN BE EFFECTIVE EVEN IF IT IS NOT IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO THE INLET PROVIDED THAT THE INLET IS PROTECTED FROM POTENTIAL SOURCES OF POLLUTION.

STRAW WATTLE

NOTES:
- DIMENSIONS MAY VARY TO FIT FIELD CONDITIONS
- STAKE DIMENSIONS ARE NOMINAL
- 9. MINIMUM 4 STAPLES PER STAKE
- 11. JOINING SECTIONS SHALL NOT BE PLACED AT SUMP LOCATIONS
- 12. SANDBAG ROWS AND LAYERS SHALL BE OFFSET TO ELIMINATE GAPS
- 4. DIMENSIONS MAY VARY TO FIT FIELD CONDITIONS
- 3. INSTALL ROLLS PERPENDICULAR TO WATER MOVEMENT AND PARALLEL TO THE SLOPE CONTOUR
- 1. INSTALL FIBER ROLLS ON LEVEL CONTOURS SPACED AS FOLLOWS:

STORM DRAIN INLET PROTECTION

NOTES:
- NOTE: USE THE SHEET Size STORM DRAIN INLET PROTECTION
- 1. REMOVE ALL CONCRETE, STEEL, REBAR, AND OTHER MATERIALS FROM THE INLET
- 2. REDUCE THE POUR OR REPLACE THE INLET WITH A NEW UNIT IF NEEDED
- 3. REPLACE THE CONCRETE SEATING STONE / BOLLARD
- 4. CLEAN THE DRAINAGE CHANNEL PRIOR TO INSTALLATION
- 5. INSTALL A BRUSH TRAP OR SIMILAR MEAN TO CATCH SEDIMENT OR DEBRIS.
- 6. KEEP THE CHANNEL CLEAN BY REGULARLY CLEANING THE INLET USING A STORM DRAIN INLET PROTECTION.
Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs)

Construction projects are required to implement the stormwater best management practices (BMP) on this page, as they apply to your project, all year long.

Storm drain polluters may be liable for fines of up to $10,000 per day!
PLANNING SUBMITTAL - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS
QUADRUS CONFERENCE CENTER - 2400-2450 SAND HILL ROAD
CITY OF MENLO PARK, CA
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L0.7 TRENCH PREPARATION AND PROTECTION MEASURES
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L0.9 GENERAL SITE PLAN
L1.1 SITE PLAN
L1.2 CONSTRUCTION PLAN
L1.3 CONSTRUCTION DETAILS
L1.4 CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS LIST AND NOTES
L1.5 INFIRMATION PLAN
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COVER SHEET

PROPERTY OWNER
750 MARKET ST
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
575 MARKET ST. #401
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

CIVIL ENGINEER
1095 VINEYARD AVE #100
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

GOVERNING AGENCY
CITY OF MENLO PARK
TYE LABEL LANE
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

REVISIONS
SUBMITTAL
05/21/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL
09/17/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL
09/17/2021 PLANNING RESUBMITTAL
09/17/2021 PLANNING RESUBMITTAL
10/28/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL
10/28/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL
10/28/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL
10/28/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL
10/28/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL
10/28/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL

SCALE
As indicated

C54
EXISTING HERITAGE TREE TO BE PROTECTED AND PRESERVED. REFER TO PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT FOR ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.

NOTES:

1. PROTECTION FOR TREES SHALL BE PROVIDED BEFORE GRADING OR OTHER EQUIPMENT IS ALLOWED ON THE PROPERTY.

2. ALL PRE-CONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES MUST BE OVERSEEN BY THE PROJECT ARBORIST.

3. CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBLE TO COMPLY WITH ALL PRE-CONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WHICH MUST BE OVERSEEN BY THE PROJECT ARBORIST.

4. TREE PROTECTION FENCING/ZONE PER PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT.

5. REPLACEMENT VALUE ASSUMED TO BE $7000 FOR EACH NEW 60" BOX TREE, PER SECTION 13.24.090 (3) OF HERITAGE TREE ADMINISTRATIVE ORDINANCE.

6. GIVEN SPACING REQUIREMENTS FOR HERITAGE TREE REPLACEMENTS (25' ON CENTER), ADEQUATE SPACE WAS NOT FOUND FOR THE REMAINING TREES. APPLICANT WILL PAY $17,100 IN LIEU FEE.

7. HERITAGE TREES NOT IN SCOPE (N.I.S.) INDICATED AS SUCH ON PLAN AND IN PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT. 'IN SCOPE' DEFINED AS HERITAGE TREES WITHIN AN AREA OF 10X THE DIAMETER OF THE TRUNK WHERE ANY EXCAVATION AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES WILL TAKE PLACE, INCLUDING STORAGE OF MATERIALS, TOOLS AND EQUIPMENT.

8. TREE PROTECTION FENCING PER PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT.

9. IT IS REQUIRED THAT THE PROJECT ARBORIST BE ON SITE TO MONITOR AND HELP MITIGATE WORK TO HERITAGE TREES TO BE REMOVED.

10. DIAMETER AT BREAST HEIGHT (DBH) MEASURED AT 54".

11. HERITAGE TREE MITIGATION LEGEND

EXISTING TREE

EXISTING HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED

TREE PROTECTION FENCING (REFER TO ARBORIST REPORT)

TREE PROTECTION

MATERIALS INDICATED HEREIN ARE THE WORK AND PROPERTY OF STUDIO G ARCHITECTS.

THIS DOCUMENT MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, REUSED OR DISCLOSED BY ANY METHOD WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF STUDIO: G ARCHITECTS. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
As indicated

### Designations

- **EXISTING TREE**
- **EXISTING NON-HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED** (shown for reference)
- **TREE PROTECTION FENCING** (refer to arborist report)

### Notes:

1. See Sheet L0.4 - L0.8 for proposed replacement tree locations.
2. See plant legend on Sheet L0.3 for tree species.
3. Refer to project arborist report (dated 8-27-2021) for tree inventory and appraised values.
4. Prior to tree removal, all existing non-heritage trees shall be protected at 1.1 meters.
5. Prior to tree removal, all existing non-heritage trees shall be protected at 1.1 meters.
6. Prior to tree removal, all existing non-heritage trees shall be protected at 1.1 meters.
7. Prior to tree removal, all existing non-heritage trees shall be protected at 1.1 meters.
8. Prior to tree removal, all existing non-heritage trees shall be protected at 1.1 meters.
9. Prior to tree removal, all existing non-heritage trees shall be protected at 1.1 meters.
10. Prior to tree removal, all existing non-heritage trees shall be protected at 1.1 meters.

### Tree Protection

- **EXISTING HERITAGE TREE**
  - **PROTECTED AND PRESERVED** (typical. Refer to project arborist report for more information)
- **ROOT BUFFER ZONE** (typical. Refer to project arborist report for additional requirements)

### Trunk Wrap

- **PER PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT, TYPICAL**

### Tree Mitigation Legend

- **NON-HERITAGE TREE MITIGATION LEGEND**

### Table: QTY to be Removed / QTY Proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE PROTECTION</th>
<th>EXISTING TREE</th>
<th>EXISTING NON-HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED (SHOWN FOR REFERENCE)</th>
<th>TREE PROTECTION FENCING (REFER TO ARBORIST REPORT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QTY TO BE REMOVED</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTY PROPOSED</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes:

1. Protection for trees shall be provided before grading or other equipment is allowed on the property.
2. All pre-construction and construction activities must abide by tree protection and preservation guidelines in project arborist report.
3. Contractor responsible to comply with all pre-construction and construction activities which must be overseen by the project arborist.

### Legend

- **SCALE**
- **DATE**
- **DRAWN BY**
- **PROJECT ID**
- **ADDRESS**
- **T: 408.283.0100**
- **STUDIOS: G ARCHITECTS. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.**
EXISTING HERITAGE TREE TO BE PROTECTED AND PRESERVED, REFER TO PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT FOR MORE INFORMATION.
EXISTING HERITAGE TREE TO BE PROTECTED, TYPICAL.
EXISTING HERITAGE TREE PROPOSED FOR REMOVAL, TYPICAL.

EXISTING NON-HERITAGE TREE TO BE REMOVED, TYPICAL.

MARKET READY IMPROVEMENTS BY DIVCOWEST
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SCALE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2020</td>
<td>HERITAGE TREE PERMIT SUBMITTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/21/2021</td>
<td>PLANNING RESUBMITTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/20/2021</td>
<td>PLANNING RESUBMITTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/21/2021</td>
<td>HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/20/2021</td>
<td>HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/17/2021</td>
<td>HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/17/2021</td>
<td>PLANNING RESUBMITTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25/2020</td>
<td>PLANNING SUBMITTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2021</td>
<td>TREE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION MEASURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/2021</td>
<td>TREE PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION MEASURES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCALE: 1/100
DATE: 09/17/2021
DRAWN BY: [Redacted]
PROJECT ID: [Redacted]
CONSTRUCTION LEGEND
SYMBOL DESCRIPTION
MEET FLUSH
PLANTING AREA
TYPICAL
ALIGN
UPLIGHT
LINEAR STEP LIGHT
IN-GROUND LINEAR LIGHT
IN-GRADE LINEAR LIGHT
WALL LIGHT
CONCRETE PAVING
INTERLOCKING PAVERS - TYPE 1
INTERLOCKING PAVERS - TYPE 2
DECOMPOSED GRANITE
WOOD DECK
CONTROL JOINT
EXPANSION JOINT
CONCRETE HEADER
PLANTER WALL TYPE A
PLANTER WALL TYPE B
TERRACE WALL
RETAINING WALL

NOTES:
1. SEE SHEET L2.1 - L2.7 FOR CONSTRUCTION DETAILS.
2. SEE SHEET L2.9 FOR MATERIALS LIST.
3. SEE SHEET L2.10 FOR LIGHTING LEGEND.
4. LOCATE EXPANSION JOINTS ADJACENT TO ALL STRUCTURES, INCLUDING WALLS AND STEPS. SEE SHEET L2.1, DETAIL B FOR MORE INFORMATION ON SPACING.
5. NEW OR RELOCATED UTILITY BOXES, INCLUDING ELECTRICAL PULL BOXES, SHALL BE LOCATED IN PLANTING AREAS 18" MIN FROM ADJACENT HARDSCAPE.
6. SITE FURNISHINGS ARE TO BE PROVIDED BY THE PROPERTY OWNER AND ARE SHOWN FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

RAMP
2450 SAND HILL ROAD
2450 SAND HILL ROAD
CONCRETE RAMP
STEEL LOUVER
STEEL PLANTER WALL 4' H
STEEL PLANTER WALL 12' H
STEEL PLANTER WALL 18' H
FURNITURE PROVIDED BY OWNER, TYP. SHOWN FOR REFERENCE ONLY.
EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN, TYPICAL. REFER TO L0.4
ACCESSIBLE PARKING STALL, TYP. 1 VAN, 2 STANDARD. REFER TO CIVIL
BIO-RETENTION PLANTER, TYP. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.
ILLUMINATED RAIL, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
SCULPTURE WASH, TYP. OF 2. REFER TO L2.10
WATER FEATURE
FIRE FEATURE
ILLUMINATED RAIL, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
WALL LIGHT
STEP LIGHT, TYP. OF 6. REFER TO L2.10
ILLUMINATED RAIL, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
CHANDELIER, TYP. OF 3. REFER TO L2.10
PIN LIGHT, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
TREE UPLIGHT, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
IN-GRADE LINEAR UPLIGHT, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
STEP TOE KICK, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
WALL TOE KICK, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
PATH LIGHT, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
SCONCE, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
TREE UPLIGHT, TYP. REFER TO L2.10
STEPS
STEEL FEATURE BED
CANTILEVERED DECK
WOOD FENCE AND SERVICE GATE SIM.
FEATURE WALL
STEEL CANOPY
CONCRETE PAVING
PLANTER WALL TYPE A
PLANTER WALL TYPE B
2450 SAND HILL ROAD
STEEL ENTRY SIGN
NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.
NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW PARKING STALL STRIPING, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.
**NOTES:**

1. SEE MATERIALS LIST FOR COLORS AND FINISHES.
2. REFER TO MANUFACTURER'S INSTALLATION GUIDELINES FOR ADDITIONAL DETAILS.
3. 1/8" DRAINAGE SPACE WHERE PAVERS MEET SYNTHETIC TURF OR PLANTING AREA, PAVERS SHALL HAVE EDGE SHAPES TO MATCH ADJACENT PAVING. 1/2" RADIUS, TYPICAL.
4. AT CORNERS, NOTCH BASE AND ADJACENT PLANTING AREAS TO MATCH ADJACENT CONCRETE HEADER OR PEDESTAL. MAINTAIN 3" CLEAR.
5. ADJACENT SYNTHETIC TURF OR PLANTING AREAS SHALL BE 2" BELOW FINISH Course OVER MORTAR BED.
FEATURE WALL

NOTES:
1. SEE MATERIALS LIST FOR COLORS AND FINISHES.
2. SEE STRUCTURAL DETAILS FOR MORE INFORMATION.

SCALE 1"=1'-0"

8X8X16 STANDARD CMU

CONCRETE RAMP

NOTES:
1. SEE MATERIALS LIST FOR COLORS AND FINISHES.
2. SLOPE SHALL NOT EXCEED 1:12.

4" CONCRETE PAVING, SEE DETAIL
1" 1/16 SQUARE RUBBER ERASER TIP AND SPOTTY TO HOMESPOT

SCALE 1"=1'-0"

SECTION-ELEVATION

CHEEK WALL SECTION

NOTES:
1. SEE MATERIALS LIST FOR COLORS AND FINISHES.
2. SEE STRUCTURAL DETAILS FOR MORE INFORMATION.

STEEL GUARDRAIL

1.5x11GA HSS ROUND
1x11GA HSS ROUND
3 6" WIDE CONCRETE CHEEK WALL, SEE PLAN
4" SQX1 2"THICK BASE PLATE

SCALE: 1"=1'

ELEVATION B

SECTION

ELEVATION A

SCALE: 1"=1'

CONCRETE FOOTING W/(8)#5 REBAR CONTINUOUS TOP AND BOTTOM N 1/2" FOR TIES 30" O.C.
REBAR LAP PER STRUCTURAL
TILE W/MORTAR
CUSTOM STEEL CAP, 2"THICK
ADJACENT PAVING PER PLAN
NATIVE GRADE
VINE CABLE SYSTEM, 12" CABLING SPACING W/STANDOFF MOUNTS.
CUSTOM OUTDOOR MIRROR
ADJACENT BUILDING WALL, INSTALL EXPANSION JOINT

STAMP
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NOTES:
1. SEE MATERIALS LIST FOR COLORS AND FINISHES.
2. REFER TO MANUFACTURER'S INSTALLATION GUIDELINES FOR ADDITIONAL DETAILS.

NOTES:
1. SEE MATERIALS LIST FOR COLORS AND FINISHES.
2. SEE STRUCTURAL DETAILS FOR MORE INFORMATION.

1" STEEL PLATE, PLATE TO PROVIDE NEGATIVE EDGE.
2. INSTALL 2-3" BLACK LA PAZ COBBLE AT ART BASE
3. ADJACENT FINISH GRADE

GLASS GUARDRAIL PER MANUFACTURER. TOP RAIL AND POST SHALL MATCH DIMENSIONS OF STEEL GUARDRAIL. INSTALL GLASS PER RECOMMENDATIONS.

1" STEEL PLATE. PLATE TO PROVIDE NEGATIVE EDGE.
WATER FEATURE A

NOTES:
1. SEE MATERIALS LIST FOR COLORS AND FINISHES.
2. SEE STRUCTURAL DETAILS FOR MORE INFORMATION.

WATER FEATURE B

NOTES:
1. SEE MATERIALS LIST FOR COLORS AND FINISHES.
2. SEE STRUCTURAL DETAILS FOR MORE INFORMATION.

1" STEEL PLATE, SEE STEEL LOUVERS DETAIL
1" STEEL PLATE
RECESS FRONT OF FOUNTAIN TO PROVIDE NEGATIVE EDGE.
INSTALL GLASS TILE AT FOUNTAIN BASE
ADJACENT TERRACE WALL PER PLAN, SEE DETAIL
WATER FEATURE WALL: (2) 2" STEEL PLATES WITH 1" 4" STEEL CAP. FOUNTAIN PLUMBING TO RUN INTERNAL TO WALL.
PROVIDE 1" GAP BETWEEN CAP AND FRONT PLATE TO ALLOW WATER TO SPILL OUT OF WALL.
NOTES:
1. SEE MATERIALS LIST FOR COLORS AND FINISHES.
2. SEE STRUCTURAL DETAILS FOR MORE INFORMATION.

ELEVATION A

ELEVATION B

PLAN VIEW

SHADE CANOPY
CONSTRUCTION PLAN NOTES:

1. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ALL LABOR, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ALL IMPROVEMENTS AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS AND AS DESCRIBED IN THE SPECIFICATIONS.

2. CONTRACTOR SHALL REVIEW ALL EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS PRIOR TO SUBMITTING BID AND PRIOR TO BEGINNING INSTALLATION. IF THE CONTRACTOR DISCOVERS ANY SITE CONDITIONS NOT RECORDED OR DRAWN ON THE PLANS, HE SHALL SO ADVISE THE OWNER'S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE.

3. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR LOCATION AND EXCAVATION OF ALL MAINS, LINES, AND UTILITY LINES SHOWN OR NOT SHOWN THAT MIGHT BE DAMAGED AS A RESULT OF CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS. CONTRACTOR SHALL ASSUME FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL COST INCURRED FOR REPAIR, RESTORATION, OR REPLACEMENT OF ANY UTILITIES DAMAGED AS A RESULT OF CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS.

4. HARDSCAPE AND STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS SHALL BE PLACED PER GEOTECHNICAL SOILS REPORT. IF HARDSCAPE IS CONSIDERED CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE PLACED IN SUITABLE BASES WITH THE OWNER'S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATION.

5. UNLESS DESIGNATED IN THE DRAWINGS OTHERWISE, ALL MATERIALS DESIGNATED FOR REMOVAL SHALL BE DISPOSED OF OFF-SITE.

6. UNLESS DESIGNATED IN THE DRAWINGS OTHERWISE, MATERIALS TO BE PURCHASED AND FURNISHED BY THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE NEW.

7. CONCRETE INDICATED FOR SAWCUTTING AND REMOVAL SHALL BE CUT TO A TRUE LINE WITH NEATLY SAWED EDGES. IF A SAWCUT IS WITHIN THREE (3) FEET OF AN EXISTING EXPANSION JOINT, CONTRACTOR SHALL FURNISH TO THE OWNER'S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE A CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE FOR SUCH FURNISHED MATERIALS.

8. CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS, MANUFACTURER'S CUTS OR DATA SHEETS FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO ORDERING MATERIALS. CONTRACTOR SHALL FURNISH TO THE OWNER'S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATION A CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE FOR ALL FURNISHED MATERIALS.

9. COSTS INCURRED DUE TO REPAIR, RESTORATION, OR REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS DESIGNATED "TO BE PROTECTED" OR "TO REMAIN" WHICH ARE DAMAGE AS A RESULT OF CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR.

10. DEVISATIONS BETWEEN THE DRAWINGS AND ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS SHALL BE BROUGHT TO THE IMMEDIATE ATTENTION OF THE OWNER'S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE.

CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS LIST:

CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE EXAMPLES OF MATERIALS TO LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT FOR APPROVAL PRIOR TO ORDERING UNLESS OTHERWISE DESIGNATED. ALL SAMPLES SHALL BE PRESENTED TO GETTIER ARCHITECT. CONTRACTOR SHALL FURNISH TO THE OWNER'S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATION ALL DESIGNS, DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIALS INDICATED HEREIN ARE THE WORK AND PROPERTY OF STUDIO: G ARCHITECTS. THIS DOCUMENT MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, REUSED OR DISCLOSED BY ANY METHOD WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF STUDIO: G ARCHITECTS. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. C75
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS LIST AND NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHEET TITLE</th>
<th>L2.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHEET NO.</td>
<td>L2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ADDRESS</td>
<td>2450 SAN MIGUEL ROAD, VELOPARK, CA 95110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING SUBMITTAL</td>
<td>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAMP</td>
<td>All designs, drawings, and written materials indicated herein are the work and property of Studio: G Architects. This document may not be duplicated, reused or disclosed by any method without the written consent of Studio: G Architects. All rights reserved. C75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS LIST AND NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHEET TITLE</th>
<th>L2.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHEET NO.</td>
<td>L2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ADDRESS</td>
<td>2450 SAN MIGUEL ROAD, VELOPARK, CA 95110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING SUBMITTAL</td>
<td>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAMP</td>
<td>All designs, drawings, and written materials indicated herein are the work and property of Studio: G Architects. This document may not be duplicated, reused or disclosed by any method without the written consent of Studio: G Architects. All rights reserved. C75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS LIST AND NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHEET TITLE</th>
<th>L2.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHEET NO.</td>
<td>L2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ADDRESS</td>
<td>2450 SAN MIGUEL ROAD, VELOPARK, CA 95110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING SUBMITTAL</td>
<td>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAMP</td>
<td>All designs, drawings, and written materials indicated herein are the work and property of Studio: G Architects. This document may not be duplicated, reused or disclosed by any method without the written consent of Studio: G Architects. All rights reserved. C75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS LIST AND NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHEET TITLE</th>
<th>L2.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHEET NO.</td>
<td>L2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ADDRESS</td>
<td>2450 SAN MIGUEL ROAD, VELOPARK, CA 95110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING SUBMITTAL</td>
<td>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAMP</td>
<td>All designs, drawings, and written materials indicated herein are the work and property of Studio: G Architects. This document may not be duplicated, reused or disclosed by any method without the written consent of Studio: G Architects. All rights reserved. C75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS LIST AND NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHEET TITLE</th>
<th>L2.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHEET NO.</td>
<td>L2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT ADDRESS</td>
<td>2450 SAN MIGUEL ROAD, VELOPARK, CA 95110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING SUBMITTAL</td>
<td>NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAMP</td>
<td>All designs, drawings, and written materials indicated herein are the work and property of Studio: G Architects. This document may not be duplicated, reused or disclosed by any method without the written consent of Studio: G Architects. All rights reserved. C75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMBOL</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>PLANTER PIN LIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>TREE UPLIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>SCULPTURE WASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>PATH LIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>SCONCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CANDIESLIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>SB OUR LINE UPLIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>STEP TO KICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>STEP LIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>RAIL TO KICK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ILLUMINATED RAIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lighting Legend**

- **PLANTER PIN LIGHT**: LUMINARE, VESTA LUMINARE, STAINLESS STEEL, 38 units.
- **TREE UPLIGHT**: BEGA, LS9402LED, STAINLESS STEEL, 40 units.
- **SCULPTURE WASH**: TARGETTI, JUPITER, STAINLESS STEEL, 2 units.
- **PATH LIGHT**: BEGA, PATHWAY BELKAN, BLACK, 9 units.
- **CONCE**: STROMA, SURFACE LIGHT, ANTHRACITE, 8 units.
- **CANDIESLIER**: SIERI, PINK BE, NAPASTE BROWN, 2 units.
- **SB OUR LINE UPLIGHT**: BEGA, LS9402LED, STAINLESS STEEL, 12 units.
- **STEP TO KICK**: BEGA, LUMINAIRE, STAINLESS STEEL, 140 units.
- **STEP LIGHT**: BEGA, LUMINAIRE, STAINLESS STEEL, 6 units.
- **RAIL TO KICK**: BEGA, LUMINAIRE, STAINLESS STEEL, 36 units.
- **ILLUMINATED RAIL**: WAGNER, LUMENLINEAR, STAINLESS STEEL, 180 units.
As indicated on Sheet L3.2, contract to verify existence and functionality of irrigation components. To confirm and not complete installation but not functional. Contractor to install components per irrigation equipment legend on Sheet L3.6.2 and Sheet L3.6.4 - 12.5.2 FM irrigation details. Contractor is responsible for necessary changes to proposed system during construction. Irrigation is being simultaneously for backfill clarity, integral baseline and layout on plant areas when possible.

EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN, TYPICAL. REFER TO TREE PROTECTION DETAIL L0.4A, PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT AND LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.
EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN, TYPICAL.
REFER TO TREE PROTECTION DETAIL L0.4A, PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT AND LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY EXISTENCE AND FUNCTIONALITY OF IRRIGATION COMPONENTS. IF COMPONENTS ARE NOT CURRENTLY INSTALLED OR ARE NOT FUNCTIONING, CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL COMPONENTS PER IRRIGATION EQUIPMENT LEGEND ON SHEETS L3.1-L3.5. SEE SHEETS L3.4 - L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS.

1. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY EXISTENCE AND FUNCTIONALITY OF IRRIGATION COMPONENTS. IF COMPONENTS ARE NOT CURRENTLY INSTALLED OR ARE NOT FUNCTIONING, CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL COMPONENTS PER IRRIGATION EQUIPMENT LEGEND ON SHEETS L3.1-L3.5. SEE SHEETS L3.4 - L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS.

2. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY EXISTENCE AND FUNCTIONALITY OF IRRIGATION COMPONENTS. IF COMPONENTS ARE NOT CURRENTLY INSTALLED OR ARE NOT FUNCTIONING, CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL COMPONENTS PER IRRIGATION EQUIPMENT LEGEND ON SHEETS L3.1-L3.5. SEE SHEETS L3.4 - L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS.

REFERRAL TO L3.1

OVERVIEW

- WATER METER
- PRESSURE REGULATOR
- MASTER VALVE
- FLOW SENSOR
- HEATER SENSOR
- IRRIGATION CONTROLLER
- PVC VALVE
- DRAIN VALVE
- CHECK VALVE
- WEATHER SENSOR
- IRRIGATION CONTROLLER
- PVC BALL VALVE
- DRIP ZONE CONTROL KIT
- QUICK COUPLER VALVE
- ON-GRADE TREE BUBBLER
- NON-PRESSURE LATERAL
- NON-PRESSURE SUPPLY LINE
- PRESSURE SUPPLY MAINLINE
- SLEEVE
- SPRAYING KIT
- DRIPLINE SPACING: 12"
- EMITTER SPACING: 12"
- VALVE TAG: STATION NUMBER
- LINESIZE
- APPROX LENGTH OF DRIP TUBING
- ZONE TYPE

NOTES:

1. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY EXISTENCE AND FUNCTIONALITY OF IRRIGATION COMPONENTS. IF COMPONENTS ARE NOT CURRENTLY INSTALLED OR ARE NOT FUNCTIONING, CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL COMPONENTS PER IRRIGATION EQUIPMENT LEGEND ON SHEETS L3.1-L3.5. SEE SHEETS L3.4 - L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS.

2. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY EXISTENCE AND FUNCTIONALITY OF IRRIGATION COMPONENTS. IF COMPONENTS ARE NOT CURRENTLY INSTALLED OR ARE NOT FUNCTIONING, CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL COMPONENTS PER IRRIGATION EQUIPMENT LEGEND ON SHEETS L3.1-L3.5. SEE SHEETS L3.4 - L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS.

MATERIALS INDICATED HEREIN ARE THE WORK AND PROPERTY OF STUDIO G ARCHITECTS. THIS DOCUMENT MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, REUSED OR DISCLOSED BY ANY METHOD WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF STUDIO G ARCHITECTS. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
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INFORMATION TO VERIFY EXISTENCE AND FUNCTIONALITY OF IRRIGATION COMPONENTS. IF COMPONENTS ARE NOT CURRENTLY INSTALLED OR ARE NOT FUNCTIONING, CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL COMPONENTS PER IRRIGATION EQUIPMENT LEGEND ON SHEETS L3.1-L3.5. SEE SHEETS L3.4 - L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS.

1. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY EXISTENCE AND FUNCTIONALITY OF IRRIGATION COMPONENTS. IF COMPONENTS ARE NOT CURRENTLY INSTALLED OR ARE NOT FUNCTIONING, CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL COMPONENTS PER IRRIGATION EQUIPMENT LEGEND ON SHEETS L3.1-L3.5. SEE SHEETS L3.4 - L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS.

2. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY EXISTENCE AND FUNCTIONALITY OF IRRIGATION COMPONENTS. IF COMPONENTS ARE NOT CURRENTLY INSTALLED OR ARE NOT FUNCTIONING, CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL COMPONENTS PER IRRIGATION EQUIPMENT LEGEND ON SHEETS L3.1-L3.5. SEE SHEETS L3.4 - L3.5 FOR IRRIGATION DETAILS.
25. Landscape contractor to coordinate with general contractor prior to demolition of protection of existing buildings and controller room for future use.

26. The cost to be bid is for any irrigation equipment in the new construction area, landscape contractor shall supply all new plumbing and controller to the site. If necessary, control valves as designed for this plan, typical.

27. Contractor shall install drip and riser pipe for manufacturer’s recommendations with CN irrigation systems on existing building.奖金为15%的美式设计

28. To install lateral, lateral check valves where necessary to prevent low head drainage. Model shall be NDS Flo Control spring check valve.

29. Contractor must provide an irrigation audit in accordance with local WeLO and Title 23 Department of Water Resources Section 492.12.

30. Drainage systems shall be provided by landscape contractor and soil amendments shall be followed for the report. Physical copies of the soil management report shall be provided to client, project landscape architect, and local agency as required. Soil management report shall conform to actual field conditions.

31. Soil management report shall be provided by landscape contractor and soil amendments shall be followed per the report. Physical copies of the soil management report shall be provided to client, project landscape architect, and local agency as required. Soil management report shall conform to actual field conditions.

32. Contracting hands shall be responsible for complete and effective coverage of all planting areas. During the maintenance period, it is the responsibility of the irrigation systems contractor to maintain all plants, irrigation systems, and landscape areas.

33. The irrigation system shall be installed within a planting area whenever possible. Contractor shall be responsible for adjustments necessary for a complete irrigation system.

34. Do not willfully install the irrigation system as shown on the drawings when it is obvious in the field that obstructions, grade differences or differences in the area dimensions exist that might not have been considered in the engineering of the system. Such difficulties shall not be grounds for rejection or claim.

35. Pressure regulators shall be installed on the irrigation system to ensure the dynamic pressure of the system is within the manufacturer’s recommendations.

36. Pressure regulators shall be installed on the irrigation system to ensure the dynamic pressure of the system is within the manufacturer’s recommendations.

37. Main, drain off valves shall be installed as close as possible to the point of connection of the irrigation system.

38. Areas less than 100 (100') feet in extent in any direction shall be irrigated with one source irrigation or other means that produces no damage on property.
1. INSTALLATION SHALL CONFORM WITH ALL LOCAL CODES.
2. INSTALL IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER’S SPECIFICATIONS.
3. SEE INSTALLATION DIAGRAMS FOR MORE DETAILS.

NOTES:
1. INSTALLATION SHALL CONFORM WITH ALL LOCAL CODES.
2. INSTALL IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER’S SPECIFICATIONS.
3. SEE INSTALLATION DIAGRAMS FOR MORE DETAILS.

NOTES:
1. INSTALLATION SHALL CONFORM WITH ALL LOCAL CODES.
2. INSTALL IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER’S SPECIFICATIONS.
3. SEE INSTALLATION DIAGRAMS FOR MORE DETAILS.

NOTES:
1. INSTALLATION SHALL CONFORM WITH ALL LOCAL CODES.
2. INSTALL IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER’S SPECIFICATIONS.
3. SEE INSTALLATION DIAGRAMS FOR MORE DETAILS.

NOTES:
1. INSTALLATION SHALL CONFORM WITH ALL LOCAL CODES.
2. INSTALL IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER’S SPECIFICATIONS.
3. SEE INSTALLATION DIAGRAMS FOR MORE DETAILS.

NOTES:
1. INSTALLATION SHALL CONFORM WITH ALL LOCAL CODES.
2. INSTALL IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER’S SPECIFICATIONS.
3. SEE INSTALLATION DIAGRAMS FOR MORE DETAILS.

NOTES:
1. INSTALLATION SHALL CONFORM WITH ALL LOCAL CODES.
2. INSTALL IN ACCORDANCE WITH MANUFACTURER’S SPECIFICATIONS.
3. SEE INSTALLATION DIAGRAMS FOR MORE DETAILS.
As indicated
09/17/2021

MARKET READY IMPROVEMENTS for
JJ

11/12/2020 HERITAGE TREE PERMIT
SUBMITTAL

05/21/2021 PLANNING RESUBMITTAL

07/20/2021 PLANNING RESUBMITTAL

05/21/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL

07/20/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL

09/17/2021 HERITAGE TREE RESUBMITTAL

09/17/2021 PLANNING RESUBMITTAL

OVERALL TREE PLAN

EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN, TYPICAL.
REFER TO TREE PROTECTION DETAIL, L0.4A, PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT AND LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION. REFER TO DETAILED NOTE, BOTTOM OF TREE PLAN.

PLAN LEGEND

SHRUBS
AGAVE 'BLUE FLAME'
ANIGOZANTHOS 'TEQUILA SUNRISE'
CHONDROPETALUM TECTORUM
DIANELLA 'COOLVISTA'
LOMANDRA 'BREEZE'
LOMANDRA 'TROPIC BELLE'
LEUCADENDRON 'SAFARI SUNSET'
MUHLENBERGIA RIGENS
PITTOSPORUM 'SILVER SHEEN'
CLEMATIS ARMANDII

GROUNDCOVERS
SEDUM 'BLUE SPRUCE'
CAREX PANSA

TREES
ARBUTUS UNEDO
CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS
GINKGO BILOBA 'PRINCETON SENTRY'
OLEA EUROPAEA 'SWAN HILL'
QUERCUS SUBER

NOTE: ALL HERITAGE AND NON-HERITAGE TREES WITHIN THE PROJECT SCOPE TO BE PROTECTED AND PRESERVED PER PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT.

CONTRACTOR TO FOLLOW ALL PRE-CONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION PROTECTION, NOTIFICATION, OBSERVATION AND REPORTING MEASURES AS REQUIRED BY THE CITY OF MENLO PARK AND BY THE PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT.

NOTE: 1. SEE SHEET L4.3 FOR PLANTING LEGEND AND NOTES
2. ALL PLANTING AREAS TO RECEIVE 3" LAYER BARK MULCH.

(R#) NON-HERITAGE REPLACEMENT TREE, TYP. CANOPY SIZE 15' SHOWN. REFER TO L0.4B.

(RH#) HERITAGE REPLACEMENT TREE, TYP. CANOPY SIZE 25' SHOWN. REFER TO L0.4A.

ARCHITECTS
ALL DESIGNS, DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIALS INDICATED HEREIN ARE THE WORK AND PROPERTY OF STUDIO G ARCHITECTS. THIS DOCUMENT MAY NOT BE DUPLICATED, REUSED OR DISCLOSED BY ANY METHOD WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF STUDIO G ARCHITECTS. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
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REVISIONS
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2400 SAND HILL ROAD

NOTES:

1. SEE SHEET L4.0 FOR PLANT LEGEND AND NOTES
2. ALL PLANTING AREAS TO RECEIVE 3" LAYER BARK MULCH.
Refer to L4.2

Plant Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Container Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARB UNE</td>
<td>ARBUTUS UNEDO</td>
<td>48&quot; BOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERC</td>
<td>CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS</td>
<td>48&quot; BOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GINK</td>
<td>GINKGO BILOBA 'PRINCETON SENTRY'</td>
<td>60&quot; BOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLE EUR</td>
<td>OLEA EUROPAEA 'SWAN HILL'</td>
<td>60&quot; BOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUERC</td>
<td>QUERCUS SUBER</td>
<td>60&quot; BOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAV</td>
<td>AGAVE 'BLUE FLAME'</td>
<td>5 GALLON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIG</td>
<td>ANIGOZANTHOS 'TEQUILA SUNRISE'</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHON</td>
<td>CHONDROPETALUM TECTORUM</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAN</td>
<td>DIANELLA 'COOLVISTA'</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOMAR</td>
<td>LOMANDRA 'BREEZE'</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOMAR</td>
<td>LOMANDRA 'TROPIC BELLE'</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEUD</td>
<td>LEUCADENDRON 'SAFARI SUNSET'</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUL</td>
<td>MUHLENBERGIA RIGENS</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIT</td>
<td>PITTOSPORUM 'SILVER SHEEN'</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEM</td>
<td>CLEMATIS ARMANDII</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shrub

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Container Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>R14</td>
<td>1 GALLON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heritage Replacement Trees

1. 48" BOX

Heritage Replacement Tree #1

Heritage Replacement Tree #2

Heritage Replacement Tree #3

Heritage Replacement Tree #4

NEW CURB, TYPICAL. SEE CIVIL PLANS FOR DETAILS.

EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN, TYPICAL. REFER TO TREE PROTECTION DETAIL L0.4A, PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT AND LANDSCAPE SPECIFICATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

MARKET READY IMPROVEMENTS for 1 HERITAGE REPLACEMENT TREE #3.

REFER TO TREE PROTECTION DETAIL L0.4A.
PLANTING PLAN NOTES:

1. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ALL LABOR, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT NECESSARY TO FURNISH AND INSTALL PLANT MATERIAL AS SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS AND AS DESCRIBED IN THE SPECIFICATIONS.

2. UNLESS DESIGNATED ON THE DRAWINGS OTHERWISE, STRUCTURAL IMPROVEMENTS AND HARDSCAPE SHALL BE INSTALLED PRIOR TO PLANTING OPERATIONS.

3. PLANT LIST ON THE DRAWINGS SHALL BE USED AS A GUIDE ONLY. CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKEOFF AND VERIFY SIZES AND QUANTITIES BY PLAN CHECK.

4. A SOIL MANAGEMENT REPORT SHALL BE PROVIDED BY CONTRACTOR AND SOIL AMENDMENTS SHALL BE PLACED IN THE SOIL AS REQUIRED. PHYSICAL COPY OF THE SOIL MANAGEMENT REPORT SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE CLIENT, PROJECT LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT, AND LOCAL AGENCY AS REQUIRED. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY THAT SOIL AMENDMENTS ARE APPLIED PER SPECIFICATIONS AND RECORD INFORMATION ON THE SOIL MANAGEMENT REPORT.

5. SAMPLES OF GROUND COVER, PLANT LEGEND, SOIL, AND HARDSCAPE MATERIALS SHALL BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO COMMISSIONING. CONTRACTOR SHALL FURNISH TO THE OWNER’S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE A CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE FOR SUCH SUBMITTED MATERIALS.

6. ALL WORK ON THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM, INCLUDING HYDROSTATIC, COVERAGE, AND OPERATIONAL TESTS AND THE BACKFILLING AND COMPACTION OF TRENCHES SHALL BE PERFORMED PRIOR TO PLANT INSTALLATION.

7. LOCATIONS OF PLANT MATERIAL SHALL BE REVIEWED ON SITE BY THE OWNER’S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.

8. TREES SHALL BE PLANTED NO CLOSER THAN TEN (10) FEET FROM EXISTING UTILITIES AND NO CLOSER THAN FIVE (5) FEET FROM NEW UTILITIES.

9. TREES PLANTED WITHIN FIVE (5) FEET OF HARDSCAPE OR STRUCTURES SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A ROOT BARRIER AS APPROVED BY THE OWNER’S AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE.

10. CONTRACTOR MUST CONTACT THE CITY OF MENLO PARK ARBORIST TO VERIFY SPECIES (EVEN IF SHOWN ON THE PLANS), LOCATIONS, AND QUANTITIES OF ALL STREET TREES PRIOR TO ORDERING MATERIAL. IF STREET TREES ARE TO BE PLANTED IN TREE WELLS, FINAL LOCATION OF TREE WELLS SHALL BE REVIEWED IN THE FIELD BY THE CITY OF MENLO PARK ARBORIST AND CONTRACTOR PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.

11. PLANT MATERIAL SHALL BE SELECTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AMERICAN STANDARD FOR NURSERY STOCK (ANSI Z60.1). FOR STANDARD FORM TREES, CALIPER SIZE SHALL BE MEASURED 6" ABOVE THE SOIL LINE FOR CALIPERS EQUAL TO OR LESS THAN 4". FOR CALIPERS GREATER THAN 4" CALIPER SHALL BE MEASURED 12" ABOVE THE SOIL LINE. FOR MULTI-TRUNK TREES THE CALIPER SHALL BE ESTABLISHED BY TAKING THE AVERAGE OF THE CALIPER OF THE TWO LARGEST TRUNKS OR 6" ABOVE THE ORIGINATION POINT OF THE SECOND LARGEST TRUNK OR 6" ABOVE GROUND IF ALL TRUNKS ORIGINATE FROM THE SOIL.

CALIPER SIZE STANDARDS:
- 15 GALLON: 0.75 - 1.25"
- 24" BOX: 1.25 - 2"
- 36" BOX: 2 - 3.5"
- 48" BOX: 3.5 - 5"
- 5 GALLON: 1 GALLON
- 1 GALLON

12. ALL PLANTING AREAS TO RECEIVE 3" THICK BARK MULCH LAYER. IN THE EVENT THAT BARK MULCH EXISTS ON SITE, CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE SAMPLE OF THE EXISTING BARK MULCH FOR APPROVAL. OTHERWISE, BARK MULCH SHALL BE UNDERSIZED FOR BARK (1" TO 1.25"") OR APPROVED EQUIL.

13. ALL HERITAGE AND NON-HERITAGE TREES WITHIN THE PROJECT SCOPE TO BE PROTECTED AND PRESERVED PER PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT. CONTRACTOR TO FOLLOW ALL PRE-CONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION PROTECTION, NOTIFICATION, OBSERVATION AND REPORTING MEASURES AS REQUIRED BY THE CITY OF MENLO PARK AND BY THE PROJECT ARBORIST REPORT.
PLANTING DETAILS

NOTES:
1. SEE LEGEND
2. INSTALL ORDER OF PLANTING 1 "MOUS
   BEFORE FINISH GRADE

A. PLANTING

NOTES:
1. THREE PLANTED SETTERS 5" BY ARMSCREW IN
   BURLAP, SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A ROOT
   BARRIER.
2. THREE PLANTED SETTERS 10" BY ARMSCREW, IN
   BURLAP, SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A ROOT
   BARRIER.
3. AT SIDE OF HARDSCAPE, INSTALL 1" "DEEP
   ROOT" CONTROL, BARRELS, 27" IN DIAMETER
   (STICKS), INSTALL 30" "DEEP ROOT" CONTROL, BARRELS, 47" IN
   DIAMETER. (STICKS), INSTALL 30" "DEEP ROOT" CONTROL, BARRELS, 47" IN
   DIAMETER. (STICKS), INSTALL 30" "DEEP ROOT" CONTROL, BARRELS, 47" IN
   DIAMETER. (STICKS), INSTALL 30" "DEEP ROOT" CONTROL, BARRELS, 47" IN
   DIAMETER. (STICKS), INSTALL 30" "DEEP ROOT" CONTROL, BARRELS, 47" IN
   DIAMETER. (STICKS), INSTALL 30" "DEEP ROOT" CONTROL, BARRELS, 47" IN
   DIAMETER. (STICKS), INSTALL 30" "DEEP ROOT" CONTROL, BARRELS, 47" IN
   DIAMETER. (STICKS), INSTAL

B. ROOT BARRIER

NOTES:
1. PLANTS TO BE PLANTED IN TRIANGULAR
   SPACING UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED ON
   PLANTING PLAN. 
2. PLANTS TO BE PLANTED IN SQUARE
   SPACING AT CORNER
3. PLANTS TO BE PLANTED IN DIAGONAL
   SPACING ON HARDSCAPING, SHOULDER SHARP EDGES
   SPACING CONSISTENT WITH ADJACENT SHARP EDGES.

GROUNDCOVER SPACING

1/2 PLANT SPACING PLUS 6" CENTER OF PLANT, SEE PLANTING PLAN FOR SPACING

PLANTING LEGEND

1. PLANTS TO BE PLANTED
2. HERITAGE TREE PLANTED
3. PLANTING AREA
4. TURFJOINTS
5. NETWORK
6. EMBANKMENT
7. 1/2 PLANT SPACING
8. PLANT CENTER
9. DEPTH OF ROOTBALL
10. TREE, SEE LEGEND
11. PLANTING AREA
12. 2X DIAMETER OF ROOTBALL
13. 6" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
14. 3" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
15. 1" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
16. 1/2" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
17. 1/4" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
18. 1/8" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
19. 1/16" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
20. 1/32" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
21. 1/64" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
22. 1/128" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
23. 1/256" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
24. 1/512" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND
25. 1/1024" GROUNDCOVER, SEE LEGEND

TREES

1. TREES PLANTED WITHIN 5' OF HARDSCAPE OR
   STRUCTURES SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH A ROOT
   BARRIER.
2. TREES PLANTED WITHIN 10' OF WATER, STORM,
   AND SEWER UTILITIES SHALL BE INSTALLED
   WITH A ROOT BARRIER.
3. AT EDGE OF HARDSCAPE, INSTALL 18" 'DEEP ROOT'
   CONTROL BARRIER.
4. AT BACK OF CURB, INSTALL 24" 'DEEP ROOT'
   CONTROL BARRIER. IF WITHIN 6' OF
   WATER/SEWER UTILITIES, INSTALL 36" 'DEEP ROOT'
   CONTROL BARRIER.
5. NO ROOT BARRIERS SHALL BE WITHIN 5' FROM
   WATER AND SEWER LATERALS.
The Owner may at any time prior to acceptance of the work, by written order to the Contractor, make certain changes in the work and the specifications therefor. The Contractor shall then execute such changes as may be directed by the Owner within the limits of the original contract sum, or, if so directed by the Owner, the Contractor shall execute the changes subject to a new or revised contract sum. The Owner shall not be required to make a new or revised contract sum if the cost of the work, as increased by the changes, is less than the amount of the original contract sum.

The Contractor shall abate dust nuisance by cleaning, sweeping and sprinkling with water, or other means as necessary, and shall save the Owner free and harmless against damage to the project or any other property at the site or adjacent thereto, such as trees, shrubs, lawns, or other real property rights of the public.

The Contractor shall furnish such samples of all materials as requested by the Owner without charge. Labor and equipment necessary for the furnishing of such samples shall be furnished at the Contractor's expense.

LABOR AND MATERIALS

The Contractor shall furnish and pay for all labor, materials, and equipment to be furnished by the Contractor.

MATERIALS, PARTS AND EQUIPMENT

Materials, parts and equipment to be furnished by the Contractor shall be new, unless otherwise specified in these specifications, and of a quality, design, and approval by the Owner or Landscape Architect, an alternate article or material may be utilized.

The Contractor shall furnish and pay for all labor, materials, and equipment to be furnished by the Contractor.

The Contractor shall furnish the Owner with a certificate of compliance stating that the materials substantially meet the specifications.

The Contractor shall keep at the project site a copy of the drawings and specifications, and all other documents which are part of the contract documents with reasonable promptness and in such sequence or to cause no inconvenience to the construction of the work.

The Contractor shall so conduct operations as to offer the least possible disturbance to the public and property, the Contractor shall keep the project site clean and free from rubbish and debris.

The Contractor shall prepare and execute the work in such a manner as to provide for the least possible disturbance to the public and property.

The Contractor shall be responsible for initiating, maintaining and supervising the performance of all bench marks, monuments and other reference points shall remain undisturbed.
E. UNSUITABLE MATERIALS

Unsuitable materials as determined by the Owner shall be removed from the project site by the responsibility of the Contractor.

A. GENERAL

Contractor shall provide all labor, materials and equipment to construct surfaces from an approved list on the drawings and specified herein.

Concrete shall be of the same brand and type used throughout the project. Cement shall be Type II low alkali portland cement conforming to ASTM C-150, and shall conform to ASTM C-90 for Grade N-1 units, free of cracks or defects. Reinforcement shall conform to the dimensions and details shown on the drawings and specified herein. No aggregate shall be used in concrete that will cause the concrete to react with the reinforcing steel.

Concrete finishes shall be as indicated on the drawings and specified herein. No aggregate shall be used in concrete that will cause the concrete to react with the reinforcing steel.

Concrete shall be made from an approved list of materials on the materials list. Mixing shall be accomplished in the Contractor's equipment in accordance with the Specifications. Cement shall be thoroughly and uniformly washed. Plaster sand is unacceptable for play areas. Samples should be submitted prior to project order for approval.

Contractor shall provide all labor, materials and equipment for furnishing, installing, testing and following through with any newly constructed pavement, roadway and sidewalks in accordance with the Specifications. Contractors shall perform a test sample for approval prior to completing the work.

a. Subgrade shall be thoroughly prepared and compacted to the required elevation. Subgrade shall be tested using a compaction technique for acceptance.

b. No aggregate shall be used in concrete that will cause the concrete to react with the reinforcing steel.

c. Reinforcing steel shall be of the same brand and type used throughout the project. Reinforcement shall be Grade 40 or Grade 60 billet steel conforming to ASTM A-615.

D. SAND FOR SURFACE AREAS

Sand for surface areas shall consist of natural or manufactured granular material. Fine sand, subangular amounts of organic materials, brakes, glass, and other foreign materials shall not be used for areas subject to traffic. Sand shall be clean, free of any deleterious material, sufficiently dampened to ensure that no moisture will be absorbed from the fresh concrete. Sand shall be thoroughly washed. Metal forms shall have sufficient rigidity to resist springing during placement of concrete. Sand shall be delivered to the site, spread, compacted and finished in accordance with the drawings.

E. DECOMPOSED GRANITE

Decomposed granite shall be the product of crushing rock or gravel; clean, hard, angular or subangular in shape; well-graded with little or no fines; free of any deleterious material; sufficient to ensure uniformity of placement; blended and proportioned as indicated on the drawings and specified herein. Subgrade shall be prior tested and compacted to the required elevation. Decomposed granite shall be placed after concrete has cured a minimum of one day and shall be thoroughly washed and compacted to the required elevation.

Contractor shall provide all labor, materials and equipment to construct masonry areas as indicated on the drawings and specified herein. Mortar shall be of the same type and color used throughout the project. Mortar shall contain not more than one part hydrated lime or lime putty and not more than one part mica. The color of the mortar shall be as indicated on the drawings and specified herein. Mortar shall be made from a mastic of sand, lime, and water, free of any deleterious material, consistent in quality, free of any debris. Mortar shall be of the same color and consistency at its source as it is received at its destination.

Contractor shall provide all labor, materials and equipment to construct masonry areas as indicated on the drawings and specified herein. Mortar shall be of the same type and color used throughout the project. Mortar shall contain not more than one part hydrated lime or lime putty and not more than one part mica. The color of the mortar shall be as indicated on the drawings and specified herein. Mortar shall be made from a mastic of sand, lime, and water, free of any deleterious material, consistent in quality, free of any debris. Mortar shall be of the same color and consistency at its source as it is received at its destination.

Contractor shall provide all labor, materials and equipment to construct masonry areas as indicated on the drawings and specified herein. Mortar shall be of the same type and color used throughout the project. Mortar shall contain not more than one part hydrated lime or lime putty and not more than one part mica. The color of the mortar shall be as indicated on the drawings and specified herein. Mortar shall be made from a mastic of sand, lime, and water, free of any deleterious material, consistent in quality, free of any debris. Mortar shall be of the same color and consistency at its source as it is received at its destination.

Contractor shall provide all labor, materials and equipment to construct masonry areas as indicated on the drawings and specified herein. Mortar shall be of the same type and color used throughout the project. Mortar shall contain not more than one part hydrated lime or lime putty and not more than one part mica. The color of the mortar shall be as indicated on the drawings and specified herein. Mortar shall be made from a mastic of sand, lime, and water, free of any deleterious material, consistent in quality, free of any debris. Mortar shall be of the same color and consistency at its source as it is received at its destination.
C90

WROUGHT IRON OR TUBULAR STEEL FENCING

Contractor shall provide expansion joints at corners and at thirty feet (30’) on each side of stock. metal type shall be galvanized, stainless steel, and zinc coated. for each vertical. Vertical bars connecting stock shall be filled with cement or concrete.

E. CEMENT PLIERS

Spaced and turned setting bed to a uniform thickness, except for minor variations required to produce a true surface, level in plane or uniformly spread for wood. Joints shall be filled with grout that is compatible with the metal type and shall be properly compacted.

F. MINORITY CONTROL

Product shall be Beiträglich Control as manufactured by Bev Eros or an approved equivalent.

G. MATERIALS IN MANUFACTURER’S ORIGINAL WRAPED CONTAINERS.

Wax and application method shall be as recommended by the manufacturer.

H. SAWCUT

Pool shall provide all labor, materials, and equipment necessary to perform and finish all necessary tasks, including all necessary tools, supplies, and equipment.

I. MATERIALS LIST

Within fifteen (15) calendar days after award of Contract and prior to commencement of work, the Contractor shall submit to the Owner a list of materials including the manufacturer, description, model number and installation data.

J. WORKMANSHIP

This section does not include reinforcing steel for concrete and masonry or items or workmanship shall be the responsibility of the Contractor.

K. QUALITY ASSURANCE

All labor and state laws, rules and regulations governing or relating to any portion of the irrigation system are hereby incorporated into and made a part of these specifications. Owner, if any, specifications shall be as indicative of the standard and requirements of the project. Reference shall be made to the project that the gouging shall not be due to any carelessness or to any lack of reasonable care on the part of the Contractor. Zinc used for galvanizing shall be grade Prime Western conforming to ASTM B-6. Materials shall be galvanized by the hot-dip method or electrodepositing process. Properized shall be performed after fabrication and prior to assembling component parts.
P. IRRIGATION HEADS

A. General

1. Irrigation heads shall be of the manufacturer, size, type, and rate of discharge as specified on the Irrigation Legend on the drawings.
2. Before installation, all heads shall be checked to verify proper specification, pressure, and discharge as specified on the Irrigation Legends.

B. identified by spraying “ID” on the valve box cover. Plastic pipe shall be protected from tool damage during assembly.

C. Diameter from two (2) permanent points of reference (buildings, monuments, paved areas, etc) to the location of the following items:

D. Prevent passive animals from entering the system.

E. Backflow prevention units shall be factory assembled and shall be as indicated in the same size as the riser opening in the irrigation head.

F. PVC pipe shall be installed below grade as indicated in the details on the drawings, in lockable valve boxes manufactured by Carson, Brooks, Fraser, Ametek, or approved equal.

G. Handle and inspect irrigation heads prior to installation on the irrigation lines. The backflow shall be tested.

H. PVC used to make joints shall be made in accordance with ASTM F 1817. PVC pipe shall also be supported or secured prior to backfilling and regrouting.

I. Victaulic style backflow preventer shall be used as noted on all threaded PVC to make joints.

J. Valve box and fittings shall be assembled using Victaulic clips, applied to the main pipe ends to ensure a proper seal and the fitting.

K. Irrigation pipes and control piping shall be installed above ground on separate PVC schedules 40-60. elbows shall be installed with the degree of the fitting in accordance with manufacturer’s recommendations.

L. Isolation valves (ball) shall be as indicated in the Irrigation Legend on the drawings.

M. Anti-drain valves shall be installed in accordance with manufacturer’s recommendations.

N. Male pipe threads shall be coated lubricant and inserted male end according to manufacturer’s recommendations.

O. Pressure test shall demonstrate that each station area is balanced to provide uniform supply to each controller. For two-wire systems, each controller shall have a

PLANTING

A. GENERAL

1. Plant material shall be in accordance with the State Department of Agriculture’s following standards:

   a. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length.
   b. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   c. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   d. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   e. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   f. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   g. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   h. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   i. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   j. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   k. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   l. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   m. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   n. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   o. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   p. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   q. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   r. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   s. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   t. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   u. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   v. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   w. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   x. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   y. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
   z. All grounding rods shall be bare copper of 5/8” diameter or greater, and 8’ in length for the smaller grade.
E. SPECIALTY SODS INCLUDING NATIVE, MOW FREE (“NO-MOW”), AND BIOFILTRATION SOD

Fertilizers shall comply with applicable requirements of the State Agricultural Code and shall be packaged, first grade, commercial quality products identified as to source, type of material, weight and manufacturer’s guaranteed analysis.

Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall be approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Control Board. Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall not be damaged after delivery and transported in a manner that will protect it from excessive moisture or drying out.

Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall be approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Control Board. Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall not be damaged after delivery and transported in a manner that will protect it from excessive moisture or drying out.

Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall be approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Control Board. Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall not be damaged after delivery and transported in a manner that will protect it from excessive moisture or drying out.

Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall be approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Control Board. Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall not be damaged after delivery and transported in a manner that will protect it from excessive moisture or drying out.

Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall be approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Control Board. Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall not be damaged after delivery and transported in a manner that will protect it from excessive moisture or drying out.

Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall be approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Control Board. Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall not be damaged after delivery and transported in a manner that will protect it from excessive moisture or drying out.

Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall be approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board San Francisco Bay Region Municipal Stormwater Control Board. Biotreament soil for projects located within the Small MS4s (Municipal Separate Stormwater Systems) shall not be damaged after delivery and transported in a manner that will protect it from excessive moisture or drying out.
Project Address: 2450 SAND HILL ROAD MENLO PARK, 94025

Purpose of the Proposal:
Purpose of the project is to create a new entrance to an office building, and separate an existing buildings into two buildings to generate an improved courtyard. These improvements are designed to generate new leasing opportunities, compliment the existing architectural style, and elevate the outdoor spaces of the campus.

Scope of Work:
Exterior Demolition: Removal of existing facade, windows, walls, balconies, stairs, hardscape and landscape. Remove and relocate some existing and reserved parking stalls to accommodate new landscape layout. Interior Demolition: Removal of existing walls, doors, ceiling, lights, restrooms, finishes, stairs and elevator.

Parking: The revised entry design and upgrade to the ADA parking stalls on-site caused the need to relocate parking stalls. The deck at the front of the building encroaches into an area previously occupied by landscape reserve parking stalls. Those parking stalls were relocated to the roundabout circle at the front of building 2400. The ADA parking stalls were widened to match current code standards. This caused the number of standard parking stalls to decrease. The parking lot was widened and parking stalls were added to offset any decrease in parking. The net number of parking stalls for both standard and landscape reserve is zero. Interior New Construction: New open office space for potential tenants.

Architectural Style, Materials, Colors and Construction Methods:
The building retains distinctive characteristics associated with Modern Era Ranch architecture during the 1960s.
The proposed new facade will compliment the existing architectural character of the adjacent buildings, and will match existing adjacent building’s style, material, color and construction method.

Existing Architectural Style
The subject building is a two story office building. It is rectangular in shape and has pitched roof with varying heights. It has several balconies and stairs leading from the building. The neighborhood is composed of other office building with consistent character and sizing. The exterior finish of the building is painted board and batten siding with a stucco finish at the basement and portions of the 1st floor.

Proposed Architectural Style
The project is designed to retain the architectural style and character of the existing building. It will retain the rectangular shape of the building and varying heights of roof. There will be new stairs that will match the other stairs on the campus. The exterior finishes with be matching board and batten, stucco and steel siding.
Existing Building on the campus

Existing entrance at 2400

Existing entrance at 2440

Existing entrance at 2420

Existing entrance at 2450 (area of work)

New entrance at 2450

Northeast entrance at 2450

Southeast facade at 2450
### Proposed New Design

![Image of a modern building with annotations]

### Existing Paint Finishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Light Beige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim</td>
<td>Light Beige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaves</td>
<td>Light Beige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns</td>
<td>Dark Beige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beams/Rafters</td>
<td>Dark Beige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railings</td>
<td>Dark Beige</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Finishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong>  Wall Panel Cladding</td>
<td>Blackened Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong>  Glazing</td>
<td>Low E Clear Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong>  Wall Finish</td>
<td>Board &amp; Batten, Painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong>  Wall Finish</td>
<td>Smooth Stucco, Painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong>  Deck &amp; Roof Eaves</td>
<td>IPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong>  Trellis</td>
<td>IPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong>  Door &amp; Window Frames</td>
<td>Black Steel, Dark Bronze Anodized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong>  Exterior Paint</td>
<td>Wall Paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong>  Roofing</td>
<td>Shake Roof, Campus Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Neighborhood Outreach:**
An outreach letter has been emailed from Quadrus management to 2500 Sand Hill Road property and all Quadrus tenants to inform them about upcoming project at 2400 Sand Hill Road. No response has been received from 2500 Sand Hill Road property and Quadrus tenants.

See following for content of the emails sent to Quadrus tenants and 2500 Sand Hill Road property.

**Neighborhood Outreach Letter to 2500 Sand Hill Road Management:**

**From:** Molly Jacobs <MJacobs@divcowest.com>
**Sent:** Monday, April 05, 2021 5:43 PM
**To:** Helaine Adams
**Cc:** Quadrus Management Office
**Subject:** Upcoming Construction: 2400 Renovation
**Attachments:** QUADRUS SITE MAP_2400 Reno.pdf

Hi Helaine,

I hope this email finds you well. We are planning to renovate the southern portion of the 2400 building and the City asked us to reach out to our neighbors at 2500 to keep everyone informed. I have marked the approximate location that will be renovated on the attached Site Map. The construction should not affect your tenants and is far enough away that noise will likely not be an issue. But as always if you have any questions or concerns, please let us know.

Best,

Molly Jacobs
Assistant Property Manager

O 650.324.6842  2440 SAND HILL ROAD, SUITE 201
C 912.547.1088  MENLO PARK, CA 94025

DIVCOWEST
Invested in the power of place. Inspired by the energy of people.
WWW.DIVCOWEST.COM
Dear Tenants,

This is to inform you that we are planning to renovate the southern portion of the 2400 building later this year, contingent on receiving a permit from the City of Menlo Park. We have marked the approximate location that will be renovated on the attached Site Map. The construction should not affect your daily operations, but there may occasionally be some noisy work. As always if you have any questions or concerns, please let us know. We will keep you updated on the status of this project as we get a better understanding of the construction schedule.

We hope you all are doing well and look forward to seeing you all soon.

Thank you,

Property Management

This message sent by Philip Huynh (phuynh) using Building Engines (Broadcast #2303184515)
Hi Matt,

Per your request, below is the email sent by DivcoWest to the property owner / management team at 675 Sharon Park.

Let me know if you need any additional information.

Thanks.

---

Hi Jen,

I hope this email finds you well. We are planning to renovate the western portion of the 2400 Sand Hill building and the City asked us to reach out to our neighbors to keep everyone informed on the project. I have marked the approximate location that will be renovated on the attached Site Map. If you have any questions or concerns, please let us know.
Best,

Molly Jacobs  
(She/Her)  
Property Manager  

O  650.324.6842  2440 SAND HILL ROAD, SUITE 201  
C  912.547.1088  MENLO PARK, CA 94025  

DIVCOWEST  
Invested in the power of place. Inspired by the energy of people.  
WWW.DIVCOWEST.COM  

Please note new property management e-mail addresses: 
2400-2498 Sand Hill: thequad@sandhillcollection.com  
www.sandhillcollection.com  

This message may contain confidential or privileged information and is intended only for the party named above. If you are not the addressee, you must not use, copy, disclose or take any action based on the information herein. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this message in error and delete this message from your system. This message is for information purposes only and is not an offer to sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy any security. Any performance information provided is estimated and unaudited; no representation or warranty is made to, and no reliance should be placed on, the fairness, accuracy, completeness or timeliness of the information contained herein. Any investment strategy entered into for potential profit also involves risk of loss. For more information regarding how we collect and process personal information, please visit our Privacy Policy.
Techcon Corp.
Attn: Julie Johnstone

via email to jjohnstone@techconcorp.com

RE: 2400 Sand Hill Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Date: 8/27/21

ARBORIST REPORT
and
TREE PROTECTION REPORT

Arborist Report

- Provide an update to our report of 8/9/19 reinspecting all trees previously inspected.
- Provide a Tree ID Chart for all trees found within the project limits, listed alphabetically by botanical name and with a photograph.
- Locate all trees on a plan. Coordinate field locations with BKF’s survey.
- Prepare an Arborist Report:
  - Visit the Project Site to evaluate all trees within the project limits and trees that overlap to be partly within the project limits.
  - Install tree tags and label tree sites on a plan or survey.
  - Determine tree health, viability and hazard potential.
  - Provide an evaluation of soil horticultural properties (physical, chemical and drainage) to typify the site at large and determine tree root depth. Site observations, testing and/or research of soil survey data may be utilized.
- Prepare an Arborist Report for Tree Protection for trees within areas that are impacted by construction. The Tree Protection Plan will include and reference the City specifications, but will be adapted to this project and may be expanded, as needed.

Background

The Quadrus property hosts a conference center and commercial office space. The owners plan to remodel the 2400 building to occupy roughly the same footprint but will be taller than the existing construction.

As the property is quite large and includes extensive smaller ornamental plantings, only trees regulated as heritage trees by Menlo Park around the proposed work zone were inventoried, along with select non-heritage trees that the owners are interested in preserving. Heritage trees are defined as any tree larger than 15” DBH (diameter at breast height), native oak trees larger than 10” DBH, certain tree designated by the City Council,
and multi-stemmed trees measuring larger than 15” diameter at the point where the stems merge. Tree Management Experts has been designated as the Project Arborist for purposes of redevelopment of this site.

The City of Menlo Park has required a complete reinspection and update to this report.

The following documents were reviewed for this report:

- The Site Survey updated April 11, 2019, prepared by BKF Engineers.
- A set of site plans and design options provided by HKS, Inc.
- The Plan Set for Planning Submittal, Civil and Architectural drawings, by StudioG and siTe dated 7/20/2021.

Observations

The area around the work site is intentionally landscaped to resemble a mature grove with individual trees and groves of conifers scattered throughout, giving the feel of a native landscape.

The largest trees on and adjacent to the site are Italian stone pines (*Pinus pinea*). As is typical for mature trees of the species, they have large spreading crowns. The limb structure is over-extended and end-heavy, where the majority of the interior foliage has been stripped out. In addition, these trees have large bark inclusions, basal, defects, and weak attachments.

Old pre-tensioned steel cables are in some trees, and at least one of these has failed. Some newer Cobra cable systems have been installed, all of which are un-tensioned and are therefore ineffective at reducing the chances of limb failures.

The Monterey pines (*Pinus radiata*) on site are all infected with pine pitch canker (*Fusarium circinatum*), a pathogenic fungus that incrementally kills limbs and tops, leaving dangerous weak wood in the canopy that can cause injuries and property damage when it fails. As the disease progresses, the sap or pitch attracts bark beetles to the trees that then kill the whole tree.

The smaller native oaks on site are generally in good condition. The large coast live oaks (*Quercus agrifolia*) on the east side of the property (tags #6 & 11) have advanced decay in them. Tree #11 has been ineffectively cabled in a way that will not help to prevent failure. The large coast live oaks on the west side of the building are slightly overextended, but not hazardous. Trees #22 and #51 are dying and should be removed. Tree #9 was dying at the time of our original inspection and has since been removed by being cut flush with the deck it grows through.

The other ornamental trees on site are generally in good condition.
A total of 66 trees were inventoried on this property. Of these trees, 49 were heritage trees. 32 inventoried trees are outside of the current scope, 25 of which are Heritage Trees. This leaves 34 trees in the current scope of work, of which 24 are heritage trees. Each tree was assigned a number that corresponds to those used on the Landscape Site Plan and the tree tags affixed to the trees in the field. The data for tree identification, defects, and recommendations are listed in the attached data table.

Site and Soil Conditions

The site appears to have characteristic Accelerator-Fagan-Urban loam to clay-loam soil that is reasonably undisturbed, except where buildings and hardscaping have been built. Characteristic loam to clay loam soils in this area are well drained, percolate water at a moderate speed with high runoff and are fairly deep (29-41 in). Rock outcroppings exist on the upper part of the site and indicate fairly shallow soils in that area.

When this soil is wet, equipment cannot be operated within any TPZ area without causing a separation of coarse particles from fine particles, a process that causes compaction and formation of layers, and destroys the natural soil pore space and thus horticultural properties of the soil.

Discussion

Planned construction will require the removal of several ornamental trees to accommodate improvements such as a parking garage ramp and ADA ramps. The owners are also concerned about structural conflicts with new taller buildings and establishing views from the new construction.

The Italian stone pines on and around the site are fully matured and have been pruned poorly over the years. The way that interior foliage has been stripped out of trees means that the branches cannot be effectively reduced to lateral limbs to reduce the end-weight on the trees. The structure of the scaffolds and the bark inclusions, as well as other defects combined with the end-heavy limbs lead to a high risk for limb failures.

The Italian stone pines’ high likelihood for limb failure was clearly recognized in the past, as the cobra systems in trees indicate. However, the use of these systems will not help to prevent failures, as they hang slack, and will not distribute dynamic loading to other parts of the affected trees during weather events. Further, installing conventional steel cables with through-hardware will not effectively mitigate the risk, as there are not stable parts of the tree to secure these to. Because of the high risk of failure in multiple parts each tree and with multiple failure scenarios, there is no means to mitigate or reduce risk through use of a supplemental support system.
Many of the Italian stone pines comprise groves where their canopies are interdependent. The removal of single trees or significant pruning would expose remaining trees to new wind loading and significantly increase the risk of failure.

The Monterey pines are declining due to pine pitch canker (*Fusarium circinatum*) infestation and should be removed since they present a hazard that will continue to increase as the trees die back.

The large coast live oak tagged #6 has a form that can be effectively pruned to reduce the risk of failures and confine branch failures to landscape areas of the property that are not used by pedestrians due to the slope. However the tree is declining and will present larger risks as time passes.

The large coast live oak tagged #11 has an ineffective cabling arrangement and during our visit showed *Armillaria mellea* fungal fruiting bodies at its base. There is also evidence of newer surface decay and bark dieback, the low spreading form of the scaffold limbs puts a large load on the attachments at the base of the tree, precisely where this decay is centered. This risk cannot be effectively mitigated with pruning or a supplemental support system.

The other native oaks on site can be effectively managed with regular maintenance pruning and structural pruning.

The other ornamental trees on site likewise can be effectively managed using regular maintenance pruning and structural training.

Maintenance on the trees should be carried out per the attached data table, including the removal of 21 trees, 19 which are Heritage Trees and will require Tree Removal Permits. This is a general recommendation for the site as a whole and does not apply to the specific project of interest here.

The Project itself will necessitate the removal of 12 inventoried trees, 8 of which are Heritage Trees and will require Tree Removal Permits.

Heritage Trees for removal have been labeled by tying fluorescent yellow flagging tape going all the way around at least one stem each tree. This flagging may have been removed in the intervening time since our inspection.

All previously inventoried Heritage Trees on site were appraised. Tree appraisals were carried out using the Trunk Formula Technique from the *Guide for Plant Appraisal* (10th ed.), also according to industry standards. These appraisals do not include removal/treatment, replacement, or aftercare costs, as this would require damage to have occurred and a mitigation method to be determined (as found in Functional Replacement, Repair, or Reproduction Methods). As no damage or casualty has occurred, only the depreciated reproduction cost for each tree was used to determine the appraised value. Base values for
replacement were drawn from the *Western Chapter ISA: Species Classification and Group Assignments* (2004) with inflation adjustments for costs applied. Once mitigation for a specific casualty is determined, the additional costs of that treatment could be added to a tree’s appraised value.

The update to this report did not significantly change any of our analyses or findings.
Tree Protection

Project Arborist & Periodic Inspections

PROJECT ARBORIST

The Project Arborists for this project shall be:

Tree Management Experts
MP Business License No: 71214

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ISA Cert. #</th>
<th>Phone #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Wang</td>
<td>MW-5597A</td>
<td>847.630.3599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy C. Leggitt, III</td>
<td>WE-0564A</td>
<td>415.606.3610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MONTHLY INSPECTIONS

The Project Arborist shall make periodic inspections on a not less than four-week interval to assess and monitor the effectiveness of the Tree Protection Plan and to provide recommendations for any additional care or treatment.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Any damage to trees due to construction activities shall be reported to the Project Arborist or City Arborist within six hours so that remedial action can be taken. The Project Arborist shall be responsible for the preservation of the designated trees. Should the builder fail to follow the tree protection specifications, it shall be the responsibility of the Project Arborist to report the matter to the City Arborist as an issue of non-compliance.

In addition, after each construction monitoring visit, the Project Arborist shall provide a follow-up letter to the city with an assessment of the severity of impacts and confirming whether mitigation has been completed to specification. If the Project Arborist determines that the structural integrity of the trees has been compromised or the long-term viability of the trees has been compromised, then the trees should be removed and appropriate mitigation should be provided.

Any tree on site protected by the Menlo Park Municipal Code will require replacement according to its appraised value if it is damaged beyond repair as a result of construction activities.
Construction Procedures

**PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES**

Do Not:

- a. Allow run off of spillage of damaging materials into the area below any tree canopy.
- b. Store materials, stockpile soil, or park or drive vehicles within the TPZ.
- c. Cut, break, skin, or bruise roots, branches, or trunks without first obtaining authorization from the City Arborist.
- d. Allow fires under and adjacent to trees.
- e. Discharge exhaust into foliage.
- f. Secure cable, chain, or rope to trees or shrubs.
- g. Trench, dig, or otherwise excavate within the dripline or TPZ of the tree(s) without first obtaining authorization from the City Arborist.
- h. Apply soil sterilants under pavement near existing trees.

**DEMOLITION**

All tree protective fencing, root buffers, and mulch must be in place prior to demolition. Refer to specific sections below for proper installation of each of these items.

At no time is any wheeled equipment or an excavator allowed to enter or cross over TPZ areas, except where a temporary root buffer has been installed. Use of a tracked Bobcat® or similar loader may be permitted within TPZ areas only on required root buffers, within the footprint of existing structures, or when the Project Arborist is on site to determine appropriate access points and to monitor soil and root conditions. Larger equipment shall not enter the TPZ under any circumstances.

**FOUNDATION PERIMETER CONSTRUCTION**

Foundation perimeter construction within TPZ areas must be done with tree protective fencing, root buffers, and mulch in place at all times. Equipment must remain within the new building footprints, on required root buffers or outside TPZ areas. The Project Arborist must be on site during any excavation activities within TPZ areas.

**DRIVEWAY AND PARKING CONSTRUCTION**

Because proposed driveways pass through TPZ areas of the property, any clearing of organic material from the surface, placement of base rock and forming activities for driveway within three (3) feet of depth from current grade must be done under the direction of the Project Arborist. The exception to this is for work within the existing width and depth of the existing roadbed.
STAGING AREAS

Staging areas are available outside of TPZ areas throughout the site. Storing and staging within TPZ areas can only be done on top of a required root buffer and with proper trunk protection, as specified in this report.

BACKFILL AND FILL SOIL

Within TPZ areas, all backfill and fill soil shall be comprised of clean native topsoil. Soil must be placed without tamping, vibration, rolling, saturating or otherwise causing compaction that exceeds 85 percent. No fill soil movement or placement may be done during wet soil conditions. Do not place, store or stage any fill soil within TPZ areas, except where backfilling against the construction perimeter.
Tree Protection Measures

Tree Protection Implementation Methods

To implement tree protection measures effectively, fences shall enclose the areas outlined on the attached site plan markup. It is recommended that fence posts be installed first, then place mulch and root buffers according to layout. Where tree canopies are contiguous, fencing may enclose multiple trees.

Surface installations such as root buffers and mulch must be installed in appropriate locations between areas identified by fence posts.

Following surface installations, chain link fencing must be strung tightly and closed off at all locations.

Tree Protection Measures for All Areas

TREE PROTECTIVE FENCING AND WARNING SIGNS

Placement: fence installation lines shall enclose the areas outlined on the attached site plan markup. For non-heritage trees to be retained on site, fencing will enclose the dripline or a circle 10x the tree diameter in radius, whichever is greater, to be adjusted as necessary and replaced with root buffers to accommodate construction activities.

Type and Size: 6-foot high chain link fencing shall be placed on 2-inch tubular galvanized iron posts driven a minimum of 2 feet into undisturbed soil and spaced not more than 10 feet on center. Where temporary access may be necessary, as approved by the City Arborist or Project Arborist, fences may be set on concrete blocks and appropriate root buffers, as described below, shall be installed. Under no circumstances may a fence be moved closer than 2 feet from the base of a tree.

Duration: Tree fencing shall be erected prior to any demolition activity, and shall remain in place for the duration of the project, except where a gap is needed for access to the detached garage.

‘Warning’ Signs: ‘Warning’ signs shall posted on Tree Protective Fencing not more than every 20 feet stating “WARNING – Tree Protective Zone – This fence shall not be removed”

TRUNK WRAP

Where root buffers are installed in lieu of Tree Protective Fencing, and where construction may affect the stems or branches of a tree, the trunks of trees shall be protected with one of the following methods:
Option 1: Planking: The trunk should be wrapped with a minimum of 4 layers of orange plastic snow fencing, then a layer of 2X4 planks set on end, edge-to-edge and wrapped with a minimum of 4 additional layers of orange plastic snow fencing. Do not nail the planks to the trunk.

Option 2: Straw wattle wrap: This method may be easier to install on multi-trunk trees. Wrap at least the lower 6 feet of the trunk with straw wattles and secure with a layer of orange plastic snow fencing.

MULCH

Placement: All areas enclosed by Tree Protective Fencing shall have a 6-inch deep layer of mulch applied, leaving a 12-inch distance around each tree trunk free of mulch.

Type and Size: Mulch material shall be 2-inch unpainted, untreated wood chip mulch or an approved equal.

Duration: Mulch shall be placed in all designated areas prior to any demolition or construction activity.

ROOT BUFFER

Placement: A temporary protective Root Buffer must be installed before any driving, storing or staging takes place within any TPZ areas. Root buffers should be placed as delineated in the attached site plan markup.

Type and Size: The Root Buffer shall consist of a base course of tree chips spread over each designated area to a minimum depth of 6 inches. In some cases, it may further stabilize the tree chips to place a cap of a base course of 3/4-inch quarry gravel. The root buffer must be covered with a minimum 3/4-inch or thicker layer of plywood. The plywood cap may be secured with clips to join the sheets. Additional wood chips may be added periodically upon the recommendation of the Project Arborist following monthly inspections.

Duration: All Root Buffers shall remain in place for the duration of the project.

Construction Impact Mitigation

GRADE CHANGES

Grading changes shall not exceed 4 inches of depth in cuts, or 4 inches of depth in fill where such grade changes are within Tree Protection Zones except as approved by the City Arborist or Project Arborist.
UTILITY TRENCHING

If any utility trenches must be excavated through any TPZ area or within 10 trunk diameters from any tree, either directional boring not less than 3 feet below grade or Airspade® (or equivalent) excavation is required.

When roots are encountered during excavation outside of this area, any roots under 2" in diameter shall be cleanly severed by hand across the cross-section using bypass pruners or a saw with a pruning blade.

Whenever roots larger than 2" in diameter are encountered, they shall be reported immediately to the Project Arborist who shall determine whether they can be cut or must be left in situ and excavated around using hand or compressed air techniques. Removal of larger roots may result in a hazardous tree and would require removal of a tree, and this can only be determined by having the Project Arborist inspect larger roots.

If roots are left in place they must be protected with dampened burlap. Trenches that must remain open for more than 24 hours shall be lined on the side adjacent to trees with four layers of dampened, untreated burlap, being rewetted as often as necessary to keep the burlap wet.

FOUNDATION CONSTRUCTION

Foundation construction will cause root impacts from perimeter footing excavation along the perimeter of the new building. Root losses are anticipated for trees in these areas. The following mitigation is required:

Excavation

All excavation within the TPZ shall be done by hand or compressed air, no machine trenching in TPZ areas will permitted until excavation has reached a depth below active root growth, in most cases three (3) feet. Over-excavation cutbacks should be avoided in favor of shoring the side of excavations.

All roots encountered of any size whatsoever shall be cleanly severed by hand across the cross-section using bypass pruners or a saw with a pruning blade at the excavation perimeter. Excavation within the TPZ shall be performed under the direction of the Project Arborist. Trenches that must remain open for more than 24 hours shall be lined on the side adjacent to trees with four layers of dampened, untreated burlap, being rewetted as often as necessary to keep the burlap wet.

Excavation Tailings

All tailings derived from excavation of the perimeter footings shall be immediately placed within the confines of the perimeter foundation, or outside all TPZ areas. No tailings shall
be stockpiled, abandoned or allowed to remain overnight in any TPZ area even where a root buffer is in place.

Soil Fracturing

All inadvertent compaction of soil within any TPZ shall be loosened by soil fracturing with Air-spade® (or equivalent) excavation equipment subsequent to all equipment access needs.

Construction Impacts and Mitigation – tree by tree

There are no impacts to trees not shown on plans.

Tree 6

Potential impacts are root losses due to landscape installations such as understory plantings and irrigation trenching, and routine pruning.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are minimal. Landscape activities need to preserve soil grades, particularly at and around the root collar. Irrigation trenching will be limited to making connections to valve assemblies. Irrigation lines will be surface mounted drip irrigation tubing.

Irrigation work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist. Work should be done under the supervision of the landscape contractor. Mitigation work will only be required if the root collar is buried.

Pruning will require the Project Arborist. This work will be scheduled together with other tree service needs and is to be completed before construction commences.

Tree 7

Potential impacts are root losses due to grading and excavation for a new retaining wall and stairway, installation of new flat work (sidewalks), landscape plantings and irrigation.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are demolition of the existing sidewalks, curbs and retaining walls, and the installation of new retaining wall and stairway, new landscape plantings and irrigation.

This work will require that demolition with heavy equipment be completed from outside the tree protection zone, or all work must be done by hand. Roots must be identified by hand digging and cut cleanly with a sharp tool.
Landscape activities need to preserve soil grades, particularly at and around the root collar. Irrigation trenching will be limited to making connections to valve assemblies. Irrigation lines will be surface mounted drip irrigation tubing.

Irrigation work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist. Work should be done under the supervision of the landscape contractor. Mitigation work will only be required if the root collar is buried.

Demolition work will require supervision by the Project Arborist. The Project Arborist must be on site during demolition, excavation and root pruning activities. The root investigation and root pruning activities are required for 25 feet linear distance back of the existing curb.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction, a trunk wrap to armor the trunk against impacts and tree protective fencing prior to demolition, and will require root pruning per the Project Arborist during excavation.

Pruning will require the Project Arborist. This work will be scheduled together with other tree service needs and is to be completed before construction commences.

Tree 8

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts.

Tree 9

Potential impacts are root losses due to grading and excavation for a new retaining wall and stairway, installation of new flat work (sidewalks), landscape plantings and irrigation.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are demolition of the existing sidewalks, curbs and retaining walls, and the installation of new retaining wall and stairway, new landscape plantings and irrigation.

This work will require that demolition with heavy equipment be completed from outside the tree protection zone, or all work must be done by hand. Roots must be identified by hand digging and cut cleanly with a sharp tool.

Landscape activities need to preserve soil grades, particularly at and around the root collar. Irrigation trenching will be limited to making connections to valve assemblies. Irrigation lines will be surface mounted drip irrigation tubing.

Irrigation work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist. Work should be done under the supervision of the landscape contractor. Mitigation work will only be required if the root collar is buried.
Demolition work will require supervision by the Project Arborist. The Project Arborist must be on site during demolition, excavation and root pruning activities. The root investigation and root pruning activities are required for 10 feet linear distance beginning 5 feet from the northeast face of the building.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction and tree protective fencing prior to demolition, and will require root pruning per the Project Arborist during excavation.

Tree 10

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts.

Tree 11

Potential impacts are root losses due to grading and excavation for a new ADA accessible parking area, installation of new flat work (sidewalk / patio) and curb walls, landscape plantings and irrigation.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are demolition of the existing parking area asphalt, sidewalks / patio, curbs and curb walls, and the installation of new asphalt, curb walls and patio, new landscape plantings and irrigation.

This work will require that demolition with heavy equipment be completed from outside the tree protection zone, or all work must be done by hand. Roots must be identified by hand digging and cut cleanly with a sharp tool.

Landscape activities need to preserve soil grades, particularly at and around the root collar. Irrigation trenching will be limited to making connections to valve assemblies. Irrigation lines will be surface mounted drip irrigation tubing.

Irrigation work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist. Work should be done under the supervision of the landscape contractor. Mitigation work will only be required if the root collar is buried.

Demolition work will require supervision by the Project Arborist. The Project Arborist must be on site during demolition, excavation and root pruning activities. The root investigation and root pruning activities are required for a looping construction area of 60 feet linear distance that encircles most of the tree.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction, a trunk wrap to armor the trunk against impacts and tree protective fencing prior to demolition, and will require root pruning per the Project Arborist during excavation.
Pruning will require the Project Arborist. This work will be scheduled together with other tree service needs and is to be completed before construction commences.

Tree 12

Potential impacts are minor root losses due to parking lot modifications.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are the demolition of the existing asphalt and curb, and installation of a new configuration of asphalt and curb. This work will be atop old fill soil and is therefore anticipated to not contain any roots from Tree 12. There are no significant impacts expected.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist. The work is atop old fill soil and will not be likely to affect Tree 12 in any significant way.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction and tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

Tree 17

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts.

Tree 18

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts.

Tree 19

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts.

Tree 20

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts.

Tree 21

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts.

Tree 22

Potential impacts are none.
Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction and tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

**Tree 23**

Potential impacts are root losses due to excavation for a new building addition, landscape plantings and irrigation.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are excavation for the new building, and the installation of a new structure, new landscape plantings and irrigation.

This work will require that excavation with heavy equipment be completed from outside the tree protection zone, or all work must be done by hand. Roots must be identified by hand digging and cut cleanly with a sharp tool.

Landscape activities need to preserve soil grades, particularly at and around the root collar. Irrigation trenching will be limited to making connections to valve assemblies. Irrigation lines will be surface mounted drip irrigation tubing.

Irrigation work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist. Work should be done under the supervision of the landscape contractor. Mitigation work will only be required if the root collar is buried.

Excavation work will require supervision by the Project Arborist. The Project Arborist must be on site during excavation and root pruning activities. The root investigation and root pruning activities are required for a distance of 12 feet linear distance where closest to the tree.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction and tree protective fencing prior to demolition, and will require root pruning per the Project Arborist during excavation.

Pruning will require the Project Arborist. This work will be scheduled together with other tree service needs and is to be completed before construction commences.
Tree 24

Potential impacts are root losses due to excavation for a new building addition, landscape plantings and irrigation.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are excavation for the new building, and the installation of a new structure, new landscape plantings and irrigation.

This work will require that excavation with heavy equipment be completed from outside the tree protection zone, or all work must be done by hand. Roots must be identified by hand digging and cut cleanly with a sharp tool.

Landscape activities need to preserve soil grades, particularly at and around the root collar. Irrigation trenching will be limited to making connections to valve assemblies. Irrigation lines will be surface mounted drip irrigation tubing.

Irrigation work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist. Work should be done under the supervision of the landscape contractor. Mitigation work will only be required if the root collar is buried.

Excavation work will require supervision by the Project Arborist. The Project Arborist must be on site during excavation and root pruning activities. The root investigation and root pruning activities are required for a distance of 12 feet linear distance where closest to the tree.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction and tree protective fencing prior to demolition, and will require root pruning per the Project Arborist during excavation.

Pruning will require the Project Arborist. This work will be scheduled together with other tree service needs and is to be completed before construction commences.

Tree 25

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts.

Tree 26

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts and because it was assessed as being a high-risk tree.
Tree 27

This tree will be removed because tree #26 is being removed and the two trees are interdependent, meaning that removing just one of them will subject the other to unaccustomed wind forces and may result in failure due to windthrow.

Tree 29

Potential impacts are passive uses.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

Tree 30

Potential impacts are passive uses.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

Tree 31

Potential impacts are passive uses.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

Tree 32

Potential impacts are passive uses.
Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

**Tree 33**

Potential impacts are passive uses.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

**Tree 34**

Potential impacts are passive uses.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

**Tree 35**

Potential impacts are passive uses.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.
Tree 36

Potential impacts are passive uses.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

Tree 37

Potential impacts are passive uses.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

Tree 46

Potential impacts are root losses due to removal and replacement of flat work (sidewalk).

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are demolition and replacement of flat work.

This work will require that excavation with heavy equipment be completed from outside the tree protection zone, or all work must be done by hand. Roots must be identified by hand digging and cut cleanly with a sharp tool.

Demolition and forming work will require supervision by the Project Arborist. The Project Arborist must be on site during any root pruning activities. The root investigation and root pruning activities are required for a distance of 12 feet linear distance where closest to the tree, and also around the root collar area when replacing the flatwork. The Project Arborist must be present during forming to prevent damage to the root collar.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction and tree protective fencing prior to demolition, and will require root pruning per the Project Arborist during demolition and forming.
Pruning will require the Project Arborist. This work will be scheduled together with other tree service needs and is to be completed before construction commences.

Tree 49

Potential impacts are root losses due to excavation for a new building addition, landscape plantings and irrigation.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are excavation for the new building, and the installation of a new structure, new landscape plantings and irrigation.

This work will require that excavation with heavy equipment be completed from outside the tree protection zone, or all work must be done by hand. Roots must be identified by hand digging and cut cleanly with a sharp tool.

Landscape activities need to preserve soil grades, particularly at and around the root collar. Irrigation trenching will be limited to making connections to valve assemblies. Irrigation lines will be surface mounted drip irrigation tubing.

Irrigation work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist. Work should be done under the supervision of the landscape contractor. Mitigation work will only be required if the root collar is buried.

Excavation work will require supervision by the Project Arborist. The Project Arborist must be on site during excavation and root pruning activities. The root investigation and root pruning activities are required for a distance of 8 feet linear distance where closest to the tree.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction, a trunk wrap to armor the trunk against impacts and tree protective fencing prior to demolition, and will require root pruning per the Project Arborist during excavation.

Pruning will require the Project Arborist. This work will be scheduled together with other tree service needs and is to be completed before construction commences.

Tree 50

Potential impacts are root losses due to excavation for a new building addition, landscape plantings and irrigation.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are excavation for the new building, and the installation of a new structure, new landscape plantings and irrigation.
This work will require that excavation with heavy equipment be completed from outside the tree protection zone, or all work must be done by hand. Roots must be identified by hand digging and cut cleanly with a sharp tool.

Landscape activities need to preserve soil grades, particularly at and around the root collar. Irrigation trenching will be limited to making connections to valve assemblies. Irrigation lines will be surface mounted drip irrigation tubing.

Irrigation work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist. Work should be done under the supervision of the landscape contractor. Mitigation work will only be required if the root collar is buried.

Excavation work will require supervision by the Project Arborist. The Project Arborist must be on site during excavation and root pruning activities. The root investigation and root pruning activities are required for a distance of 15 feet linear distance where closest to the tree and in an “L” wrapping around the corner of the building.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction, a trunk wrap to armor the trunk against impacts and tree protective fencing prior to demolition, and will require root pruning per the Project Arborist during excavation.

Pruning will require the Project Arborist. This work will be scheduled together with other tree service needs and is to be completed before construction commences.

Tree 51

Potential impacts are passive uses.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

Tree 68

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts.

Tree 69

Potential impacts are passive uses.
Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are limited to passive access by materials and equipment. Tree protective fencing will exclude passive access.

This work will not require supervision by the Project Arborist.

Mitigation will require tree protective fencing prior to demolition.

**Tree 70**

Potential impacts are root losses due to grading and excavation for new asphalt and curb.

Demolition and construction activities that will occur within the tree protection zone for this tree are demolition of the existing asphalt and curb, and placement of new surface materials.

This work will require that demolition with heavy equipment be completed from outside the tree protection zone, or all work must be done by hand. Roots must be identified by hand digging and cut cleanly with a sharp tool.

Demolition work will require supervision by the Project Arborist. The Project Arborist must be on site during demolition, excavation and root pruning activities. The root investigation and root pruning activities are required for 10 feet linear distance along the area adjacent to the tree.

Mitigation will require a root buffer along the edge of construction and tree protective fencing prior to demolition, and will require root pruning per the Project Arborist during excavation.

Pruning will not be required.

**Tree 71**

This tree will be removed due to planned work conflicts.
Maintenance and Ongoing Care

Tree maintenance and ongoing care is necessary in preparation for construction, and throughout the entire timeline for construction. Anticipated needs include pruning and tree protection during landscape construction:

**PRUNING**

Pruning shall be done by a Certified Arborist in accordance with the current ANSI A300 Pruning Standards and International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) Best Management Practices.

Pruning shall be in accordance with that outlined in the data table.

**IRRIGATION**

Supplemental irrigation shall be applied to all trees that are anticipated to have root impacts as a result of construction impacts. However, summer irrigation of native oaks can predispose them to sudden oak death and fungal infections and should not occur under any circumstances. Winter precipitation may not be sufficient to support tree health and during this cooler periods, native oaks, especially those impacted by construction, may need to receive supplemental irrigation.

In cases where irrigation is deemed necessary it shall consist of 1 time per month during the irrigation season (usually March through September, depending on precipitation) in the amount of 10 gallons per inch of trunk diameter to be evenly applied within the dripline by standard gear driven sprinklers, inline drip tubing, or soaker hoses. The water flow should not cause runoff and should be adjusted to fully percolate into soil.

**LANDSCAPING**

Care must be exercised during landscape construction to avoid any trenches across existing TPZ areas. If sub-surface trenches must be installed, common trenches should be used and they should stay as far away from the trees as possible. A trench running along a radius line directly toward a tree is preferable to a cross trench.

Landscape construction plans are subject to review and comment by the Project Arborist. If extensive trenching is required, Air-spade® excavation may be required.

Care must be taken to keep mulch away from the base of all trees and other woody plants. Similarly, soil grades must be carefully monitored to keep excess soil from accumulating around the base of trees and shrubs.
Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

1. Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. Title and ownership of all property considered are assumed to be good and marketable. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character. Any and all property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.

2. It is assumed that any property is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes or other governmental regulations.

3. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible. The consultant can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.

4. Various diagrams, sketches and photographs in this report are intended as visual aids and are not to scale, unless specifically stated as such on the drawing. These communication tools in no way substitute for nor should be construed as surveys, architectural or engineering drawings.

5. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.

6. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior written or verbal consent of the consultant.

7. This report is confidential and to be distributed only to the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any or all of the contents of this report may be conveyed to another party only with the express prior written or verbal consent of the consultant. Such limitations apply to the original report, a copy, facsimile, scanned image or digital version thereof.

8. This report represents the opinion of the consultant. In no way is the consultant’s fee contingent upon a stipulated result, the occurrence of a subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.

9. The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services as described in the fee schedule, an agreement or a contract.

10. Information contained in this report reflects observations made only to those items described and only reflects the condition of those items at the time of the site visit. Furthermore, the inspection is limited to visual examination of items and elements at the site, unless expressly stated otherwise. There is no expressed or implied warranty or guarantee that problems or deficiencies of the plants or property inspected may not arise in the future.

Disclosure Statement

Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training, and experience to examine trees, recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees, and attempt to reduce the risk of living near trees. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist, or to seek additional advice.

Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms that fail in ways we do not fully understand. Conditions are often hidden within trees and below ground. Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period of time. Likewise, remedial treatments, like any medicine, cannot be guaranteed.
Tree Management Experts
Consulting Arborists
3109 Sacramento Street
San Francisco, CA 94115
Member, American Society of Consulting Arborists
Certified Arborists, Tree Risk Assessment Qualified

cell 415.606.3610  fax 415.921.7711  email Roy@treemanagementexperts.com

Treatment, pruning, and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborist’s services such as property boundaries, property ownership, site lines, disputes between neighbors, and other issues. An arborist cannot take such considerations into account unless complete and accurate information is disclosed to the arborist. An arborist should then be expected to reasonably rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided.

Trees can be managed, but they cannot be controlled. To live near trees is to accept some degree of risk. The only way to eliminate all risk associated with trees is to eliminate the trees.

Certification of Performance

I, Roy C. Leggitt, III, Certify:

- That we have inspected the trees and/or property evaluated in this report. We have stated findings accurately, insofar as the limitations of the Assignment and within the extent and context identified by this report;
- That we have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or any real estate that is the subject of this report, and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved;
- That the analysis, opinions and conclusions stated herein are original and are based on current scientific procedures and facts and according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices;
- That no significant professional assistance was provided, except as indicated by the inclusion of another professional report within this report;
- That compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party.

I am a member in good standing of the American Society of Consulting Arborists and a member and Certified Arborist with the International Society of Arboriculture.

I have attained professional training in all areas of knowledge asserted through this report by completion of a Bachelor of Science degree in Plant Science, by routinely attending pertinent professional conferences and by reading current research from professional journals, books and other media.

I have rendered professional services in a full-time capacity in the field of horticulture and arboriculture for more than 32 years.

Signed: ____________________________

Date: 8/27/21
Certification of Performance

I, Aaron Wang, Certify:

• That we have inspected the trees and/or property evaluated in this report. We have stated findings accurately, insofar as the limitations of the Assignment and within the extent and context identified by this report;

• That we have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or any real estate that is the subject of this report, and have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved;

• That the analysis, opinions and conclusions stated herein are original and are based on current scientific procedures and facts and according to commonly accepted arboricultural practices;

• That no significant professional assistance was provided, except as indicated by the inclusion of another professional report within this report;

• That compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party.

I am a member and Certified Arborist with the International Society of Arboriculture.

I have attained professional training in all areas of knowledge asserted through this report by completion of a Bachelor of Science degree in Forestry and Natural Resources, by routinely attending pertinent professional conferences and by reading current research from professional journals, books and other media.

I have rendered professional services in a full-time capacity in the field of horticulture and arboriculture for more than 7 years.

Signed: 

Date: 8/27/21
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Identification</th>
<th>Defects</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>TRAQ Assessment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Reason for Removal</th>
<th>Appraised Value</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quercus agrifolia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tree live oak</strong></td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After pine</strong></td>
<td><strong>Italian Stone pine</strong></td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quercus agrifolia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tree live oak</strong></td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quercus agrifolia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tree live oak</strong></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quercus agrifolia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tree live oak</strong></td>
<td>13.2, 15.5, 15.9, 16.0, 16.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quercus agrifolia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tree live oak</strong></td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quercus agrifolia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tree live oak</strong></td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequoia sempervirens</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Redwood</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequoia sempervirens</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Redwood</strong></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Probable</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequoia sempervirens</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Redwood</strong></td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequoia sempervirens</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Redwood</strong></td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequoia sempervirens</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Redwood</strong></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinus pinea</strong></td>
<td><strong>Italian Stone pine</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinus pinea</strong></td>
<td><strong>Italian Stone pine</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequoia sempervirens</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Redwood</strong></td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequoia sempervirens</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Redwood</strong></td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequoia sempervirens</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Redwood</strong></td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quercus agrifolia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tree live oak</strong></td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinus pinea</strong></td>
<td><strong>Italian Stone pine</strong></td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinus pinea</strong></td>
<td><strong>Italian Stone pine</strong></td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinus pinea</strong></td>
<td><strong>Italian Stone pine</strong></td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinus pinea</strong></td>
<td><strong>Italian Stone pine</strong></td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequoia sempervirens</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Redwood</strong></td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequoia sempervirens</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Redwood</strong></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinus radiata</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monterey pine</strong></td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinus radiata</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monterey pine</strong></td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinus radiata</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monterey pine</strong></td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinus radiata</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monterey pine</strong></td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tree Management Experts 2021**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Species Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>DIA (in)</th>
<th>DBH (in)</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Initial Rating</th>
<th>Reason for Removal</th>
<th>Appraised Value</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pinus • Co.</td>
<td>yellow pines</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Quercus • Co.</td>
<td>acacia</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
26
27
28
32
33
34
35
36
38
39
41
42
43
44
45
47
51
52
54
55
57
58
59
60
61
64
65
66
67
69
70
71

Species
Pinus pinea
Quercus agrifolia
Pinus pinea
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus agrifolia
Sequoia sempervirens
Sequoia sempervirens
Quercus agrifolia
Pistacia chinensis
Pinus radiata
Sequoia sempervirens
Quercus garryana
Sequoia sempervirens
Sequoia sempervirens
Pinus pinea
Pinus pinea
Quercus garryana
Quercus agrifolia
Pinus pinea
Pinus pinea
Pinus pinea
Pinus pinea
Sequoia sempervirens
Sequoia sempervirens
Pinus radiata
Pinus radiata
Pinus radiata
Pinus radiata
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus douglasii
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus agrifolia
Pinus pinea
Pinus pinea
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus agrifolia
Pinus pinea
Pinus pinea
Pinus pinea
Pinus pinea
Quercus agrifolia
Quercus wislizeni
Sequoia sempervirens
Acacia melanoxylon

Trunk
Diameter
Area
Cond %
28
615.75
60%
16.2
206.12
40%
30.76 (e) 743.13
30%
11.6
105.68
60%
13.1
134.78
20%
10.5
86.59
70%
39.8 (e) 1244.11
30%
40.4
1281.90
30%
13.5
143.14
50%
17.2
232.35
80%
22.5
397.61
70%
12.1
114.99
70%
15
176.72
70%
42.1
1392.05
50%
25
490.88
80%
15.6
191.13
20%
23.1
419.10
80%
17.8
248.85
80%
25
490.88
60%
21.4
359.68
50%
17.6
243.29
40%
13.2
136.85
60%
24.2
459.96
70%
20.2
320.47
70%
21.6
366.44
60%
20.8
339.80
70%
16.1
203.58
70%
15.6
191.13
70%
21.1
349.67
60%
32.5
829.58
60%
15.3
183.85
60%
27.6
598.29
40%
33.7
891.97
60%
13.6
145.27
60%
14.2
158.37
10%
17
226.98
30%
15.7
193.59
80%
18.6
271.72
70%
33.7
891.97
30%
43.8
1506.74
50%
20.3
323.66
70%
23.5
433.74
50%
27.5
593.96
50%
47.2
1749.75
60%
26
530.93
40%
35.2
973.14
60%
19.1
286.52
60%
10.2
81.71
40%
16
201.06
70%
11.3
100.29
70%

TRUNK FORMULA TECHNIQUE TREE APPRAISAL

Tree #
FL %
70%
90%
70%
50%
50%
70%
20%
30%
30%
50%
90%
50%
70%
10%
30%
50%
30%
30%
30%
30%
40%
40%
30%
30%
30%
30%
30%
30%
40%
40%
40%
40%
50%
70%
90%
50%
50%
80%
50%
90%
70%
60%
70%
80%
30%
30%
70%
90%
30%
10%

EL %
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
50%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%
90%

Repl
Dia
2.46
2.20
2.46
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
1.69
2.46
2.46
1.69
2.46
2.46
2.46
2.46
1.69
2.20
2.46
2.46
2.46
2.46
2.20
2.20
2.46
2.46
2.46
2.46
2.20
2.20
2.20
1.69
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
2.20
1.69
2.46
2.20

Repl
Trunk
Area
4.75
3.80
4.75
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
2.24
4.75
4.75
2.24
4.75
4.75
4.75
4.75
2.24
3.80
4.75
4.75
4.75
4.75
3.80
3.80
4.75
4.75
4.75
4.75
3.80
3.80
3.80
2.24
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
3.80
2.24
4.75
3.80
Replacement
Cost
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00
$
395.00

Unit Tree
Cost
$ 83.11
$ 103.91
$ 83.11
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 176.09
$ 83.11
$ 83.11
$ 176.09
$ 83.11
$ 83.11
$ 83.11
$ 83.11
$ 176.09
$ 103.91
$ 83.11
$ 83.11
$ 83.11
$ 83.11
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 83.11
$ 83.11
$ 83.11
$ 83.11
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 176.09
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 103.91
$ 176.09
$ 83.11
$ 103.91

2400SandHillRoad
TreeAppraisals

Basic Cost
$ 51,173.24
$ 21,418.14
$ 61,758.90
$ 10,981.65
$ 14,005.36
$
8,997.68
$ 129,275.99
$ 133,203.14
$ 14,873.71
$ 24,143.97
$ 41,315.86
$ 11,948.75
$ 31,117.61
$ 115,688.74
$ 40,795.00
$ 33,656.80
$ 34,829.79
$ 20,680.78
$ 40,795.00
$ 29,891.96
$ 42,839.96
$ 14,220.00
$ 38,225.89
$ 26,633.58
$ 30,453.30
$ 28,239.28
$ 21,154.54
$ 19,860.99
$ 29,059.74
$ 68,943.54
$ 15,279.52
$ 49,721.59
$ 92,685.44
$ 15,094.88
$ 16,456.16
$ 39,968.84
$ 20,116.44
$ 28,234.34
$ 92,685.44
$ 156,566.90
$ 33,631.31
$ 45,069.99
$ 61,718.75
$ 181,817.52
$ 55,169.42
$ 101,120.00
$ 29,772.72
$ 14,388.78
$ 16,709.63
$ 10,420.98

Depreciated Cost
$
19,343.49
$
6,939.48
$
11,672.43
$
2,965.05
$
1,260.48
$
3,967.97
$
6,980.90
$
10,789.45
$
2,007.95
$
8,691.83
$
23,426.09
$
3,763.86
$
13,722.87
$
5,205.99
$
8,811.72
$
3,029.11
$
7,523.23
$
4,467.05
$
6,608.79
$
4,035.41
$
6,168.95
$
3,071.52
$
4,013.72
$
5,033.75
$
4,933.43
$
5,337.22
$
3,998.21
$
3,753.73
$
6,276.90
$
14,891.81
$
3,300.38
$
7,159.91
$
25,025.07
$
5,705.86
$
1,332.95
$
5,395.79
$
7,241.92
$
14,230.11
$
12,512.53
$
63,409.59
$
14,831.41
$
12,168.90
$
19,441.41
$
78,545.17
$
5,958.30
$
16,381.44
$
11,254.09
$
4,661.97
$
3,158.12
$
656.52

Repl Tree
Install
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
Aftercare
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
-

Total Addl
Costs
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
$
-

Appraisal
Total Costs (Rounded)
$ 19,343.49 $ 19,300
$ 6,939.48 $ 6,900
$ 11,672.43 $ 11,700
$ 2,965.05 $ 3,000
$ 1,260.48 $ 1,300
$ 3,967.97 $ 4,000
$ 6,980.90 $ 7,000
$ 10,789.45 $ 10,800
$ 2,007.95 $ 2,000
$ 8,691.83 $ 8,700
$ 23,426.09 $ 23,400
$ 3,763.86 $ 3,800
$ 13,722.87 $ 13,700
$ 5,205.99 $ 5,200
$ 8,811.72 $ 8,800
$ 3,029.11 $ 3,000
$ 7,523.23 $ 7,500
$ 4,467.05 $ 4,500
$ 6,608.79 $ 6,600
$ 4,035.41 $ 4,000
$ 6,168.95 $ 6,200
$ 3,071.52 $ 3,100
$ 4,013.72 $ 4,000
$ 5,033.75 $ 5,000
$ 4,933.43 $ 4,900
$ 5,337.22 $ 5,300
$ 3,998.21 $ 4,000
$ 3,753.73 $ 3,800
$ 6,276.90 $ 6,300
$ 14,891.81 $ 14,900
$ 3,300.38 $ 3,300
$ 7,159.91 $ 7,200
$ 25,025.07 $ 25,000
$ 5,705.86 $ 5,700
$ 1,332.95 $ 1,300
$ 5,395.79 $ 5,400
$ 7,241.92 $ 7,200
$ 14,230.11 $ 14,200
$ 12,512.53 $ 12,500
$ 63,409.59 $ 63,400
$ 14,831.41 $ 14,800
$ 12,168.90 $ 12,200
$ 19,441.41 $ 19,400
$ 78,545.17 $ 78,500
$ 5,958.30 $ 6,000
$ 16,381.44 $ 16,400
$ 11,254.09 $ 11,300
$ 4,661.97 $ 4,700
$ 3,158.12 $ 3,200
$
656.52 $
660


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Species Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Heritage Tree</th>
<th>Planned Removal</th>
<th>Reason for Removal</th>
<th>10x TPZ Radius (ft)</th>
<th>Distance to Impacts (ft)</th>
<th>Expected Root Loss</th>
<th>Expected Canopy Loss</th>
<th>Significant Impacts (25%)</th>
<th>Tree Protection Fencing</th>
<th>Trunk Wrap</th>
<th>Root Buffer</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>coast live oak</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11 10% 5%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blocks Views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian stone pine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>8.6 35% 10% X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blocks Views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>coast live oak</td>
<td>X X Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0 100% 100% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed, cut flush with deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>coast live oak</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.6 0% 0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict with Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>coast live oak</td>
<td>X X Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0 100% 100% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>coast live oak</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>14 30% 20% X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>coast live oak</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>17 5% 0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>southern magnolia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0 100% 100% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict with Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>coast live oak</td>
<td>X X Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0 100% 100% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pistacia chinensis</td>
<td>Chinese pistache</td>
<td>X X Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0 100% 100% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pinus radiata</td>
<td>Monterey pine</td>
<td>X X Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>0 100% 100% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blocks Views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
<td>X X Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0 100% 100% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Quercus garyana</td>
<td>Oregon oak</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>33 0% 0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dead, Poor Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>16.2 5% 15%</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.9 10% 15%</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
<td>X X Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0 100% 100% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian stone pine</td>
<td>X X Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>5.2 40% 10% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interdependent with #27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian stone pine</td>
<td>X X Interdependent w/#26; High Risk</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>14.6 5% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interdependent with #26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>34.2 0% 0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>28.2 0% 0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>35.8 0% 0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>30.2 0% 0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian stone pine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>40 0% 0%</td>
<td>X #33-36 interdependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian stone pine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>40.2 0% 0%</td>
<td>X #33-36 interdependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian stone pine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>40 0% 0%</td>
<td>X #33-36 interdependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian stone pine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>40.2 0% 0%</td>
<td>X #33-36 interdependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Pinus pinea</td>
<td>Italian stone pine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>50.6 0% 0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.6 20% 0%</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Podocarpus gracilis</td>
<td>yellowwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6 10% 10%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Quercus virginiana</td>
<td>southern live oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.6 10% 10%</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Arbutus unedo</td>
<td>strawberry tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.8 5% 10%</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Olea europaea</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>X Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0 100% 100% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Quercus wislizeni</td>
<td>interior live oak</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.2 10% 10%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Sequoia sempervirens</td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.8 15% 0%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Acacia melanoxyylon</td>
<td>blackwood acacia</td>
<td>X Conflict w/Planned Work</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0 100% 100% X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arbutus unedo
strawberry tree

Liquidambar styraciflua
sweetgum
Magnolia grandiflora
Southern Magnolia

Pinus pinea
Italian stone pine
Pinus radiata
Monterey pine

Pistacia chinensis
Chinese pistache
Podocarpus gracilior
yellowwood

Quercus agrifolia
coast live oak
Quercus garryana
Oregon white oak

Quercus wislizeni
Interior live oak
Sequoia sempervirens
coast redwood
Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission use this study session to consider a presentation from the applicant, receive public comment, and provide individual, preliminary feedback on a revised proposal for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to modify Municipal Code Chapter 16.92 (Signs-Outdoor Advertising). The requested amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would be associated with a previously approved mixed-use office, residential, and retail development project in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district.

Policy Issues
Study sessions provide an opportunity for Planning Commissioners and the public to provide initial feedback on the overall proposal. Study sessions should be considered on a case-by-case basis, with comments used to inform future consideration of the project. The City Council will ultimately consider whether the required findings can be made for the proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment. For the study session, Planning Commissioners should provide feedback on the proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment, including the revised formulas for calculating permitted signage based on street frontage lengths and a requirement for approval of a Master Sign Plan by the Planning Commission.

Background
The City Council approved the 1300 El Camino Real project (also known at the time as “Station 1300” and currently called “Springline”) on January 24 and February 7, 2017. The project is a mixed-use development consisting of non-medical office, residential, and community-serving uses on a 6.4-acre site, with a total of approximately 220,000 square feet of non-residential uses and 183 dwelling units. Applicable entitlements and agreements for this project included Architectural Control, Development Agreement, Tentative Map, Use Permit, Heritage Tree Removal Permits, and Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Agreement.

On November 22, 2021, the Planning Commission conditionally approved revisions to the project that would increase its gross floor area by approximately 9,000 square feet, of which about 4,000 square feet would be commercial (office and community-serving uses). The additional gross floor area requires approval of Specific Plan amendments to increase the maximum Public Benefit Bonus-level floor area ratio (FAR) from 1.50 to 1.55 in the ECR NE-R District under certain circumstances, and an amendment to the approved Development Agreement. On December 7, 2021, the City Council held a public hearing and voted affirmatively to introduce two ordinances to amend the Specific Plan and the Development Agreement. The second reading of the ordinances is scheduled for the City Council’s December 14, 2021 meeting.

The City Council previously directed that revisions be pursued to allow larger Specific Plan projects to receive larger signage allocations, subject to discretionary review. However, the drafting of these Sign
Ordinance and/or Specific Plan changes has been delayed and was not included as a City Council priority in 2020 or 2021. In consultation with staff, Springline has now proposed a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to increase the permitted signage for larger projects, which would apply to the entire El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (“Specific Plan”) area, encompassing El Camino Real, the Caltrain station area and downtown Menlo Park. A map of the Specific Plan area is included as Attachment A.

On October 18, 2021, the Planning Commission held a study session on a previous proposal for a Zoning Ordinance text amendment to modify Municipal Code Chapter 16.92 (Signs-Outdoor Advertising) for larger projects within the Specific Plan area. Planning Commissioners provided the following feedback on the proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendments:

- General support for allowing larger projects within the Specific Plan, including Springline, additional signage to allow for successful commercial uses, especially retail;
- Concerns about the possibility of very large signs;
- Concerns about multi-story buildings with cluttered signage and the amount of signage allowed for offices uses;
- Questions about the applicability of the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments to other projects;
- Questions about how the signage allowed by the proposed amendments would compare to signage allowed in nearby jurisdictions; and
- Concerns about public outreach.

**Analysis**

**Project description**

The proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment to update the signage regulations in the Specific Plan area (ECR/D-SP zoning district) includes maintaining the current formula for calculating the maximum sign area based on the length of a project’s frontage, while eliminating the 100 square foot cap on the total sign area for the primary frontage, as well as the 50 square foot cap on total signage per secondary frontage.

Under the current Sign Ordinance, the entire Springline project would be allowed a total signage area of 100 square feet on El Camino Real, and 50 square feet each on Oak Grove Avenue and Garwood Avenue. Given the length of the frontages, these areas would be disproportionally small relative to the buildings, and could negatively affect the vibrancy of the community-serving/retail and office components of the project. Similarly, the Middle Plaza (500 El Camino Real) project, a mixed-use development consisting of office, retail, and residential uses on an 8.4-acre site, with a total of approximately 10,286 square feet of retail/restaurant, 142,840 square feet of non-medical office, and 215 residential units, approved by the City Council on September 26 and October 10, 2017, would only be allowed 100 square feet of total signage as El Camino Real is it’s only street frontage.

Since the last study session, the applicant has revised the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment, including the following revisions:

- Removed the provision that would have allowed additional signage area for properties with multistory buildings;
- Added a maximum sign area of 50 square feet for individual business signs;
- Limited office tenant signage to one sign per 100 feet of the applicable frontage and one ground-mounted monument sign per office building (with the provision that a frontage over 150 feet would be
• Added an exemption from the signage area limits for project identification and directional signage on a property with a frontage on El Camino Real, including signage identifying an overall mixed-use development, and directional signage such as entries to parking garages.

The proposed ordinance amendment would amend Section 16.92.110 of the Zoning Ordinance with the underlined text:

**Section 16.92.110(2):** Such signs will not exceed in total display area, measured in square feet, the ratio of total display area to lot primary frontage as shown on the attached graph, entitled "Figure No. 1," incorporated herein, and made a part of this chapter. The maximum display area permitted for any lot, regardless of the number of uses or tenants housed on a single lot, is one hundred square feet. Notwithstanding the above, the one hundred square foot maximum shall not apply to lots located within the ECR/D-SP zoning district with primary frontage along El Camino Real, which may be permitted larger total display areas, subject to Planning Commission approval of a Master Sign Plan, consistent with the following formulas: (a) for non-residential uses, the maximum display area permitted for a lot with frontage along El Camino Real shall be determined by the formula used in Figure 1 \((30' + ((\text{Frontage Length} - 10') \times (8/7)))\) without regard to the one hundred square foot maximum. For any additional signage area authorized pursuant to this exception, any individual sign would be limited to a maximum of 50 square feet, and the total area of signage for a single project would be limited to a maximum of 1,000 square feet. In addition, with respect to any signage authorized pursuant to the above, for buildings with a mixture of community serving uses/retail and office uses, signs identifying an office tenant or tenants are limited to one sign for each 100 lineal feet of the project on the applicable frontage, plus one ground level monument sign per office building. (Normal rounding rules would apply, so that for example a property with a frontage of 150 feet or more would round up to two office signs allowed.)
Section 16.92.110(3): In the case of parcels of land having secondary frontage, signs may be located on such frontage, provided that the total sign area thereon shall not exceed one-half the maximum sign area allowed by Figure No 1 for such secondary frontage, and further provided that, subject to Planning Commission approval of a Master Sign Plan, for any parcel within the ECR/D-SP zoning district with frontage on a street other than El Camino Real, the maximum total sign area on that frontage shall not exceed the formula of $(0.5 \times (30 + ((\text{non-ECR Frontage}-10) \times 8/7)))$ without regard to the 100 square foot maximum (50 square feet on secondary frontages) that applies in zoning districts other than the ECR-D-SP zoning district. The limitation on office tenant signage set forth in 16.92.110 (2) shall also apply to such secondary frontage.

Section 16.92.110(9): For any parcel within the ECR/D-SP district, informational signage identifying the name of a project and outdoor directional or wayfinding signage shall be exempt from the otherwise applicable limits on total signage areas, provided that the maximum signage area for project identification and directional signage (including tenant directories) allowed pursuant to such exemption shall be limited to one-half square foot of signage for each linear foot of a project’s specific frontage from which such signage would be visible. Any project identification signage considered exempt pursuant to this Section 16.92.110(9) shall not include a reference to a generally recognized name of a commercial product or business or institution. Any project identification or directional signage exempted from the maximum signage otherwise permitted by Section 16.92.110(2) and (3) shall be approved as part of a Master Sign Plan.
The applicant indicates in their project description letter, that the proposed text amendments are designed to accomplish the following:

- Maintain the current formula for calculating the maximum sign area based on the length of a project’s frontage;
- For projects within the ECR/D-SP district, eliminate the 100 square foot “cap” on the total sign area for the primary frontage, as well as the 50 square foot “cap” on total signage per secondary frontage, provided that the maximum sign area on any frontage would be 1,000 square feet regardless of the length of the frontage;
- Establish a formula for calculating the maximum sign area for secondary frontages, or primary frontages not along El Camino Real, based on 50 percent of the (increased) maximum allowable signage area on the El Camino Real frontage;
- For any signage allowed on frontages, limit the area of any individual sign to a maximum of 50 square feet;
- For properties containing a mix of retail and office uses, allow no more than one office tenant sign on a particular frontage for each 100 feet of the project’s frontage on that street plus one ground level monument sign per office building, with rounding allowing two signs on a property with 151 or more feet of frontage; and
- Provide an exemption from the signage area limits for project identification and directional signage on a property with a frontage on El Camino Real, including signage identifying an overall mixed-use development, and directional signage such as entries to parking garages, with the exemption limited to no more than one-half square foot of project identification and directional signage for each one foot of frontage on El Camino Real. (For example, for a property with a primary frontage 250 feet in length, up to 125 square feet of project identification/directional signage would be exempt from the overall signage area limit calculated under Figure 1.)

The applicant indicates their proposal would not subject El Camino Real to the proposed secondary frontage limitation because it is a unique corridor. However, for any project with a secondary frontage other than along El Camino Real, the amount of signage area would be limited to one half of what the proposed formula would permit on the primary frontage.

In addition, the applicant indicates they are also seeking additional flexibility, compared to the current signage regulations, with respect to signage letter sizes (maximum 24 inches in letter size for the retail level, and 30 inches for the upper level, office uses). In an effort to streamline approval of the Zoning Ordinance text amendment, the applicant did not include these in their current proposal but indicates they would incorporate this into a Master Sign Plan, when site-specific factors can be taken into account. The applicant also indicates they are interested in developing a formula for how sign area is allocated between multiple tenants in a single building that would be incorporated into their Master Sign Plan.

With the elimination of the proposed additional signage allowance for multistory buildings, the Springline project would be limited to approximately 540 square feet of total signage along its El Camino Real frontage. The applicant indicates they intend to utilize approximately 179 square feet for project identification and directional signage, which would leave approximately 360 square feet for commercial (office and community serving uses) signage. The applicant indicates 360 square feet of commercial signage would be insufficient for market needs. Therefore, the applicant is also proposing to exempt project identification (for example, the “Springline” arched sign over the project entry) and directional signage from the overall El Camino Real signage allowance, which for the Springline project would mean up to a total area of 228 square feet of identification and directional signage. This exemption would allow the entire 540 square feet that would be allowed on Springline’s El Camino Real frontage after removal of the 100 square foot cap to be used for commercial signage. Under the applicant’s original proposal, with the signage area
supplement for multistory buildings, the project would have been allowed up to 1,079 square feet of total signage area along its El Camino Real frontage, of which up to 900 square feet would have been for commercial signage.

The applicant has submitted a revised massing study (Attachment B) with a series of elevation sheets that illustrate the various signs that could be permitted by the proposed text amendments, visible from Springline’s three frontages (El Camino, Oak Grove, and Garwood). It should be noted, the elevations, which also show possible signage locations, are only for illustrative purposes. If the text amendments are approved by City Council, Springline, like other projects utilizing the new regulations, would be required to submit a Master Sign Plan for review and action by the Planning Commission.

Middle Plaza

As previously noted, the Middle Plaza at 500 El Camino Real project was approved by the City Council in 2017 with office, retail, and residential uses on an 8.4-acre site, with a total of approximately 10,286 square feet of retail/restaurant, 142,840 square feet of non-medical office, and 215 residential units. The property has approximately 1,600 feet of frontage along El Camino Real but under the current regulations would only be allowed 100 square feet of signage since it does not have a secondary frontage. The sign consultant for the project submitted a letter (Attachment D) of support for the Zoning Ordinance amendments as well plans showing a preliminary signage proposal for the Middle Plaza project. The letter includes a suggestion for a change to the proposed ordinance language that would allow the office tenant signage limit for a mixed-use building to be calculated by multiplying the linear feet of the street frontage by 0.01 and multiplying the result by 50 square feet instead of limiting the signage to one sign up to 50 square feet in size per 100 square feet of frontage. This change would allow smaller signs for multiple office tenants.

Similar to the Springline project, the Middle Plaza property was created when several smaller parcels were merged to allow for a large mixed-use development. The permitted signage for each of the previous parcels was calculated based on their individual frontages, so with the merger of the parcels the permitted signage along the frontage of the previous parcels was greatly reduced. This type of large mixed-use development did not exist in the City when the current signage regulations were put in place, and like the Springline project, Middle Plaza has indicated they will not be able to attract retail and office tenants without the allowance for additional signage.

Neighboring jurisdictions

Staff has reviewed the signage regulations in the Cities of Palo Alto and Redwood City as a comparison to the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments since these Cities have similar commercial corridors along El Camino Real. Although it’s difficult to compare different types of regulations, these two Cities appear to allow at least as much commercial signage, if not more, than the proposed Zoning Ordinance regulations would, within their downtowns and along El Camino Real.

City of Palo Alto

For properties with 200 feet or more of frontage, the City of Palo Alto allows free standing signs up to five feet in height along commercial properties on El Camino Real up to a maximum of approximately 62 square feet in size, and free standing signs over five feet in height up to a maximum of approximately 72 square feet in size. One free standing sign is also permitted for each frontage and one additional sign is permitted for any portion of frontage in excess of 250 feet. In the case of frontage in excess of 250 feet, the portion of the frontage in excess of 250 feet is used to determine the size of the second free standing sign.

Palo Alto also allows wall signs based on wall area, which is defined as the height times the width of the wall on which the sign is located. In some commercial zones, up to 132 square feet of signage is permitted
for a wall area of 5,000 square feet. In addition, for wall areas that exceed 5,000 square feet, the sign area may be increased by seven square feet for each 500 square feet of wall area, but no sign may exceed 203 square feet. Palo Alto requires design review for new and replacement signs, which may reduce the overall size permitted.

City of Redwood City
Redwood City’s Downtown Precise Plan Area consists of approximately one hundred eighty-three acres within the City’s historic center and provides specific signage regulations within the plan area, which includes portions of El Camino Real. Within the Precise Plan, each establishment is allowed one and one-half square feet of total sign for each foot of street frontage. For multi-tenant buildings, each establishment is calculated individually.

The signage regulations in the Precise Plan also includes signs that do not count towards the total sign area permitted based on the length of the street frontage. For example, designated street frontages within the plan are allowed “Grand Projecting Signs”, which are tall, large, vertically oriented signs that project from the building perpendicular to the façade and are structurally integrated into the building. One projecting sign may be permitted per establishment.

The Precise plan also allows “Grand Wall Signs”, which are large signs located on, and parallel to, large unfenestrated building wall areas, along certain streets. “Grand Wall Signs” may only be located on unfenestrated wall areas of at least 2,000 square feet in size. Only one “Grand Wall Sign” is permitted per establishment per façade but the area of “Grand Wall Sign” does not count towards the total sign area permitted based on street frontage. The total area of a “Grand Wall Sign” is not permitted to exceed 1,000 square feet or 25 percent of the total wall area, whichever is less.

Additionally, other signs of various sizes are permitted by Redwood City’s Downtown Precise Plan, such as marquee signs (canopy-like structures mounted over the entrance to a theater), which do not count towards the total sign area permitted based on street frontage.

Planning Commission considerations
The study session format allows for a wide range of discussion/direction on the proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment. However, to assist the Planning Commission, staff recommends considering a sequence of questions, including:

- **Are the proposed formulas for calculating signage generally supported?** These include the formulas for frontages along El Camino Real and other primary and secondary frontages.
- **Should a Master Sign Plan be required for projects that fall under the proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment?** A Master Sign Plan would allow the Planning Commission to review a specific project’s signage to ensure a cohesive look and would allow deviations from the Sign Design Guidelines if requested by a specific project.
- **Should office tenant signage limitations be based on Springline’s proposal to allow one sign per 100 feet of the applicable frontage and one ground-mounted monument sign per office building (with the provision that frontage over 150 feet would be rounded up to allow two signs)?** The sign consultant for Middle Plaza offered an alternative that would allow the tenant signage limit for a mixed-use building to be calculated by multiplying the linear feet of the street frontage by 0.01 and multiplying the result by 50 square feet instead of limiting the signage to one sign up to 50 square feet in size per 100 square feet of frontage. Although this alternative could result in more individual signs, a master sign
program could help create a unified look.

**Correspondence**
As previously mentioned, staff received one item of correspondence from the sign consultant for Middle Plaza, which is included as Attachment D. The applicant indicates they have conducted outreach including discussions within the local community and working with the Chamber of Commerce. Additionally, the applicant indicates the Chamber of Commerce has hosted them at several farmers markets including, most recently, on December 5 and December 8 at the Bon Marché Wednesday evening farmers market.

**Impact on City Resources**
The project sponsor is required to pay Planning, Building and Public Works permit fees, based on the City’s Master Fee Schedule, to fully cover the cost of staff time spent on the review of the project.

**Environmental Review**
Staff is evaluating the project proposal to determine the appropriate level of review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**Public Notice**
Public notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Public notification also consisted of publishing a notice in the local newspaper and notification by mail of owners and occupants within a 300-foot radius of the Specific Plan area.

**Attachments**
A. Map of Specific Plan Area  
B. Project Description Letter  
C. Springline Preliminary Signage Proposal  
D. Middle Plaza Preliminary Signage Proposal and Letter

Report prepared by:  
Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner

Report review by:  
Kyle Perata, Acting Planning Manager
Springline Project/Sign Ordinance Amendment (Updated December 3, 2021)

Proposed Amendment to the Signs—Outdoor Advertising (Signage) Requirements Applicable to the El Camino Real and Downtown Specific Plan Area

1. Introduction

When the City approved the Station 1300 Project (now renamed as “Springline”) in January 2017, City staff’s recommendation acknowledged that the limitations on sign area in Chapter 16.92 of the City’s Code should be revised in order to make the Project commercially viable, and indicated a general intent that an amendment to authorize a more appropriate amount of display area should be considered prior to occupancy. Over the past several months, the new manager of the Project, Presidio Bay Ventures, has engaged in informal discussions with City staff about the scope of an amendment to the City’s signage ordinance, now that prospective tenants have been identified and more information is available regarding market conditions and tenant preferences. In order to ensure that this issue is presented to the City Council in a timely manner, Presidio Bay is now submitting an application for a Zoning Text Amendment (applicable solely to the area subject to the El Camino Real and Downtown Specific Plan) that would allow for signage appropriate to the Project’s scale and current market conditions. These amendments are intended to ensure that the Project’s community-serving retail and office components are successful, consistent with the outcome that we understand the City wants and deserves; in addition, the additional signage this amendment would allow should also be appropriate for the rest of the Specific Plan area.

The proposed text amendment is designed to accomplish the following objectives:

- Maintain the current formula for calculating the maximum sign area based on the length of a project’s frontage (although a more simplified formula that results in a very similar signage area may also be considered as previously discussed with City staff).
- For projects within the ECR/D-SP district, eliminate the 100 square foot “cap” on the total sign area for the primary frontage, as well as the 50 square foot “cap” on total signage per secondary frontage, provided that the maximum sign area on any frontage shall be 1000 sf regardless of the length of frontage.
- Establish a formula, also applicable only within the ECR/D-SP district, for calculating the maximum sign area for secondary frontages based on 50% of the (increased) maximum allowable signage area on the primary frontage.
- For any signage allowed on frontages, limit the area of any individual sign to a maximum of 50 square feet.
- For properties containing a mix of retail and office uses, provide that there shall be no more than one office tenant sign on a particular frontage for each 100 lineal feet of the project’s frontage on that street plus one ground level monument sign per office building. (Normal “rounding” rules would apply; for example, if the frontage was 151 feet, this would round up to two office signs allowed.)
- Provide an exemption from the signage area limits for project identification and directional signage on a property with a frontage on El Camino Real, including signage identifying an overall mixed-use development, and directional signage such as entries to parking garages, with the exemption limited to no more than one-half square foot of project identification...
and directional signage for each one linear foot of frontage on El Camino Real. For example, for a property with a primary frontage 250 feet in length, up to 125 square feet of project identification/directional signage would be exempt from the overall signage area limit calculated under Figure 1.

It is important to note that any signage that would be permitted pursuant to these proposed amendments would be subject to all the City’s existing Code and Sign Guidelines with regard to such factors as lighting, limitations on bright colors etc. Once a signage plan was approved by the Planning Commission, specific signs could be approved administratively o long as they were consistent with the Master Plan.

2. **Revisions Based on Planning Commission Feedback**

This revised set of proposed ordinance amendments responds to comments of the Planning Commission at the study session as follows:

1. Removes the proposed amendment which would allow additional signage area for properties with multistory buildings.

2. Establishes a maximum area of 50 square feet from any individual business sign.

3. Limits office tenant signage to one sign per each 100 feet of the applicable frontage, plus one ground-mounted monument sign per office building.

4. Adds a proposed amendment that would exempt (up to a total amount based on site frontage) non-commercial project identification and directional or way finding signage.

The key differences between the current proposal and the proposal discussed at the previous study session involve (1) eliminating specific rules for multistory buildings, and (2) including an exemption for directional and project identification signage. The previously proposed additional signage allowance for multistory buildings only applied to the El Camino frontage, and the new proposed exemption for project identification and directional signage would also be limited to the primary El Camino frontage, thus under our revised proposal there would be no change from the previous proposal to the amount of signage that would be allowed on the Oak Grove and Garwood frontages.

With the elimination of the proposed additional signage allowance for multistory buildings, even with eliminating the 100 square foot cap, the Springline Project would be limited to 540 square feet of total signage on the El Camino Real frontage, of which the project intends to utilize approximately 179 square feet for project identification and directional signage, leaving only about 360 square feet which is insufficient for market needs. Exempting up to 228 square feet of information/directional signage from the overall limit would allow the entire 540 square feet under Figure 1 (after removal of the 100 sf “cap”) to be used for business signage uses. Under the original proposal, with the signage area supplement for multistory buildings, the project would have been allowed up to 1,079 square feet of total signage area, of which (after subtracting
identification/directional signage) up to 900 square feet would have been for business signage; the illustrations included in the original proposal showed about 727 square feet of total business signage on the El Camino frontage. Thus, the revised proposal, including the proposed exemption for project identification and directional signage, would result in substantially less allowed business signage on the El Camino frontage than the previous proposal and would also reduce the allowed signage to approximately 200 square feet less than the signage shown in the illustrative diagrams that accompanied the original proposal.

In support of the revised application, Presidio Bay Ventures is submitting the following information:

- A table that shows (1) the maximum permitted sign area on each frontage under the current regulations, (2) the increased sign area under the proposed formulas, and (3) the corresponding maximum sign area that could be permitted for the Project, based on frontage lengths, for illustrative purposes only.
- A massing study with a series of elevation sheets that illustrates the various signs that could be permitted by the proposed text amendments visible from the Project’s three frontages (El Camino, Oak Grove, and Garwood). (The elevations, which also show possible signage locations, are again for illustrative purposes only; assuming the text amendment is approved, any project would be required to submit a Master Sign Plan for approval.)
- An updated explanation of the proposed text amendments and suggested amendment language.

The proposed language would allow the additional sign area which Presidio Bay Ventures believes is necessary to accommodate the minimum requirements or expectations for retail and office tenants in today’s market and avoid “empty storefront” scenarios. This includes amendments to Section 16.92.110 subsection (2) for the primary frontage and subsection (3) for the secondary frontages, as well as an exemption of certain informational/directional signage on the El Camino frontage from the otherwise applicable signage area limits.

3. Context and Rationale

Our suggested approach to increasing sign area based on project dimensions (e.g., length of frontages) is informed by a number of considerations, as follows:

- In response to input from staff, we incorporated the current formula used for the “Figure 1” display area calculation. We had originally suggested a slightly different (and somewhat simpler) formula of 1.25 x primary frontage length (and one half that, 0.625 for the secondary frontages), which would result in similar sign area relative to the more complex formula currently in effect. For example, with the proposed removal of the 100 square foot cap on the primary frontage, our proposed simpler formula allows 570 square feet of sign area for the primary frontage on El Camino Real, whereas the current formula (without the 100 square foot maximum) allows 540 square feet. We remain receptive to modifying the scope of our application to incorporate the simpler formula if that approach is supported by City staff.
• Regardless of the length of a project’s primary frontage, the total area of non-exempt signage on any property would be limited to a maximum of 1,000 sf.

• Our proposal maintains the current limitation on sign area for the secondary frontage to 50% of the maximum sign area that would be permitted if it was a primary frontage, unless the secondary frontage is along El Camino Real in which case the 50% limit would not apply. The rationale for this concept within the ECR/Downtown district is that El Camino Real is a unique corridor. In our proposal, the greater allowance therefore applies to El Camino Real (whether it’s the primary frontage or not); other streets in the Specific Plan area, except for El Camino Real, would be subject to the secondary frontage limitation. In other words, for any project with a secondary frontage other than along El Camino Real, the amount of signage area would be limited to one half of what our proposed formula would permit on the primary frontage.

• The updated signage massing study illustrates the general conceptual appearance of the Project’s signage that would be allowed consistent with our proposal, with individual signs specifically limited to 50 square feet. It is anticipated that most individual signs at the ground floor level would not exceed about 25 square feet. We are also seeking additional flexibility, compared to the current signage regulations, with respect to signage letter sizes (maximum 24 inches in letter size for the retail level, and 30 inches for the upper level, office uses). Those provisions could be added to our draft language, but we are mindful of the desire to not complicate matters. We suggest addressing the letter sizes in the Master Sign Plan, when site-specific factors can be taken into account.

• During the study session, Planning Commissioners indicated that they were most favorable to the concept of removing the 100 sf (and 50 sf) caps for retail/ground floor signage, and were also concerned about an excessive number of signs for office tenants. Therefore, we are also proposing that for properties including both retail/CSU and office uses, that the number of building signs identifying office tenant(s) be limited to a maximum of one such sign for each 100 lineal feet of that frontage. Thus, using the Springline project as an example, because this property has approximately 456 feet of frontage on El Camino Real, under the proposal it would be allowed up to five office tenant signs which would be visible from El Camino. In addition, one monument sign per office building would be allowed. The current intent for the Springline project is to provide each office building with one office sign directly facing El Camino, and one office sign for each office building facing the central courtyard but visible from El Camino; the specifics regarding these signs would be set forth in the required Master Signage Plan.

• We are also proposing that the signage ordinance be amended to provide a limited exemption for a frontage in the Specific Plan area with respect to 1) project identification signage, such as the “Springline” sign that will be installed on an archway between the two office buildings, and 2) for directional or “wayfinding” signage, such as signage showing the entry to the parking garage, the location of dog park, directories of tenant locations and similar wayfinding. The amount of such signage area exempted would be limited to one-half a square foot of signage area for each linear foot of a
project’s primary frontage. In addition, in order to be eligible for this exemption, we propose that the project identification name would not be allowed to include the name of a generally known commercial product or business or institutional entity (i.e., no “naming rights” would be permitted). As applied to the Springline Project’s primary frontage on El Camino Real, this provision would allow up to 228 square feet of such exempt signage (one-half of the Project’s 456 feet of El Camino frontage). As shown in the materials presented at the Study Session, the applicant contemplates approximately 178 square feet of project identification signage on the El Camino frontage, the majority of which would be the “Springline” sign located on an arch above the passageway to the plaza, with the remaining exempt signage area including signage marking entry to the parking garage and other directional or wayfinding signage. Because “Springline” is not the name of a commercial entity or product, it would be qualified for this exemption. (In contrast, project identification signage including a name like “Wells Fargo” or “Safeway” would be a recognized commercial name and would not qualify for this exemption.) Also, although this project identification and directional signage would be exempt from the Code’s signage area limitations, any such signage would be subject to City review as part of the Project’s overall signage master plan.

- One issue that has yet to be discussed with City staff or the Planning Commission concerns language in the City’s Design Guidelines for Signs that provides a formula for how sign area is allocated between multiple tenants in a single building. We have yet to evaluate how that formula would apply in practice, but it may also be something that warrants modification to provide additional flexibility (perhaps by giving the decision-maker the ability to approve variations from the design guidelines on a case-by-case basis). We suggest addressing this topic as part of the Master Sign Plan process rather than being governed by the Design Guidelines formula, which does not apply easily to a multi-story situation.

- Our proposal limits the increases in maximum sign area and the qualified exemption for project identification and directional signage to projects subject to the Specific Plan. Of course, we are mindful of the fact that the current signage area limitations also apply to signage in other areas of the city; but for a variety of reasons, our preference would be for the current proposal to allow additional signage area to be narrowly tailored and not apply city-wide. For one, properties in other areas are likely to be subject to different constraints and market conditions as compared to the Specific Plan area. In addition, applying the contemplated amendments city-wide would inevitably delay the adoption of these amendments and would therefore be prejudicial to the Project’s ability to attract high-quality tenants by requiring analysis of a far greater variety of situations than exists within the Specific Plan area. Further, sizable developments in the Specific Plan area with long frontages, including Springline and Middle Plaza, are coming online now or in the very near future. The failure to address these large new projects’ signage needs in the near-term by adopting the proposed amendment is likely to negatively affect the viability of attracting high-quality retail and office tenants to newly constructed Specific Plan projects which is contrary to the Specific Plan’s vision for a more vital and vibrant area. Therefore, from a policy perspective, we are
requesting that the City adopt the proposed signage changes in the near future for the Specific Plan area only, while deferring consideration of these or similar changes to signage rules for other parts of the City until a future time.

4. Proposed Text Amendment (proposed new text underlined)

Section 16.92.110(2): Such signs will not exceed in total display area, measured in square feet, the ratio of total display area to lot primary frontage as shown on the attached graph, entitled "Figure No. 1," incorporated herein, and made a part of this chapter. The maximum display area permitted for any lot, regardless of the number of uses or tenants housed on a single lot, is one hundred square feet. Notwithstanding the above, the one hundred square foot maximum shall not apply to lots located within the ECR/D-SP zoning district with primary frontage along El Camino Real, which may be permitted larger total display areas, subject to Planning Commission approval of a Master Sign Plan, consistent with the following formulas: (a) for non-residential uses, the maximum display area permitted for a lot with frontage along El Camino Real shall be determined by the formula used in Figure 1 (30’ + ((Frontage Length -10’) x (8/7))) without regard to the one hundred square foot maximum. For any additional signage area authorized pursuant to this exception, any individual sign would be limited to a maximum of 50 square feet, and the total area of signage for a single project would be limited to a maximum of 1,000 square feet. In addition, with respect to any signage authorized pursuant to the above, for buildings with a mixture of CSU/retail and office uses, signs identifying an office tenant or tenants are limited to one sign for each 100 lineal feet of the project on the applicable frontage, plus one ground level monument sign per office building. (Normal rounding rules would apply, so that for example a property with a frontage of 150 feet or more would round up to two office signs allowed.)

Section 16.92.110(3): In the case of parcels of land having secondary frontage, signs may be located on such frontage, provided that the total sign area thereon shall not exceed one-half the maximum sign area allowed by Figure No 1 for such secondary frontage, and further provided that, subject to Planning Commission approval of a Master Sign Plan, for any parcel within the ECR/D-SP zoning district with frontage on a street other than El Camino Real, the maximum total sign area on that frontage shall not exceed the formula of (0.5 x (30 + ((non-ECR Frontage-10) x 8/7))) without regard to the 100 square foot maximum (50 square feet on secondary frontages) that applies in zoning districts other than the ECR-D-SP zoning district. The limitation on office tenant signage set forth in 16.92.110 (2) shall also apply to such secondary frontage.

Section 16.92.110(9): For any parcel within the ECR/D-SP district, informational signage identifying the name of a project and outdoor directional or wayfinding signage shall be exempt from the otherwise applicable limits on total signage areas, provided that the maximum signage area for project identification and directional signage (including tenant directories) allowed pursuant to such exemption shall be limited to one-half square foot of signage for each linear foot of a project’s specific frontage from which such signage would be visible. Any project identification signage considered exempt pursuant to this Section 16.92.110(9) shall not include a reference to a generally recognized name of a commercial product or business or institution. Any project identification or directional signage exempted from the maximum signage otherwise permitted by Section 16.92.110(2) and (3) shall be approved as part of a Master Sign Plan.

***
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VICINITY MAP

NORTH OFFICE BUILDING

SOUTH OFFICE BUILDING

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING

Oak Grove Avenue

688°-0" GARWOOD WAY

456°-0"

EL CAMINO REAL
Elevations

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING - SOUTH ELEVATION

*Note some locations have the option to mount their tenant signage under the roof or canopy
NOTE: SIGNAGE IS VISIBLE FROM BOTH OAK GROVE AND GARWOOD BUT IS ALLOCATED TO OAK GROVE ON TOTALS; SUBJECT TO FURTHER DISCUSSION AS TO ALLOCATION OF SIGNAGE VISIBLE / POTENTIALLY VISIBLE FROM MULTIPLE STREETS.

*Note some locations have the option to mount their tenant signage under the roof or canopy*
Total Square Footage of Commercial Signage Shown: 213 sqft
NOTE: THOUGH THIS SOUTH FACING SIGNAGE MAY BE SOMEWHAT VISIBLE FROM OAK GROVE, IT IS ALLOCATED TO ECR IN SUMMARY SIGNAGE NUMBERS.

Total Square Footage of Commercial Signage Shown 26 sqft
Elevations

El Camino Real

Total Square Footage of Commercial Signage Shown 82 sqft

Note: Possibly visible from Garwood

Note: Signage area allocated to ECR, though visibility limited due to angle
Note: Signage area allocated to ECR, though visibility limited due to angle

Note: Possibly visible from Garwood

Total Square Footage of Commercial Signage Shown

94 sqft
Elevations

OFFICE BUILDING NORTH

Garwood Way

Total Square Footage of Commercial Signage Shown 50 sqft

Office tenants are permitted signs over 2'6" in height as long as they fit within the allowable square footage allowances.

NORTH OFFICE BUILDING - EAST ELEVATION
Elevations

OFFICE BUILDING SOUTH

OFFICE BUILDING NORTH

El Camino Real

NORTH & SOUTH OFFICE BUILDING - WEST ELEVATION

ENLARGED ELEVATION
Elevations

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING - EAST ELEVATION

ENLARGED ELEVATION

Garwood Way

PROJECT ID SIGNAGE

ZONE KEY
## Total Springline Signage Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID (Parking/etc) Excluded</th>
<th>Project ID (Parking/etc)</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Total Visible</th>
<th>Proposed Maximum Commercial Signage Area Under Proposed Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible from Oak Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td>477 SF</td>
<td>477 SF</td>
<td>540 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible from Garwood Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>41 SF</td>
<td>90 SF</td>
<td>165 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>275 SF</td>
<td>717 SF</td>
<td>402 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>178 SF</td>
<td>477 SF</td>
<td>992 SF</td>
<td>1,107 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Visual Representation in Massing Study

## Maximum Signage Area Existing and Proposed Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Lot Linear Frontage (in feet) at Springline</th>
<th>Average Current Signage: Allowable Square footage per Menlo Park City Code (Primary Max 100 Secondary Max 50)</th>
<th>Original Proposal Signage: Two-Component Approach</th>
<th>Revised Signage: Primary Façade: (30+((FRONTAGE-10)*(8/7)))</th>
<th>Secondary Façade: 0.5*(30+((FRONTAGE-10)*(8/7)))</th>
<th>Exempt Signage Project ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real - Primary</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>540 SF</td>
<td>178 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove - Secondary</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garwood Way - Secondary</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>402 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>200 SF</td>
<td>1,646 SF</td>
<td>1,107 SF</td>
<td>178 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 13, 2021

Corinna D. Sandmeier
City of Menlo Park
701 Laurel St.
Menlo Park, CA

RE: Proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment (Signage)

ScottAG is a multi-disciplinary signage design and manufacturing studio located in Sonoma County. We provide signage design and consulting services in the US and abroad. We have extensive experience in developing sign programs for commercial, residential, retail, office, and mixed-use projects. Our work includes entitlement and permitting in many municipalities.

We have worked along El Camino Real in Menlo Park and adjacent Peninsula communities extensively over the past 10 years primarily on residential and mixed-use projects. I was in the audience for the previous Planning Commission study session regarding the proposed text amendment and have carefully reviewed the updated proposal being considered tonight.

ScottAG has been contracted to design signage for the Middle Plaza project. We have a keen interest in the outcome of this process. The Middle Plaza project is also located in the El Camino Real and Downtown Specific Plan area and faces the same issues around the zoning code language relative to signage as the Springline project. The critical issue regarding signage is the imposition of the 100sf of sign area per parcel cap. It is critical that the City of Menlo Park continues the process to address the need for additional signage allowance for projects of this type that was originally recognized by staff in 2017. Our comments here reflect our general support for the text amendment and outline questions remaining to ensure that the needs for our project can be accommodated.

The Middle Plaza project has over 1600lf of frontage on El Camino Real and no secondary frontages. The attached massing study is based on project identification, directional, and address signage designed for the residential project and projected tenant signage (as well as project identification, directional, and address signage) required for the office and retail components. The elevations clearly demonstrate the light touch that our proposed level of signage will have on a project of this scale. The elevations reflect signage which would be allowed under the proposed text amendment for the following reasons which we support:

- The continuing use of the current 1sf / 1lf of sign area allowance with an updated 1,000sf cap.
- Caps size of each individual sign at 50sf.
- Allow 1 (one) single or multi-tenant monument sign per office building.
- Continues to enforce all elements of the current zoning code regarding sign height, location, colors, lighting.

There are a handful of questions we believe require further study and consideration:

- The primary controls on the amount of signage are maximum total signage square footage per project frontage footage (lf) and the maximum sign size. In addition, Springline has proposed limiting the number of office tenant signs on a mixed office/retail building. This limit to one office tenant sign per 100lf of lot primary frontage (or fraction thereof) assumes the sign would be the maximum 50sf. This may not be the case - - smaller office tenant signage may be used - - and we would propose that the office tenant signage limit for a mixed building should be 50sf times the multiple the lot primary frontage is of 100lf, not a specified number of signs which is not cognizant of signage size.

- As the Springline proposal suggests we would like to see the formula for allocation of signage amongst tenants suspended and allow that distribution to be handled in the Master Sign Program process with staff have perview over the applicant’s proposal.

I would be happy to answer any questions regarding the proposed Middle Plaza signage program. I will be attending the Monday 12/13 meeting.

Sincerely,

Michael Burch
ScottAG
Principal
### EL CAMINO REAL SIGNAGE

#### RESIDENTIAL SIGNAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA - HALO-LIT BUILDING ADDRESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3'-6&quot; X 2'-0&quot;</td>
<td>7 FT²</td>
<td>35 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB - RESIDENTIAL PROJECT ID MONUMENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6'-0&quot; X 6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>39 FT²</td>
<td>78 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM - RESIDENTIAL WALL ID</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3'-0&quot; X 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>9 FT²</td>
<td>36 FT²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SIGN AREA**: 114 FT²

#### OFFICE SIGNAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA - HALO-LIT BUILDING ADDRESS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3'-6&quot; X 2'-0&quot;</td>
<td>7 FT²</td>
<td>49 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM - OFFICE MONUMENT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6'-0&quot; X 6'-0&quot;</td>
<td>39 FT²</td>
<td>117 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RN - RETAIL TENANT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15'-0&quot; X 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>45 FT²</td>
<td>180 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT - RETAIL BLADE SIGN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3'-0&quot; X 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>9 FT²</td>
<td>36 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM - OFFICE BUILDING TENANT SIGN, Size A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15'-0&quot; X 3'-4&quot;</td>
<td>50 FT²</td>
<td>250 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM - OFFICE BUILDING TENANT SIGN, Size B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5'-0&quot; X 4'-0&quot;</td>
<td>20 FT²</td>
<td>20 FT²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED OFFICE SIGN AREA**: 603 FT²

#### PARKING/DIRECTIONAL SIGNAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD - PARKING DIRECTIONAL, Size A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14'-0&quot; X 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>42 FT²</td>
<td>84 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD - PARKING DIRECTIONAL, Size B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5'-0&quot; X 4'-0&quot;</td>
<td>20 FT²</td>
<td>40 FT²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED PARKING/DIRECTIONAL SIGN AREA**: 124 FT²

---

### PRIVATE STREET SIGNAGE

#### RESIDENTIAL SIGNAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA - HALO-LIT BUILDING ADDRESS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3'-6&quot; X 2'-0&quot;</td>
<td>7 FT²</td>
<td>21 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RN - BUILDING ENTRY HANGING SIGN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3'-0&quot; X 2'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6 FT²</td>
<td>6 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RN - RESIDENTIAL WALL ID</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3'-0&quot; X 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>9 FT²</td>
<td>9 FT²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL SIGN AREA**: 15 FT²

#### PARKING/DIRECTIONAL SIGNAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGN TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD - PARKING DIRECTIONAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14'-0&quot; X 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>42 FT²</td>
<td>84 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD - PARKING DIRECTIONAL BLADE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3'-0&quot; X 3'-0&quot;</td>
<td>9 FT²</td>
<td>54 FT²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT - TRANSIT PEDESTRIAN DIRECTIONAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2'-0&quot; X 1'-0&quot;</td>
<td>2 FT²</td>
<td>6 FT²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED PARKING/DIRECTIONAL SIGN AREA**: 144 FT²

**TOTAL PROPOSED ECR**: 159 FT²

#### TOTAL PROPOSED PROPERTY SIGNAGE

**1000 FT²**

---

**TOTAL PROPOSED ECR**: 841 FT²
STAFF REPORT

Planning Commission
Meeting Date: 12/13/2021
Staff Report Number: 21-067-PC

Regular Business: Review of Draft 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Dates

Recommendation
Staff recommends that the Planning Commission provide feedback on the proposed 2021 Planning Commission calendar, included as Attachment A.

Policy Issues
Review of the draft Planning Commission calendar does not raise any particular policy issues.

Background
Each year, the Planning Commission reviews the Planning Commission calendar for the upcoming year.

Analysis
Attachment A identifies the proposed 2022 Planning Commission meeting dates. The proposed meeting dates were selected with consideration of the following factors:

- Typical schedule of two meetings per month;
- City holidays and other noted celebrations and religious holidays;
- Avoidance of Planning Commission and City Council meetings in the same week when possible; and
- Avoidance of back-to-back meetings when possible.

At times, the Planning Commission may also need to schedule a study session or special meetings. These meetings can be scheduled on an as needed basis, and therefore, have not been identified on the calendar.

In addition to the above listed factors, the draft 2022 Planning Commission calendar takes into account the Columbus Day holiday, which while not a City holiday, is observed by the local school districts and some government and private sector organizations. At the December 13 meeting, the Commissioners should be prepared to discuss their schedules to determine if any modifications are needed to the draft schedule. Staff recognizes that schedule conflicts may arise in the future, but if the Commission can determine if any meeting dates would result in a lack of a quorum, these dates should be avoided now. For example, if a Planning Commissioner is aware of a particularly problematic conflict with a local school break, that can be discussed at this meeting.

The Planning Commission may make a formal motion/second and vote to approve the draft calendar (with or without revisions), or Commissioners may provide individual input for staff to review and finalize administratively. Once the Commission has approved the 2022 meeting dates, staff will provide the City
Clerk with the information and update the City’s webpage.

Impact on City Resources
Review of the draft Planning Commission calendar does not affect City resources.

Environmental Review
Review of the draft Planning Commission calendar is not a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and thus no environmental review is required.

Public Notice
Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Attachments
A. Draft 2022 Planning Commission Calendar

Report prepared by:
Corinna Sandmeier, Acting Principal Planner
PLANNING COMMISSION

DRAFT MEETING DATES FOR 2022

January

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

February

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

March

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

August

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

November

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

December

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC MEETINGS
CITY HALL CLOSED
CITY HOLIDAYS

SPECIAL MEETINGS WILL BE SCHEDULED AS NEEDED
**Legend**

- PC Meetings
- City Hall Closed
- City Holidays
- Jewish Holidays
- Columbus Day
- Cesar Chavez Day
- Juneteenth
- Draft CC Calendar (2nd & 4th Tuesdays)

**Jewish Holidays**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 15-22</td>
<td>Passover (no work permitted on 4/15; 4/16; 4/21 &amp; 4/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 4-7</td>
<td>Shavuot (no work permitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 25-27</td>
<td>Rosh Hashanah (no work permitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 4-5</td>
<td>Yom Kippur (no work permitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 9-11</td>
<td>Sukkot (no work permitted on 10/10; 10/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 16-18</td>
<td>Simchat Torah (no work permitted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 18-26</td>
<td>Chanukah/Hanukkah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:*

*No work is permitted*

**School Breaks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 20 - 31</td>
<td>Winter Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 21-25</td>
<td>Mid-Winter Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 28 - 31</td>
<td>Spring Break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City Hall Holidays**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1</td>
<td>New Year's Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 17</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 21</td>
<td>President's Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30</td>
<td>Memorial Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 4</td>
<td>Independence Day's observed (July 5 in lieu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 5</td>
<td>Labor Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11</td>
<td>Veterans Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 24-25</td>
<td>Thanksgiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 25</td>
<td>Christmas Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 26</td>
<td>Christmas Day (Dec. 26 in lieu)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>