



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
Inter-Departmental Correspondence
Planning and Building



Date: November 2, 2015
Board Meeting Date: November 17, 2015
Special Notice / Hearing: Newspaper – 10 Day
Notice
Vote Required: Majority

To: Honorable Board of Supervisors

From: Steve Monowitz, Community Development Director

Subject: Public hearing to consider an appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of a Design Review Permit and a Grading Permit, to allow construction of a new 2,394 sq. ft. single-family residence (1,932 sq. ft. residence with an attached 441 sq. ft. garage), and associated grading in the amount of 448 cubic yards, on a 7,623 sq. ft. legal parcel located on Cordilleras Road in the unincorporated Emerald Lake Hills area of the County. Two significant trees are proposed to be removed.

RECOMMENDATION:

Deny the appeal, uphold the denial of the appeal by the Planning Commission, and uphold the Community Development Director's decision to approve the project, by making the findings and adopting the conditions of approval as shown on Attachment A.

BACKGROUND:

The applicant proposes to construct a new 2,394 sq. ft. single-family residence with an attached two-car garage in the unincorporated Emerald Lake Hills area. Construction requires a Design Review approval and a Grading Permit (PLN 2014-00409), and involves the removal of two significant trees. The site is an undeveloped parcel with residential development on both adjacent parcels. The approval of the project by the Community Development Director of the project on April 20, 2015, was appealed to the Planning Commission who denied the appeal on August 26, 2015. That decision has been appealed to the Board of Supervisors by the property owners on adjacent parcels 2039 Cordilleras Road (to the right, Peter Ingram's residence) and 2027 Cordilleras Road (to the left, Seth Thompson's residence).

Report Prepared By: Erica D. Adams, Emerald Lake Hills Design Review Officer,
Telephone 650/363-1828

Report Reviewed By: Camille Leung, Senior Planner, Telephone 650/363-4826

.
. .
.

Owners: Nicholas Zmay and Ryan Karich

Applicant: Nicholas Zmay

Appellants: Peter C. Ingram and Seth Thompson

Location: 2029 Cordilleras Road, Emerald Lake Hills

APN: 057-031-210

Parcel Size: 7,623 sq. ft.

Existing Zoning: RH/DR (Residential Hillside/Design Review)

General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential (0.3 to 2.3 dwelling units per acre)

Sphere-of-Influence: City of Redwood City

Existing Land Use: Undeveloped

Water and Sewer Services: Redwood City Municipal/Emerald Lake Hills Sewer District

Flood Zone: FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map designation indicates parcel as Zone C, Areas of Minimal Flooding, Community Panel No. 06081C0282E, dated July 5, 1984.

Environmental Evaluation: Categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15303, Class 3; construction of a single-family residence in a residential zone.

Parcel Legality: The parcel was legalized with a Certificate of Compliance, Type A (PLN 2014-00292); recorded on September 15, 2104.

Setting: The subject parcel is located on the south side of Cordilleras Road in the unincorporated community of Emerald Lake Hills. The parcel has a 35% average slope, is only 46 feet in width, and has eight significant trees. Both adjacent parcels are developed with single-family residences.

Chronology:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Action</u>
October 17, 2014	- Application submitted.
March 24, 2015	- Application deemed complete.

- April 1, 2015 - Emerald Lake Hills Design Review meeting - project recommended for approval.
- April 20, 2015 - Project, including grading permit, approved by Community Development Director.
- May 3, 2015 - Appeal filed by Peter Ingram and Seth Thompson. Subsequently, the applicant entered into discussions with the appellants and their representative regarding the points of the appeal.
- August 26, 2015 - Planning Commission denies the appeal and upholds the approval of the project.
- September 10, 2015 - Appeal of Planning Commission's decision is filed by Peter Ingram and Seth Thompson.
- November 17, 2015 - Board of Supervisors hearing.

DISCUSSION:

A. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

On August 26, 2015, the San Mateo County Planning Commission (Commission) heard testimony from the appellants and considered project modifications to the project proposed by the applicant. The modifications include the removal of one retaining wall and the relocation of two other retaining walls such that they will be further away from the significant trees, lowering the house by one foot, and the strategic planting of replacement trees to increase privacy between residences. The Commission voted unanimously to uphold the approval of the project, finding that the project complies with Section 6565.15 of the Zoning Regulations, and incorporated, new and revised, conditions of approval (included with Letter of Decision in Attachment E), which further clarified the tree protection and grading measures. On September 10, 2015, Peter C. Ingram and Seth Thompson appealed the Planning Commission's decision, stating that the project, as proposed, modified and conditioned, does not comply with design review standards.

Subsequent Project Modifications Made by the Applicant to Address Appellants' Concerns

The approved project differs from the originally approved project, which included the removal of three (3) significant trees (Trees #1 (non-significant), #2, #3, and #7, as identified in the arborist's report from Kielty Arborist Services, LLC, dated August 11, 2015), while the applicant's current proposal retains Tree #7. Also, the applicant has reduced the proposed grading from 668 cubic yards to 448 cubic yards, by eliminating grading (primarily fill) in the rear yard of the property.

B. KEY ISSUES OF THE APPEAL

In their application for appeal, the appellants Peter C. Ingram (2039 Cordilleras Road) and Seth Thompson (2027 Cordilleras Road) state that the Planning Commission did not impose sufficient conditions of approval to bring the project into compliance with Design Review Standards in Section 6565.15 of the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations. Specifically, the appellants cite concerns with Condition Nos. 3, 8 and 10, as described below:

1. The appellants state that Condition No. 3 regarding tree protection measures conflicts with “arboricultural best practices for avoiding excessive disturbance to roots and crowns during and after construction,” by not ensuring minimum distances for retaining walls to existing significant indigenous trees. They state that Condition No. 3.c “does not clearly limit over excavation on the site” and Condition No. 3.d “provides a clear disincentive to the applicant to do everything possible to ensure tree survival.”

Condition No. 3, as approved by the Planning Commission:

3. *Tree Protection Measures:*

- a. *Four trees (Trees #1, #2, #3, and #7, as identified in the arborist’s report from Kielty Arborist Services, LLC, dated August 11, 2015) are approved for removal.*
- b. *Trees designated to be trimmed and remain shall be protected from damage during construction according to measures outlined in the arborist’s report dated August 11, 2015. Any additional tree removal or trimming of tree branches greater than 6 inches in diameter is subject to the San Mateo County Tree Ordinance and will require a separate permit for removal or trimming.*
- c. *A retaining wall shall be no closer than (1) 48 inches from Tree #6, (2) 34 inches from Tree #8, and (3) 14 inches from Tree #10. The retaining wall shown near Trees #4 and #5 shall be eliminated from the project and removed from the building plans. Excavation for all retaining walls near trees shall not exceed the minimum required for construction.*
- d. *If Tree #6, Tree #8, or Tree #10 becomes damaged and needs to be removed, or dies due to installation of retaining walls within two years from the commencement of construction, the tree(s) shall be replaced to provide screening. A tree replanting plan*

. . .

shall be submitted for review and approval by the Community Development Director, and implement within 30 days of approval.

Staff's Response: The appellants contend that the project has excessive tree removal because two significant trees (Trees #2 (23.9" Coast Live Oak) and #3 (7.2"-9.1" Buckeye)) are proposed for removal, and remaining trees would be damaged by construction and would, eventually, need to be removed. The appellants maintain that the proposed construction, specifically proposed retaining walls, would be too close to the remaining trees to ensure their survival post-construction. The appellants refer to a "best practice" protection measure which prohibits disturbance within a tree's dripline and state that proposed root and crown cutting of remaining trees would not comply with this measure.

Staff has determined that the applicant has taken reasonable steps to protect the remaining trees at the property. To address the appellants' concern with the proximity of retaining walls to Trees #6 and #8, the applicant states that the retaining walls will be shifted to better help preserve the trees. Plans show a 2-foot shift for the wall near Tree #6 and a 1-foot shift for Tree #8. Condition No. 3.c identifies the required distance of the retaining walls from these trees.

In addition, the applicant's arborist, Kielty Arborist Services, provided a tree survey and recommended a Tree Protection Plan for the remaining trees which are required by Condition No. 4. The plan includes hand digging, mulching and irrigation procedures during construction, and deliberate care post-construction. The arborist's report reflects anticipated survival of the trees with proper attention during construction phases. To further ensure the proper implementation of the plan, staff has added a requirement to Condition No. 4 requiring an arborist to implement elements of the Tree Protection Plan that involve cutting of roots or crown, relocation of roots, and treatment of trees (application of fertilizer, protection of exposed roots) and requiring that the applicant consult with an arborist regarding the installation of recommended irrigation.

Table 1 Trees on the Subject Property					
#	Species	DBH	Condition	Location	Retain or Remove?
1	Black Acacia	5.5-4.8*	Poor vigor, poor form	Front	Remove*
2	Coast Live Oak	23.9	Fair vigor, poor form	Front/left side	Remove (1)
3	Buckeye	7.2-9.1	Fair vigor, poor form	House footprint	Remove (1)
4	Buckeye	5.5-4.9*	Fair vigor, poor form	Left side	Retain
5	Buckeye	9.2-6.8	Fair vigor, poor form	Left side	Retain
6	Coast Live Oak	17.8	Fair vigor, poor form	Right side	Retain
7	Coast Live Oak	12.8	Fair vigor, poor form	Right side	Retain
8	Coast Live Oak	20.8	Fair vigor, fair form	Right side	Retain
9	Coast Live Oak	24.5	Fair vigor, poor form	Right side	Retain
10	Coast Live Oak	15.3	Fair vigor, poor form	Right side	Retain
11	Grecian Laurel	10x6"	Good vigor, poor form	Right side	Retain
Total Significant Trees to be Removed: 2					
*Not a significant tree, as diameter of tree is less than 6" DBH. Source: Tree Survey from report by Kevin Kielty, Kielty Arborist Services, dated August 11, 2015.					

Staff had determined that the applicant has also taken reasonable steps to minimize project tree removal and preserve trees at the property. While project plans show Tree #5 (9.2"-6.8" Buckeye) proposed for removal, the applicant has stated that, to address the Thompson's concerns of privacy, Tree #5 will be preserved by removing a retaining wall. While the appellants' arborist, Kielty Arborist Services, provided a tree survey identifying compromised health for Tree #7, which states that it has poor form and decay at the base, and Tree #9 has poor form and a hollow base, the applicant does not request removal of these trees and plans on using the arborist's recommended tree protection measures to retain them.

Tree protection was discussed extensively at the August 26, 2015 Planning Commission hearing. The Commission stated that some impact to the roots of the trees was unavoidable due to the size of the building footprint relative to the size of the parcel, but that implementation of the arborist's Tree Protection Plan would improve the trees' survival rate. In addition, Condition 3.d requires that if tree(s) dies within two years of the commencement of construction that replacement tree(s) would be planted to help maintain the natural screening between residences.

The Planning Commission determined that the project, as proposed, modified and conditioned, complies with the standard regarding minimization of tree removal, as required by Section 6565.15.A.1.

2. The appellants state that Condition No. 8 “only addresses grading but does not stipulate leaving the upper portion of the parcel in an undisturbed condition throughout the construction period” and conditions do not minimize grading impacts at property lines.

Condition No. 8, as approved by the Planning Commission:

8. *The grading plan shall be revised to remove grading in the rear portion of the parcel behind the proposed residence, except to create a swale to assist with on-site water retention, near the rear retaining wall.*

Staff's Response: Condition No. 8 was a recommendation from the Emerald Lake Hills Design Review Officer which was included in the Community Development Director's approval. The applicant will revise the project grading plans to reflect this condition and the revised plans will be reviewed and issued with the building permit.

Staff has added additional requirements in Condition No. 13 to require separate erosion and sediment control plans (including tree protection among other measures) at the grading and construction stages. Also, the applicant would be required to protect areas that will not be disturbed during grading and construction (area of the parcel to the rear of the house) and must show barriers along the “limit.” Work, storage, earth moving, vegetation clearing, and other disturbance in this protected area are prohibited, except as necessary to create a swale.

The submitted grading plans have been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the Planning and Building Department's Geotechnical Section. Geotechnical studies and drainage plans, in particular, are preliminary, and reviewed for adherence to regulations and guidelines, but are typically refined during the building permit process. The applicant's geotechnical and civil engineer responded to the concerns raised in the appellants' letter. Their responses were subsequently reviewed by Department of Public Works staff and the Geotechnical Section staff, whereby the project has maintained the preliminary approval, subject to conditions, of these agencies. Per Condition No. 25, the project's geotechnical consultant shall ensure that work has been completed in conformance with the revised and approved plans, conditions of approval/mitigation measures, and the Grading Regulations. In addition, building inspectors from the Planning and Building Department will conduct site inspections at different stages of grading and construction to ensure that field work matches approved plan and that adequate erosion control measures are implemented.

The Planning Commission determined that the project, as proposed, modified and conditioned, complies with the standard regarding minimization of alteration of the natural topography, as required by Section 6565.15.A.2.

3. The appellants state that Condition No. 10 “does not go far enough to lower proposed elevation and revise setbacks such that the project will respect the privacy of neighboring homes as much as possible.”

Condition No. 10, as approved by the Planning Commission:

10. a. *The plans shall be modified to show a one (1) foot reduction in elevation height (the garage plate height shall be 9 feet, finished floor of first floor shall be no greater than 191 feet and finished floor of the second floor shall be no greater than 202 feet).*
- b. *Prior to Planning approval of the building permit application, the applicant shall have the licensed land surveyor or engineer indicate on the construction plans: (1) the natural grade elevations at the significant corners (at least four) of the footprint of the proposed structure on the submitted site plan, and (2) the elevations of proposed finished grades. In addition, (1) the natural grade elevations at the significant corners of the proposed structure, (2) the finished floor elevations, (3) the topmost elevation of the roof, and (4) the garage slab elevation must be shown on the plan, elevations, and cross-section (if one is provided).*

Staff's Response: The applicant and appellants with respective legal counsel have met on two occasions in an attempt to resolve outstanding issues. The appellants have requested changes to project design, requesting a 2.5-foot shift of the house such that it is centered on the property, provides 10-foot setbacks on both sides, and a lowering of the house by 2 feet.

Following the meetings, the applicant provided a list of agreed upon project modifications dated August 6, 2015 (Attachment K), which was presented at the Planning Commission hearing. The list stated that to address the Thompsons' concerns of privacy, Trees #4 and #5 will be preserved by removing a retaining wall. The trees will provide a natural privacy screen between the residences. To address the Ingram's concerns about privacy, the applicant will plant a red bud tree in front of the kitchen window. In addition, the finished floor elevation of the proposed home will be lowered by one foot.

In a correspondence to staff dated October 7, 2015, Mr. Zmay states that lowering the garage finish floor an additional one foot in addition to the one foot lowering that the Commission implemented would (1) increase grading amounts and (2) lower the garage finish floor to a point where proper driveway drainage could be an issue. At the Planning Commission meeting, Peter Ingram stated that the finish floor of the main deck would have a one 1-foot sight line over his privacy wall and to address this concern, the applicant proposed to lower the house by one foot at the meeting.

Regarding setbacks, Mr. Zmay states that the light well for the master bedroom is located on the right side of the property along with two oaks. He states that he has moved the light well wall to the left away from the trees to address the neighbors concern with wall and tree proximity. If the applicant were to center the house, he would be moving the house and the light well to the right, closer to the trees the appellants desire to see protected.

At the Planning Commission hearing, a Commissioner stated that the project not only meets, but exceeds, the expectation of privacy, and all the Commissioners stated that the project met the privacy standard.

The Planning Commission determined that the project, as proposed, modified, and conditioned, complies with the standard regarding respect for the privacy of neighboring houses and outdoor living areas, as required by Section 6565.15.A.3.

C. PROJECT COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY REGULATIONS

1. Conformance with the General Plan and the Emerald Lake Hills Area Plan

General Plan Visual Quality Policy 4.4 requires the appearance of rural and urban development to “promote aesthetically pleasing development.” The General Plan then calls for the establishment of guidelines for communities to achieve these goals. The establishment of the Design Review Chapter in the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations is the mechanism which fulfills this directive. A project that complies with the Emerald Lake Hills Design Standards (Section 6565.15) of the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations also conforms with General Plan Policies 4.14 (*Appearance of New Development*) and 4.35 (*Urban Area Design Concept*). These policies require structures to promote and enhance good design, and improve the appearance and visual character of development in the area by managing the location and appearance of the structure. The application has been reviewed by the Emerald Lake Hills the Design Review Officer and has been found to meet the Design Review Standards for Emerald Lake Hills, Section 6565.15. A detailed discussion of project compliance with the design review standards is provided in Section C.3 of this report.

Policy 2.2 requires minimization of soil erosion - the process by which soil is detached and transported by running water, wind and gravity. Policy 2.17 requires the regulation of development to minimize soil erosion and sedimentation to ensure stabilization of disturbed areas and to protect and enhance natural plant communities. The project minimizes soil erosion, both during construction and post-construction, through the proposed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Drainage Plan. The project plans have been reviewed and approved by the Geotechnical Section and the Department of Public Works. Comments and recommendations of these reviewing agencies have been addressed by the applicant or included as conditions of approval to ensure that the project will comply with the policies and will prevent soil erosion. Additionally, with adherence to the standard "Best Practices" and site-specific recommendations and conditions from the aforementioned agencies, the proposed grading will minimize soil erosion.

2. Conformance with the Zoning Regulations

The project is located in the Residential Hillside/Design Review (RH/DR) Zoning District. The project's degree of compliance with the district's development standards, as required by Sections 6803 through 6810, is detailed in the table below:

Development Standards	Zoning Requirements	Proposal
Building Site Area	45,000 sq. ft. (based on 35% average slope)	7,623 sq. ft.
Minimum Site Width	50 ft.	46 ft.
Building Site Frontage	50 ft.	50 ft.
Minimum Setbacks		
Front	20 ft.	26 ft.
Rear	20 ft.	71.5 ft.
Left Side		7.5 ft.
Right Side		12.5 ft.
Combined Side Yard	Combination of 20 ft.	20 ft.
Lot Coverage	25%	21.3% or 1,625 sq. ft.
Maximum Building Floor Area	Greater of 30% or 2,400 sq. ft.	31.4% or 2,394 sq. ft.
Maximum Building Height	28 ft.	28 ft.
Minimum Parking	2 covered and 2 guest spaces	2 covered and 2 guest spaces
Grading Quantities	Cannot exceed 1,000 cy	448 cy

3. Conformance with the Design Review Regulations

The project complies with applicable Design Review Standards contained in Section 6565.15 of the Design Review Regulations, as discussed below:

A. Site Planning

Section 656.15 states that, as much as possible, site new buildings on a parcel in locations that:

1. *Minimize tree removal:* The applicant has reduced the number of significant trees to be removed from four (as approved by the Community Development Director) to two, under the current proposal. Condition Nos. 3 and 4 require the applicant to implement enhanced tree protection measures as recommended by an arborist.
2. *Minimize alteration of the natural topography:* Project grading has been reduced from 668 cubic yards to 448 cubic yards in part by eliminating grading at the rear of the house.
3. *Respect the privacy of neighboring houses and outdoor living areas:* To address privacy concerns, Trees #4 and #5 which provide screening would be preserved by removing a retaining wall and the applicant will plant a red bud tree in front of the kitchen window; the finished floor elevation of the proposed home will be lowered by one foot; first floor windows are small bathroom windows; and outdoor gathering areas would be located in the front and rear of the residence, avoiding side yards.
4. *Minimize the blockage of sunlight on neighboring buildings:* The project minimizes the blockage of sunlight, to the extent feasible, as the proposed residence is located at the center of the parcel, approximately 50 feet from the Ingram residence and approximately 15 feet from the Thompson residence.
5. *Minimize alteration of streams and natural drainage channels:* The subject parcel is more than 150 feet from Cordilleras Creek and on the north side (opposite side) of Cordilleras Road. Staff has determined that the project will not have an impact on Cordilleras Creek.

B. Architectural Styles

Design new buildings that are architecturally compatible with existing buildings by requiring them to reflect and emulate, as much as possible, the predominant architectural styles and the natural surroundings of the immediate area (e.g., bungalow, craftsman, ranch): The proposed craftsman design, color and materials of the

residence are architecturally compatible with existing buildings in the area.

C. Building Shapes and Bulk

Design buildings with shapes that respect and conform to the natural topography of the site by requiring them to step up or down hillsides in the same direction as the natural grade: As shown in project elevation drawings included in Attachment H, the building has been designed to conform to the natural topography of the site, stepping down the hillside in the same direction as the natural grade.

D. Facades

Design well-articulated and proportioned facades: The proposed design is well articulated, including use of a pitched roof design.

E. Materials and Colors

Make varying architectural styles compatible by using similar materials and colors which blend with the natural setting and the immediate area: The Design Review Officer found that the residence, as proposed and conditioned, is architecturally compatible with existing buildings in the area. Regarding proposed materials, the Design Review Officer found that, while the selected stacked stone and wood siding comply with the design review standards, a change to a rock veneer also complies and addresses the neighbors' concerns about compatibility. Condition No. 9 requires the applicant to apply a stone veneer to the garage and the retaining walls which face Cordilleras Road.

4. Conformance with the Grading Regulations

The following findings must be made in order to issue a grading permit for this project. Staff's review of the project is discussed below:

- a. *That the granting of the permit will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.*

The project site has undergone a geotechnical study from Michelucci and Associates, Inc., and has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the County's Geotechnical Section for soil stability. The grading plan has been prepared by a licensed civil engineer and has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the Department of Public Works.

The report from Michelucci and Associates, Inc., provides detailed recommendations about the proposed development. These specific recommendations and recommendations from other reviewing agencies have been integrated into the application and have been made conditions of approval for the grading permit, and will prevent a significant adverse impact on the environment.

- b. *That the project conforms to the criteria of Chapter 8, Division VII, of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code, including the standards referenced in Section 8605.*

The grading meets the standards referenced in Section 8605: (1) Erosion and Sediment Control, (2) Grading, (3) Geotechnical Reports, (4) Dust Control Plans, (5) Fire Safety, and (6) Time Restrictions. Erosion and sediment control measures have been required to remain in place during- and post-construction, and they will be monitored throughout construction. Performance standards for grading have been added as conditions of approval and will be implemented and monitored. A dust control plan must be submitted for approval and implemented on the site. The proposed grading plan was prepared by a licensed civil engineer and reviewed for adequacy by the San Mateo County Department of Public Works. A geotechnical report was also prepared for the site and reviewed by the County's Geotechnical Section. Grading is only allowed during the period between April 30 and October 1.

The design of the project and conditions associated with an approval will assure that the development is accomplished in a manner that minimizes the potential for erosion. In addition, the proposed grading will be subject to standard conditions of approval that include pre-construction, during-construction, and post-construction measures to ensure that the project is in compliance with the San Mateo County Grading Regulations.

- c. *That the project is consistent with the General Plan.*

The General Plan designation for this site is Low Density Residential. Due to its steep slopes, Emerald Lake Hills is a region of the County where grading permits are often obtained for construction of new residences. The proposed construction grading for a residence is consistent with the land use allowed by this General Plan designation. In addition, as discussed in the General Plan Compliance, Section C.1, of this report, the project, as conditioned, complies with all applicable General Plan goals and policies.

D. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project is categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15303, Class 3(a), construction of a single-family residence, in a residential zone, within a residential area.

E. ALTERNATIVES

If the Board of Supervisors (Board) finds that modifications to the proposal are needed to bring the project into compliance, the Board may specify that these changes be included in the building plans and evaluated by staff before building permit issuance, or may request a continuance to allow the changes to be incorporated into the plans being presented before the Board at a subsequent hearing.

Alternatively, the Board may uphold the appeal, and deny approval of the proposal as presented.

F. REVIEWING AGENCIES

Department of Public Works
Building Inspection Section
Cal-Fire
Geotechnical Section

County Counsel has reviewed and approved the report as to form.

Approval of the Design Review Permit and Grading Permit, to allow the construction of a new single-family residence, contributes to the 2025 Shared Vision outcome of a Livable Community, as the project would allow for implementation of a project that is consistent with the County's land use regulations, including the Emerald Lake Hills Design Review Standards, General Plan, and Zoning Regulations.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Approval by the Board of Supervisors would result in marginal property tax revenue increase with tax being assessed on future residential construction.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Recommended Findings and Conditions of Approval
- B. Vicinity Map
- C. Aerial Map of Subject and Neighboring Properties
- D. Appeal Statement to Board of Supervisors, dated September 10, 2015
- E. Planning Commission Decision Letter, dated August 26, 2015
- F. Appeal Statement to Planning Commission
- G. Community Development Director Decision Letter, dated April 20, 2015
- H. Project Site Plans, Floor Plans, Elevations, and Civil Plans

- I. Kielty Tree Survey, dated February 3, 2015 (updated March 31, 2015)
- J. Kielty Tree Survey, dated August 11, 2015
- K. Applicant's Statement (regarding minor modifications with supporting elevations), dated August 6, 2015
- L. Applicant's Statement in Response to Appellant, dated October 7, 2015
- M. Staff Report to the Planning Commission (excludes attachments included above)