

**COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

DATE: May 24, 2023

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Planning Staff

SUBJECT: Consideration of a Design Review Permit, pursuant to Section 6565.3 of the Zoning Regulations, and a Grading Permit, pursuant to Section 9283 of the County Ordinance Code, to allow the construction of a new three-story, 5,742 sq. ft. single-family residence with a 501 sq. ft. attached garage, involving 1,830 cubic yards (c.y.) of earthwork for the construction of a residence and a driveway/access road from Chesham Avenue, on a legal, 9.73-acre parcel on Devonshire Boulevard in the unincorporated Devonshire area of San Mateo County. The access road would be constructed within the area of a recorded easement located on the adjacent undeveloped parcel, APN 049-020-110. The project includes removal of 24 significant trees. In conjunction with the requested permits, it is recommended that the Planning Commission determine that the project is categorically exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303.

County File Number: PLN 2020-00467 (Bagerman)

PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes construction of a new three-story, 5,742 sq. ft. single-family residence with a 501 sq. ft. attached garage on a 9.73-acre parcel. The property would be accessed from Chesham Avenue via a new access road to be located in the area of a recorded easement located on the adjacent undeveloped parcel (APN 049-020-110). The project involves 1,830 cubic yards (c.y.) of earthwork (950 c.y. for the driveway/access road from Chesham Avenue and 880 c.y. for the residence) and removal of 24 significant trees. The parcel has frontage on both Devonshire Boulevard and Chesham Avenue; however, the applicant has indicated that only access from Chesham can achieve a driveway and fire truck turnaround that meets the slope requirements of Department of Public Works and the County Fire Department. The property is located within an existing residential neighborhood and adjoins developed parcels on the east and north sides, and undeveloped land in the City of San Carlos on the west and south sides.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Planning Commission approve the Design Review Permit and Grading Permit, by making the required findings and adopting the conditions of approval in Attachment A.

BACKGROUND:

Report Prepared By: Erica Adams, Planner

Applicant/Owner: Alexander Bagerman

Public Notification: Ten (10) day advanced notification for the hearing was mailed to property owners within 300 feet of the project parcel and a notice for the hearing posted in the San Mateo Times newspaper.

APN: 049-020-070

Location: The parcel has frontage along Chesham Avenue and Devonshire Boulevard. The nearest cross street is Hyde Park Avenue. Access will be taken from Chesham Avenue along an easement which traverses an adjacent parcel, APN 049-020-110.

Existing Zoning: R-E/S-102/DR Residential Estates/Single -Family Residential/Combining District (Minimum Lot Size 20,000 sq. ft.)/Design Review

General Plan Designation: Medium Low Density Residential; Urban

Existing Land Use: Undeveloped

Water Supply: California Water Service - San Carlos

Sewage Disposal: Proposed septic system

Flood Zone: Flood Zone X (Area of minimal flood hazard, usually depicted on FIRMs as above the 500-year flood level), per FEMA Panel No. 06081C0282E, effective October 16, 2012.

Environmental Evaluation: The project is categorically exempt from CEQA per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(a) (Class 3), which includes the construction and location of limited numbers of new, small structures on a legal parcel. One single-family residence may be constructed or converted under this exemption.

Setting: The 9.73-acre vacant parcel is located at the border of the unincorporated Devonshire area, where it is adjacent to residences and undeveloped land within the City of San Carlos. The parcel has frontage along Chesham Avenue and Devonshire Boulevard. Access will be taken from Chesham Avenue along an easement which

traverses an adjacent parcel, APN 049-020-110. The property has an average slope of 21% in the project area.

Chronology:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Action</u>
December 24, 2020	- Application submitted.
December 12, 2021	Project septic plans are revised to address comments from Environmental Health.
January 11, 2022	Project is deemed complete.
July 2, 2022	- At the Bayside Design Review Committee (BDRC) hearing, the Committee found that the design complied with the design standards, but it was discovered that some of the access improvements were outside of the area of the recorded easement on APN 049-020-110, owned by Ronald and Therese Roberts (the Roberts). The project was continued to a later date to allow the applicant to revise plans for the access road such that access improvements could be located within the boundaries of the easement.
October 9, 2022	Applicant submitted revised plans where all the proposed access improvements are included in the boundaries of the access easement.
January 4, 2023	- Bayside Design Review Committee (Committee) hearing. Committee recommends the project for approval, based on compliance with design standards. in response to concerns raised by the Roberts regarding potential access impacts, the Committee recommended that the applicant continue to communicate with the Roberts regarding the design of the access road.
January 25, 2023	Staff coordinates a meeting to allow discussions about the access road and easement, where the Roberts state that they prefer the previous proposal, where the road is not located within the boundaries of the easement. Applicant agrees to revise the easement boundaries to allow for construction of the earlier road design.
February 3, 2023	Applicant informs staff that, despite their efforts to reach out to the Roberts regarding revising the easement, the Roberts have not responded to the applicant. The applicant indicates a desire to proceed with the project as currently designed,

where proposed access improvements would be located within the existing easement.

April 26, 2023

- Planning Commission public hearing.

DISCUSSION

A) KEY ISSUES

1. Conformance with the General Plan

Visual Quality Policy 4.4 - The General Plan requires 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 (DR) Zoning District, Section 6565 of the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations, is the mechanism that fulfills this directive. A project that complies with the Devonshire Design Standards (Section 6565.15 of the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations) therefore conforms to the 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, as well as improve the appearance and visual character of development in the area by managing the location and appearance of the structure. The project has been reviewed by the Bayside Design Review Committee and has been found to be in compliance with the Design Review Standards for Devonshire. A detailed discussion is provided in Section A.2.b of this report.

Soil Resources Policy 2.23 (Regulate Excavation, Grading, Filling, and Land Clearing Activities Against Accelerated Soil Erosion) – The General Plan calls for the County to regulate excavation, grading, filling, and land clearing activities to protect against accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation. The project includes earthwork of 1,760 c.y. of cut and 70 c.y. of fill, with a total area of land disturbance of 97,257 square feet. The applicant proposes an Erosion Control Plan which includes measures that would contain and slow run-off, while allowing for natural infiltration. Due to the potential for erosion and sedimentation during land disturbing and earth-moving activities, Conditions 19 through 24 are included in Attachment A. As proposed and conditioned, the applicant would off-haul all cut spoils and implement stormwater pollution prevention measures. Also, the Project Engineer would regularly inspect the erosion control measures for the duration of all grading remediation activities, especially after major storm events, to monitor that they are functioning as designed and that proper maintenance and corrections are performed.

2. COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY ZONING REGULATIONS

The property is zoned R-1/S-71/DR (One-Family Residential/Combining District with a minimum lot size of 5,000 sq. Ft./Design Review) and R-1/S-102/DR (One-Family Residential/Combining District with a minimum lot size of 20,000 sq. ft./Design Review). The proposed development is located entirely within the S-102 portion of the parcel; therefore, staff has applied the S-102 development standards to the project. The proposed single-family residential use is allowed in the R-1 Zoning District.

a. Project Compliance with the Development Standards of the S-102 Zoning District

As shown in the table below, the project complies with the development standards of the S-102 Zoning District.

Development Standards	S-102 Zoning District	Proposed
Building Site Area	20,000 sq. ft.	9.73 acres
Maximum Building Site Coverage	25% 97,482 sq. ft.	3.73% 15,820 sq.
Maximum Building Floor Area Ratio	8,600 sq. ft.	5,969 sq. ft.
Minimum Front Setback	20 ft.	54 ft. -9 in.
Minimum Rear Setback	20 ft.	49 ft.- 5 in.
Minimum Right-Side Setback	10 ft.	10 ft.
Minimum Left Side Setback	10 ft.	11 ft.- 5 in.
Maximum Building Height	30 ft.	30 ft..
Minimum Covered Parking Spaces	2 covered parking spaces	2 covered parking spaces

b. Project Compliance with Design Review Standards of the DR Zoning District:

At its February 2, 2022 and January 4, 2023 meetings, the Bayside Design Review Committee (Committee) reviewed the project. At both meetings, emails from neighbors were received, and members of the public expressed concerns regarding project design and compatibility with existing houses in the neighborhood, the improvements required for the driveway/fire truck access, and potential glare from windows.

Staff clarified that the Committee’s review is limited to project compliance with design standards and that the matter of the easement

and proposed access improvements are civil matters in nature (between two private property owners) and outside the County's ability to regulate. The Committee found that the design of the residence is consistent with design standards for Devonshire but wanted clarification about the access improvements. The applicant requested a continuance to address the easement boundaries. Discussions involving staff, the applicant, and the Roberts is summarized in Section A.2.b.2, below.

At the January 4, 2023 meeting, the Committee recommended approval of the project with a condition to utilize "dark sky" exterior lighting and a recommendation to have any solar array be lower than the roof parapet.

1. The project's compliance with these Design Review Standards is discussed below:

(a) Site Planning: Requires the siting of new buildings on a parcel in locations which achieve the following objectives:

(i) Minimize tree removal.

Twenty-four (24) significant trees are proposed for removal. The initial driveway design preserved four significant trees that now require removal with the new design. Planning staff identified five trees to try to preserve and asked the applicant to review them with Advanced Tree Care for further evaluation for preservation. A revised arborist report was submitted on April 6, 2023, and after consultation with the County Arborist two were determined to be candidates for preservation, trees number 8 and 18.

Tree removal is based on the following justification: Two trees are dead, and two trees are proposed to be removed due to poor health. Sixteen (16) trees need to be removed to accommodate the driveway and six (6) trees are in the building footprint.

Section 6565.21.B of the design review chapter of the Zoning Regulations sets a replanting ratio for native trees of up to 3:1 with a 5-gallon replacement tree. However, the Current Planning Section allows for a 1:1 replacement ratio to accommodate building

footprints, need for defensible space, and/or to accommodate the existing tree canopy.

Condition 9 addresses tree replacement, requiring Coast Live Oaks to be replaced with Coast Live Oaks, with the six (6) trees greater than 20 inches in diameter to be replaced with six (6) 24-inch box specimen and the remaining twelve (12) Coast live oaks to be replaced with 15-gallon Coast Live Oak trees. There are four buckeye trees which are also native and will be replaced with 5-gallon natives. The remaining two (2) trees will be replaced with six (6) 5-gallon trees of a non-invasive and/or native species.

The remaining 20 significant trees will be protected during construction activity. According to the County Arborist, the tree protection and arborist recommendations to hand-dig within driplines of trees 45-48, 50-51, which are in close proximity to areas to be disturbed, satisfy tree protection requirements.

- (ii) Minimize alteration of the natural topography.

The subject parcel has an average slope of 21 percent in the construction area. Grading is proposed for the residence and the driveway and would not modify the overall topography of the site. The design of the proposed residence is stepped and follows the slope of the land. The driveway also follows the direction of the existing slope, while achieving the slope required for the fire truck access.

- (iii) Respect the privacy of neighboring houses and outdoor living areas.

Due to the distance of the proposed residence to the other residences, there are minimal privacy impacts.

- (iv) Minimize blockage of sunlight on neighboring housing and outdoor living areas.

Due to the distance of the proposed residence to the other residences, there are no concerns about blockage of sunlight.

- (v) Minimize alteration of streams and natural drainage channels.

There are no streams or drainage channels that would be impacted by this project.

- (b) Architectural Styles: Requires buildings to be architecturally compatible with existing buildings and reflect and emulate architectural styles and the natural surroundings of the immediate area.

There is a wide array of residential styles in the immediate surrounding area. Many residences in the Devonshire community are constructed on smaller parcels which is a factor in the house size and how it can appear to be compatible with its surroundings.

- (c) Unenclosed Spaces: Requires avoiding the creation of space beneath buildings and prohibits buildings that are predominantly built on stilts.

No unenclosed spaces, or structures built on stilts, would be created by this proposal.

- (d) Building Shapes and Bulk: Requires that buildings are designed with shapes that respect and conform to the natural topography of the site.

The proposed development would conform to the existing topography.

- (e) Facades: Requires well-articulated and proportioned facades.

The proposed residence has a contemporary style that would achieve an adequate level of articulation using the application of different siding materials and window patterns. The proposed design of the residence would not create any massive blank walls.

- (f) Roofs: Requires pitched roofs.

The Design Review Committee did not require pitched roofs, as they found flat roofs suitable for the overall design.

- (g) Materials and Colors: Requires that varying architectural styles are made compatible by using similar materials and colors that blend with the natural setting and the immediate area. The residence uses earth tones which are compliant with the DR standards and blend in with the natural setting.

- (h) Utilities: New utilities should be placed underground.

New utilities are proposed to be placed underground (Condition 11).

- (i) Paved Areas: Requires minimization of paved areas.

Proposed paved areas are primarily associated with the driveway and fire truck turnaround. The project does not have excessive paved areas.

2. Comments received regarding the Access Easement on APN 049-020-110

At the February 2, 2022 Committee meeting, the grantors of the easement, the Roberts, owners of APN 049-020-110, stated they were not aware of the scope of the improvements that are proposed to provide access to the building site and expressed concerns about tree removal and grading. In addition, staff noted that some of the access improvements were not in the boundaries of the recorded easement.

At the January 4, 2023 Committee meeting, the applicant presented revised plans which showed the access to the proposed residence entirely within the boundaries of the easement. The Roberts remained concerned about the improvements necessary to construct the driveway and potential access impacts to their property, specifically the height and location of a retaining wall which would restrict access over their undeveloped parcel from the parcel with their home on it.

On January 25, 2023, staff coordinated a meeting between the applicant and the Roberts to allow discussion about the access road and easement. The Roberts stated that they prefer the previous proposal, where the road is not located within the boundaries of the easement. The applicant agreed to work with the Roberts to revise the easement boundaries to allow for construction of the earlier road design.

On February 3, 2023, the applicant informed staff that, despite their efforts to reach out to the Roberts regarding revising the easement, the Roberts have not responded to the applicant. The applicant indicated a desire to proceed with the project as currently designed, where proposed access improvements would be located within the existing easement.

The Department of Public Works has reviewed the proposed access improvements. Condition 39 requires that, should the access shown on the plans go through neighboring properties, the applicant shall provide documentation that "ingress and egress" easements match the as-built condition of the constructed access prior to final building permit approval.

3. COMPLIANCE WITH COUNTY GRADING REGULATIONS

The proposed project requires approximately 1,760 c.y. of cut and 70 c.y. of fill to accommodate the proposed driveway and residence. Planning and Geotechnical staff have reviewed the proposal and submitted reports and determined that the project conforms to the criteria for review contained in the Regulations for Excavating, Grading, Filling and Clearing on Lands in Unincorporated San Mateo County (referred to in this report as "Grading Regulations"). The findings and supporting evidence are outlined below:

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

The project will have a less-than-significant impact on the environment with the implementation of standard conditions of approval which will require excavated earth to be off-hauled and deposited to an approved disposal location, require application of erosion control measures prior to and during project grading and construction, place limitations on grading during the wet season, and require the Project Engineer to submit written certification that all grading has been completed in conformance with the approved plans, conditions of approval, and the Grading Regulations.

- b. **That the project conforms to the criteria of the San Mateo County Grading Ordinance.**

The project, as conditioned, conforms to the criteria for review contained in the Grading Regulations, including an erosion and sediment control plan and dust control measures.

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

As outlined earlier in Section A of this report, the project conforms to applicable components of the County's General Plan.

B) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project is categorically exempt from CEQA per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(a) (Class 3), which includes the construction and location of limited numbers of new, small structures on a legal parcel. One single-family residence, in a residential zone, in urbanized areas, may be constructed under this exemption.

C) REVIEWING AGENCIES

Building Inspection's Drainage Section
Building Inspection Geotechnical Section
County Environmental Health Services
County Department of Public Works
County Arborist
San Mateo County Fire Department
California Water Service – San Carlos

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Recommended Findings and Conditions of Approval
- B. Vicinity Map
- C. Project Plans
- D. Arborist Report
- E. Design Review Continuance and Recommendation Letters
- F. Comment letters

EDA:mda – EDAH0086_WM.U.DOCX

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Project File Number: PLN 2020-00467

Hearing Date: May 24, 2023

Prepared By: Erica Adams, Project Planner For Adoption By: Planning Commission

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS

Regarding the Environmental Review, Find:

1. The project is categorically exempt from CEQA per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(a) (Class 3), which includes the construction and location of limited numbers of new, small structures on a legal parcel. One single-family residence, in a residential zone, in urbanized areas, may be constructed under this exemption.

Regarding the Design Review, Find:

2. After consideration of project plans and public testimony, the project, as proposed and conditioned on May 24, 2023, is in compliance with the Design Review Standards based on the site planning and colors and materials which provide compatibility with surrounding residences.
3. This project, as designed and conditioned, has been reviewed under and found to be in compliance with the Design Review Standards as stipulated in Chapter 28, Section 6565.15, of the San Mateo County Zoning Regulations. The proposal was reviewed and recommended for approval by the San Mateo County Planning Commission on April 26, 2022.
4. After consideration of project plans and public testimony, the proposed house design, as proposed and conditioned, is in compliance with the Design Review Standards because the project: (a) incorporates materials which comply with the Design Review Standards, (b) respects privacy of neighboring houses, and (c) the proposed house has proportioned doors and windows.

Regarding the Grading Permit, Find:

5. That the granting of the permit will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. The project, as proposed and conditioned, has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by the Planning and Building Department's Geotechnical Section and the Department of Public Works, with conditions incorporated into Attachment A of the staff report. As analyzed in the staff report, with imposition of the conditions of approval, the project would not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.
6. That this project, as conditioned, conforms to the criteria of the San Mateo County Grading Regulations and is consistent with the General Plan. The project, as it will be conditioned, conforms to the criteria for review contained in the Grading Regulations, including an erosion and sediment control plan and dust control measures. The project conforms to the applicable components of the County's General Plan.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Current Planning Section

1. The project shall be constructed in compliance with the plans approved by the Planning Commission on May 24, 2023, and in compliance with the plans reviewed by the Bayside Design Review Committee (BDRC) on January 4, 2023. Any changes or revisions to the approved plans shall be submitted for review by the Community Development Director to determine if they are in substantial compliance with the approved plans, prior to being incorporated into the building plans. Adjustments to the design of the project may be approved by the Design Review Officer if they are consistent with the intent of and are in substantial conformance with this approval. Adjustments to the design during the building permit stage may result in the requirement for additional plan resubmittal or assessment of revision fees. Alternatively, the Design Review Officer may refer consideration of the adjustments, if they are deemed to be major, to a new BDRC public hearing which requires payment of an additional fee of \$1,500.
2. The Design Review and Grading Permit shall be valid for five (5) years from the date of final approval, in which time a building permit shall be issued, and a completed inspection (to the satisfaction of the building inspector) shall have occurred within 180 days of its issuance. The design review approval may be extended one time for a one (1) year increment with submittal of an application for permit extension and payment of applicable extension fees 60 days prior to the expiration date.
3. The applicant shall indicate the following on plans submitted for a building permit, as stipulated by the Bayside Design Review Committee:
 - a. Use of "Dark sky" exterior light fixtures and submittal of specification sheets.

4. If solar panels are installed it is recommended that they are situated below the parapet of the roof.
5. The approved exterior colors and materials shall be verified prior to final approval of the building permit. The applicant shall provide photographs to the Design Review Officer to verify adherence to this condition prior to a final building permit approval by the Current Planning Section.
6. At the time of building permit application, the applicant shall submit a tree protection plan which implements all arborist recommendations for any work within tree driplines or adjacent to off-site trees, including the following:
 - a. Identify, establish, and maintain tree protection zones throughout the entire duration of the project.
 - b. Isolate tree protection zones using 5-foot tall, orange plastic fencing supported by poles pounded into the ground, located at the driplines as described in the arborist's report.
 - c. Maintain tree protection zones free of equipment and materials storage; contractors shall not clean any tools, forms, or equipment within these areas.
 - d. If any large roots or large masses of roots need to be cut, the roots shall be inspected by a certified arborist or registered forester prior to cutting as required in the arborist's report. Any root cutting shall be undertaken by an arborist or forester and documented. Roots to be cut shall be severed cleanly with a saw or topers. A tree protection verification letter from the certified arborist shall be submitted to the Planning Department within five (5) business days from site inspection following root cutting.
 - e. Prior to Issuance of a building permit, the Planning and Building Department shall complete a pre-construction site inspection, as necessary, to verify that all required tree protection and erosion control measures are in place.
 - f. Hand-digging shall occur within driplines of trees 45-48, 50-51, which are in close proximity to areas to be disturbed.
7. Once all review agencies have approved your building permit, you will be notified when the Erosion Control and/or Tree Protection Plan is ready for implementation. Once the Erosion Control and/or Tree Protection measures have been installed per the approved plans, please arrange a site inspection with the assigned Planner. A \$165 inspection fee will be assessed to the building permit for the inspection. If the initial pre-site inspection is not approved, an additional inspection fee will be assessed for each required re-inspection until the job site passes the Pre-Site Inspection.

8. Twenty-four (24) significant trees are approved for removal. All other trees must be protected during grading and construction in accordance with the Arborist Report. Compliance with Tree Protection Plan of the Arborist Report shall be demonstrated on plans submitted for the building permit application. Any additional tree removal is subject to the San Mateo County Tree Ordinance and will require a separate permit for removal.
9. Prior to the final approval of the building permit, the applicant shall plant 24 replacement trees, including:
 - a. Six (6) 24-inch box Coast live oaks;
 - b. Twelve (12) 15-gallon Coast live oaks;
 - c. Four native trees (4) 5 gallon size and
 - d. Two (2) 5-gallon size trees of a non-invasive and/or native species.

The landscape plan, as submitted with the building permit application, shall show the location of the replacement trees and irrigation systems necessary for their maintenance. The applicant shall provide photographs to the Design Review Officer to verify adherence to this condition prior to a final building permit sign-off by the Current Planning Section.

10. Prior to the Current Planning Section approval of the building permit application, the applicant shall also 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).
11. All new power and telephone utility lines from the street or nearest existing utility pole to the main dwelling and/or any other structure on the property shall be placed underground.
12. Once the building is under construction, prior to the below floor framing inspection or the pouring of the concrete slab (as the case may be) for the lowest floor(s), the applicant shall provide to the Building Inspection Section a letter from the licensed land surveyor or engineer certifying that the lowest floor height, as constructed, is equal to the elevation specified for that floor in the approved plans. Similarly, certifications on the garage slab and the topmost elevation of the roof are required.

13. If the actual floor height, garage slab, or roof height, as constructed, is different than the elevation specified in the plans, then the applicant shall cease all construction and no additional inspections shall be approved until a revised set of plans is submitted to and subsequently approved by both the Building Official and the Community Development Director.
14. The applicant shall adhere to all requirements of the Building Inspection Section, the Department of Public Works, and San Mateo County Fire Department.
15. No site disturbance shall occur, including any grading or tree/vegetation removal, until a building permit and grading hard card has been issued.
16. To reduce the impact of construction activities on neighboring properties, comply with the following:
 - a. All debris shall be contained on-site; a dumpster or trash bin shall be provided on-site during construction to prevent debris from blowing onto adjacent properties. The applicant shall monitor the site to ensure that trash is picked up and appropriately disposed of daily.
 - b. The applicant shall remove all construction equipment from the site upon completion of the use and/or need of each piece of equipment which shall include but not be limited to tractors, back hoes, cement mixers, etc.
 - c. The applicant shall ensure that no construction-related vehicles impede through traffic along the right-of-way on Devonshire Boulevard and Chesham Avenue. All construction vehicles shall be parked on-site outside the public right-of-way or in locations which do not impede safe access on Devonshire Boulevard and Chesham Avenue. There shall be no storage of construction vehicles in the public right-of-way.
17. Noise sources associated with demolition, construction, repair, remodeling, or grading of any real property shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., weekdays, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Saturdays. Said activities are prohibited on Sundays, Thanksgiving, and Christmas (San Mateo County Ordinance Code Section 4.88.360).
18. The project is subject to compliance to the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO): <https://www.smcgov.org/planning/water-efficient-landscape-ordinance-welo>

Grading Conditions

19. No grading shall be allowed during the winter season (October 1 to April 30) to avoid potential soil erosion, unless the applicant applies for an Exception to the Winter Grading Moratorium and the Community Development Director grants the exception. Exceptions will only be granted if the associated building permit is a week or less from being issued, dry weather is forecasted during scheduled

grading operations, and the erosion control plan includes adequate winterization measures (amongst other determining factors).

20. Add notes with the following minimum dust control measures:
 - a. Water all construction and grading areas at least twice daily.
 - b. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials, or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard.
 - c. Paves apply water two times daily or apply (non-toxic) soil on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the project site.
 - d. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
 - e. Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
21. Prior to issuance of the grading permit “hard card,” the property owner shall submit a schedule of all grading operations to the Current Planning Section, subject to review and approval by the Current Planning Section. Along with the “hard card” application, the applicant shall submit a letter to the Current Planning Section, at least 2 weeks prior to commencement of grading, stating the date when grading operations will begin, anticipated end date of grading operations, including dates of revegetation, and haul route. If the schedule of grading operations calls for the grading to be completed in one dry season, then the winterization plan shall be considered a contingent plan to be implemented if work falls behind schedule.
22. It shall be the responsibility of the engineer of record to regularly inspect the erosion control measures for the duration of all grading remediation activities, especially after major storm events, and determine that they are functioning as designed and that proper maintenance is being performed. Deficiencies shall be immediately corrected, as determined by and implemented under the observation of the engineer of record.
23. For the final approval of the grading permit, the property owner shall ensure the performance of the following activities within 30 days of the completion of grading at the project site: (a) the engineer shall submit written certification that all grading has been completed in conformance with the approved plans, conditions of approval/mitigation measures, and the Grading Regulations, to the Department of Public Works and the Planning and Building Department’s Geotechnical Engineer; and (b) the geotechnical consultant shall observe and approve all

applicable work during construction and sign Section II of the Geotechnical Consultant Approval form, for submittal to the Planning and Building Department's Geotechnical Engineer and the Current Planning Section.

24. The property owner shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines" including, but not limited to, the following:
 - a. Delineation with field markers of clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones, trees, and drainage courses within the vicinity of areas to be disturbed by construction and/or grading.
 - b. Protection of adjacent properties and undisturbed areas from construction impacts using vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes, mulching, or other measures as appropriate.
 - c. Performing clearing and earth-moving activities only during dry weather.
 - d. Stabilization of all denuded areas and maintenance of erosion control measures continuously between October 1 and April 30.
 - e. Storage, handling, and disposal of construction materials and wastes properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater.
 - f. Control and prevention of the discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, wash water or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges, to storm drains and watercourses.
 - g. Use of sediment controls or filtration to remove sediment when dewatering site and obtain all necessary permits.
 - h. Avoiding cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in a designated area where wash water is contained and treated.
 - i. Limiting and timing application of pesticides and fertilizers to prevent polluted runoff.
 - j. Limiting construction access routes and stabilization of designated access points.
 - k. Avoiding tracking dirt or other materials off-site; cleaning off-site paved areas and sidewalks using dry sweeping methods.

- l. Training and providing instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding the Watershed Protection Maintenance Standards and construction Best Management Practices.
- m. Additional Best Management Practices in addition to those shown on the plans may be required by the Building Inspector to maintain effective stormwater management during construction activities. Any water leaving the site shall be clear and running slowly at all times.
- n. Failure to install or maintain these measures will result in stoppage of construction until the corrections have been made and fees paid for staff enforcement time.

San Mateo County Fire Department

- 25. All buildings that have a street address shall have the number of that address on the building, mailbox, or other type of sign at the driveway entrance in such a manner that the number is easily and clearly visible from either direction of travel from the street. New residential buildings shall have internally illuminated address numbers contrasting with the background so as to be seen from the public way fronting the building. Residential address numbers shall be at least 6 feet above the finished surface of the driveway. An address sign shall be placed at each break of the road where deemed applicable by the San Mateo County Fire Department. Numerals shall be contrasting in color to their background and shall be no less than 4 inches in height and have a minimum 1/2-inch stroke. Remote signage shall be a 6-inch by 18-inch green reflective metal sign.
- 26. Remove that portion of any tree which extends within 10 feet of the outlet of any chimney or stovepipe or any portion of the tree which overhangs the roof assembly or is within 5 feet of any portion of the structure.
- 27. Adequate g.p.m. fire flow for 2 hours with a 20-psi residual operating pressure must be available as specified by additional project conditions to the project site. The applicant shall provide documentation including hydrant location, main size, and fire flow report at the building permit application stage. Inspection required prior to Fire's final approval of the building permit or before combustibles are brought on site.
- 28. Maintain around and adjacent to such buildings or structures a fuel break/firebreak made by removing and clearing away flammable vegetation for a distance of not less than 30 feet and up to 100 feet around the perimeter of all structures, or to the property line, if the property line is less than 30 feet from any structure.

29. The required fire flow shall be available from a County Standard 6-inch Wet Barrel Fire Hydrant. The configuration of the hydrant shall have a minimum of one each 4 1/2-inch outlet and one each 2 1/2-inch outlet located not more than 250 feet from the building measured by way of approved drivable access to the project site.
30. All roof assemblies in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones shall have a minimum CLASS-A fire resistive rating and be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications and current California Building and Residential Codes.
31. Smoke alarms and carbon monoxide detectors shall be installed in accordance with the California Building and Residential Codes. This includes the requirement for hardwired, interconnected detectors equipped with battery backup and placement in each sleeping room in addition to the corridors and on each level of the residence.
32. An approved Automatic Fire Sprinkler System meeting the requirements of NFPA-13D shall be required to be installed for your project. Plans shall be submitted to the San Mateo County Building Department for review and approval by the authority having jurisdiction.
33. A statement that the building will be equipped and protected by automatic fire sprinklers must appear on the title page of the building plans.
34. An interior and exterior audible alarm activated by automatic fire sprinkler system water flow shall be required to be installed in all residential systems. All hardware must be included on the submitted sprinkler plans.
35. All dead-end roadways shall be terminated by a turnaround bulb of not less than 96 feet in diameter.
36. This project is located in a wildland urban interface area. Roofing, attic ventilation, exterior walls, windows, exterior doors, decking, floors, and underfloor protection to meet CRC R327 or CBC Chapter 7A requirements.

Department of Public Works

37. Prior to the issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall submit a driveway "Plan and Profile," to the Department of Public Works, showing the driveway access to the parcel (garage slab) complying with County Standards for driveway slopes (not to exceed 20%) and to County Standards for driveways (at the property line) being the same elevation as the center of the access roadway. When appropriate, as determined by the Department of Public Works, this plan and profile shall be prepared from elevations and alignment shown on the

roadway improvement plans. The driveway plan shall also include and show specific provisions and details for both the existing and the proposed drainage patterns and drainage facilities.

38. Should the access shown on the plans go through neighboring properties, the applicant shall provide documentation that "ingress and egress" easements match the as-built condition of the constructed access prior to final building permit approval.
39. No proposed construction work within the County right-of-way shall begin until County requirements for the issuance of an encroachment permit, including review of the plans, have been met and an encroachment permit issued. Applicant shall contact a Department of Public Works Inspector 48 hours prior to commencing work in the right-of-way.
40. Prior to the issuance of the Building Permit, the applicant will be required to provide payment of "roadway mitigation fees" based on the square footage (assessable space) of the proposed building per Ordinance No. 3277.

County Arborist

41. Orange snow fencing shall be used to delineate tree protection zones for trees immediately adjacent to the septic line and leech field.

Geotechnical Section

42. The Project Geologic and Geotechnical Consultant shall be provided final grading plans, building layouts and floor elevations to provide supplemental recommendations, as necessary. Given the steep colluvium mantled slopes above the general building area, the Project Team shall consider the potential for shallow debris type failures that could impact the proposed improvements. The Project Geotechnical Consultant and Project Team shall consider the benefits of retaining walls with freeboard design to resist potential impact forces.
43. Follow SP117A Table 2: Recommended content for site-investigation reports within zones of required investigations to finish additional required investigations.

Drainage Section

44. Prior to the issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall have prepared, by a registered civil engineer, a drainage analysis of the proposed project and submit it to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. The drainage analysis shall consist of a written narrative and a plan. The flow of the stormwater onto, over, and off of the property shall be detailed on the plan and shall include

adjacent lands as appropriate to clearly depict the pattern of flow. The analysis shall detail the measures necessary to certify adequate drainage. Post-development flows and velocities shall not exceed those that existed in the pre-developed state. Recommended measures shall be designed and included in the improvement plans and submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval.

45. At the time of the building permit submittal, the project shall be required to comply with the County's "prescriptive" drainage review requirements and provide the following:
 - a. Final Drainage Report stamped and signed by a registered Civil Engineer.
 - b. Final Grading and Drainage Plan stamped and signed by a registered Civil Engineer depicting a storage and metering stormwater retention system and subdrain system(s) consistent with the requirements in the County's current Drainage Manual.
 - c. Final C.3 and C.6 Development Review Checklist.

County Environmental Health Services


46. At the building permit application stage, the applicant shall submit plans consistent with the On-site Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) design that has been reviewed and preliminarily approved by Environmental Health Services.

EDA:mda – EDAH0086_WM.U.DOCX




COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT B




WGS_1984_Web_Mercator_Auxiliary_Sphere
 © Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

1:4,972 

This map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable.

THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION



0.57 0 0.28 0.57 Miles

WGS_1984_Web_Mercator_Auxiliary_Sphere
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

1: 18,056



This map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable.

THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT C

PROJECT INFORMATION: NEW HOME

PROJECT ADDRESS: APN: 049-020-070

BUILDING OCCUPANCY GROUP: R-3/U
 TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION: VB
 NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS: 1
 STORIES: 2
 (E) COVERED PARKING SPACES: 2
 (E) UNCOVERED PARKING SPACES: 2
 LOT SIZE: 9.73 AC. (P/SURVEY)
 423,870 SF

PROPOSED FLOOR AREA BREAKDOWN
 (SEE SHEET A-0.2 SQUARE FOOTAGE DIAGRAMS)

ZONING S-102
 MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA FOR >30,000 SF LOT: 8,600.0 SF
 HABITABLE SPACE AREA (1ST, 2ND & 3RD.) = 4,488.3 SF
 NON-HABITABLE: GARAGE, STORAGE,
 COVERED PORCHES (1ST, 2ND & 3RD.) = 1,480.1 SF

TOTAL PROPOSED FLOOR AREA = 5,968.37 SF < 8,600.0 SF = OK
 SEE CALCULATIONS ON SHEET A-0.2

MAXIMUM SITE COVERAGE 25% OF LOT: 105,967.5 SF
 SEE CALCULATION ON SHEET A-1.0

APPLICABLE CODES:

1. ALL WORK DESCRIBED HEREIN SHALL COMPLY WITH THE LATEST BUILDING CONSTRUCTION CODES AS ADOPTED OR AMENDED BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO.


CALIFORNIA RESIDENTIAL CODE 2019
 CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE 2019
 CALIFORNIA MECHANICAL CODE 2019
 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE 2019
 CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE 2019
 TITLE 24 ENERGY REGULATIONS 2019
 CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE 2019
 CALIFORNIA GREEN BUILDING CODE 2019

AUTOMATED SPRINKLERS: YES
 FIRE SPRINKLERS PLANS UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT

SEPTIC SYSTEM: YES

SCOPE OF WORK:

- SITE DEVELOPMENT:
 - NEW ACCESS ROAD, FIRE TRUCK TURN-AROUND AND UNCOVERED GUEST PARKING;
 - REAR PATIO, DECK AND RETAINING WALLS;
- NEW HOME TO INCLUDE:
 - TWO-CAR GARAGE
 - 2BR / 2.5 BA.
 - GREAT ROOM (KITCHEN, LIVING ROOM, DINING ROOM, PANTRY), TV ROOM, ART STUDIO, STORAGE.
 - STAIRCASES & RESIDENTIAL ELEVATOR.
- UTILITIES:
 - NEW SEPTIC SYSTEM
 - NEW UNDERGROUND JOINT TRENCH FOR GAS, ELECTRIC & DSL LINES



1 PARCEL AND VICINITY MAPS

PROJECT OWNER: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN
 239 Manor Dr. San Carlos CA 94070
 bagerman@gmail.com
 PH: (650) 504 7424

PROJECT DESIGNER: Patrick J. Flanders
 Flanders Bay Company (FBC West)
 patrick@flandersbayco.com
 12175-C Saratoga-Sunnyvale Road
 Saratoga, CA 95070
 PH: 408-354-0949 / 408-348-6355
 East Coast Office: P.O.Box 528
 Bemus Point, NY 14712
 PH: 716-462-5428
 & BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
 19969 Stevens Creek Blvd.
 Cupertino, CA 95014
 info@bekomdesign.com
 PH: 408-203-4686

GEOTECH ENGINEER: Christopher R. Hundemer, Principal
 C2Earth, Inc.
 750 Camden Avenue, Suite A
 Campbell, CA 95008
 PH: 408.866.5436
 C2@C2Earth.com

ARBORIST: Robert Weatherill
 Advanced Tree Care
 Certified Arborist WE 1936A
 965 East San Carlos Ave, San Carlos

SURVEY: Mirko Ferreira, Principal
 Lea & Braze Engineering, Inc.
 Civil Engineers | Land Surveyors
 WWW.LEABRAZE.COM
 Email: mf@leabraze.com
 PH: 510-887-4086 x.106

SEPTIC DESIGN: Christopher Day
 Environmental Health Consulting
 P.O. Box 26, Redwood City, CA 94064
 PH: (650)293-1045
 christopherday@aol.com

2 PROJECT INFORMATION


#	SHEET #	SHEET NAME
0	A-0.0	COVER SHEET
1	A-0.1	3D VIEWS / MATERIAL BOARD / LIGHTING SPECS.
2	A-0.2	SQUARE FOOTAGE DIAGRAMS / DAYLIGHT PLANES
3	A-0.3	ARBORIST REPORT
4	A-0.4	ARBORIST REPORT / TREE PROTECTION PLAN
5	A-0.5	NOTES
10	A-1.0	PROPOSED SITE PLAN / SITE COVERAGE
11	A-1.01	LANDSCAPE PLANS
12	A-1.1	PROPOSED 1ST FLOOR PLAN
13	A-1.2	PROPOSED 2ND FLOOR PLAN
14	A-1.3	PROPOSED 3RD FLOOR PLAN
15	A-2.0	PROPOSED ROOF PLAN
16	A-3.0	ELEVATIONS '1' (EAST) & '8' (WEST)
17	A-3.1	ELEVATIONS '2' & '2A' (NORTH)
18	A-3.2	ELEVATIONS '3' (SOUTH) & '7' (NORTH-EAST)
19	A-3.3	ELEVATIONS '4', '5' & '6'
20	A-4.0	SECTIONS 'A' & 'B'
21	A-4.1	SECTIONS 'C' & 'D'
23	A-4.2	SECTIONS 'E', 'F' & 'G'
40	C1	GRADING & DRAINAGE
41	C2	GRADING & DRAINAGE

3 PROJECT DIRECTORY

#	SHEET #	SHEET NAME
42	C3	SECTIONS & DETAILS
50	US 1	TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
51	US 2	TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
52	US 3	TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
53	US 4	TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
54	OWTS 1	SEPTIC DESIGN
55	OWTS 2	SEPTIC DETAILS

4 SHEET INDEX

TOTAL SHEETS: 29



HARDSCAPE LEGEND

- NEW HOUSE FOOTPRINT
- SETBACKS & EASEMENTS
- PROPERTY LINES
- CONCRETE ACCESS ROAD
- TURF BLOCK PERMEABLE (40%)
- GRAVEL / DECOMPOSITE GRANITE
- RAISED WOOD DECK
- PORCELAIN PAVERS ABOVE CONCRETE

UTILITY LEGEND

- (N) WATER LINE
- (N) JOINT TRENCH FOR UNDERGROUND ELECTRICAL, GAS, DSL
- (N) AC CONDENSER PADS
- (N) MAIN ELECTRIC PANEL - 200A
- (N) SEPTIC TANK AND PUMP
- (N) LEACH FIELDS
- ABOVE 50% AVERAGE SLOPES

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
 NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
 OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN

PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
 &
BEKOM DESIGN, INC
 E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
 PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017

ISSUANCES

No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021

Checked By: _____ Checker


COVER SHEET

Drawing Scale: As indicated
 Job No. PROPOSED

A-0.0

6 PROPOSED SITE PLAN - LOCATION

1" = 30'-0"



4 PROPOSED RENDERING
1/8" = 1'-0"



WINDOWS STRUCTURE:
BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-30
(PEWTER) / LRV 33



ROUND POSTS:
BENJAMIN MOORE:
2121-40 / LRV 57.53



CONCRETE WALL:
NATURAL FINISH (GREY)




CONCRETE WALL FINISH:
BASALT LINER STAINED



STUCCO-
COLOR: NATURAL
FINISH: SMOOTH - SMOOTH




FASCIA:
BRIDGE & ELEVATOR:
BENJAMIN MOORE:
2121-20 / LRV 19.37



ACCENT WALL:
PERFORATED METAL (GALVALUME)
WITH BACK WALL IN COLOR:
BENJAMIN MOORE 2114-20 / LRV: 5.41



WINDOWS-
WESTERN ALUMINUM
SATIN ANODIZED



GARAGE DOOR: MARTIN ATHENA
FINISH: ALUMINUM ANODIZED / FROSTED GLASS



ENTRY DOOR:
WESTERN ALUMINUM
SATIN ANODIZED



WALL SCONCE-
KUZKO LIGHTING CASA LED
12V (800LUMENS)/3000 K
GREY



STEP LIGHT:
WAC LIGHTING STEP LIGHT
12V / AM AMBER
CAST STAINLESS STEEL



RAILINGS-
2X2 POSTS WITH 1/4" RODS
AND SQUARE HANDRAIL
SS FINISH

EverGuard® TPO Colors:



Slate Gray 740

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE - EXTERIOR MATERIAL BOARD

1 MATERIAL BOARD
1/4" = 1'-0"

Casa LED Outdoor Wall Sconce

By Kuzko Lighting



Product Options

Finish: Black, Grey
Size: Small, Medium, Large

Details

- Square backplate
- Designed in 2018
- Material: Die-cast Aluminum
- Shade Material: Polymer
- Dimmable when used with a Electronic low voltage (ELV) Dimmer (Not Included)
- Dimmer Range: 100-100%
- ADA compliant
- ETL Listed
- Warranty: 5 Year LED, 1 Year Fixture
- Made in China

Dimensions

Small Option Fixture: Width 4.5", Height 4.5", Depth 1"
Medium Option Fixture: Width 6.75", Height 6.75", Depth 1"
Large Option Fixture: Width 8.25", Height 8.25", Depth 1"

Lighting

- Small Option: 11 Watt (800 Lumens) 120 Volt Integrated LED- CRI: 90 Color Temp: 3000K Lifespan: 50000 hours
- Medium Option: 23 Watt (1600 Lumens) 120 Volt Integrated LED- 90 Color Temp: 3000K Lifespan: 50000 hours
- Large Option: 32 Watt (2400 Lumens) 120 Volt Integrated LED- CRI: 90 Color Temp: 3000K Lifespan: 50000 hours

Additional Details

Product URL:
<https://www.kuzko.com/casa-led-outdoor-wall-light-by-kuzko-lighting-KUZP205808.html>
Rating: ETL Listed

Product ID: KUZP205808

Prepared by:

Prepared for:

Project:

Room:

Placement:

Approval:



Notes:


Blank notes area for project details.



2 EXTERIOR WALL SCONCES SPECS.
NOT TO SCALE

RECTANGLE STEP LIGHTS 12V
4011

WAC
LANDSCAPE LIGHTING



Fixture Type:
Catalog Number:
Project:
Location:

PRODUCT DESCRIPTION

Horizontal rectangle step light designed for safety and style on stairways, patios, decks, balcony areas, walkways and building perimeters.

Features an architectural design. Energy efficient for long-lasting outdoor lighting solutions. Creates an attractive, seamless impression at night.

FEATURES

- Solid die-cast brass, corrosion resistant aluminum alloy, or cast stainless steel construction
- IP66 rated, Protected against high-pressure water jets
- Conveniently adjusts into existing 12V system
- Invisible hardware
- Maintains constant lumen output against voltage drop
- UL 1818 Listed

SPECIFICATIONS

Input: 9-15VAC (Transformer is required)
Power: 2W / 3.1VA
CRI: 90
Mounting: Fits into 2" x 4" J-Box with minimum inside dimensions of 2 1/4" x 2 1/4" x 2 1/4" Includes bracket for J-Box mount.
Rated Life: 60,000 hours

ORDERING NUMBER

Color Temp	CRI	Finish	Material	Lumens			
27	2700K	90	BK Bronze on Brass	17			
			BL Black on Aluminum	17			
			BZ Bronze on Aluminum	17			
			WT White on Aluminum	17			
			AM Amber	17			
			SS Cast Stainless Steel	17			
30	3000K	90	BK Bronze on Brass	17			
			BL Black on Aluminum	17			
			BZ Bronze on Aluminum	17			
			WT White on Aluminum	17			
			AM Amber	17			
			SS Cast Stainless Steel	17			
AM	Amber	-	BK Black on Aluminum	17			
			BZ Bronze on Aluminum	17			
			WT White on Aluminum	23			
			SS Cast Stainless Steel	14			

RECTANGLE STEP LIGHTS 12V
4011


WAC
LANDSCAPE LIGHTING

Model	Power Rating	Color Temp
9025-TBN-SS	25W Max	2700K
9150-TBN-SS	15W Max	1500K
9300-TBN-SS	200W Max	3000K
9600-TBN-SS	600W Max	6000K

TESTED MAGNETIC LOW VOLTAGE(MV) DIMMERS

Luminaire	Manufacturer	Family	Model	Power Rating	Range*	Note
4011	Lutron	Skytrak	DVCF-000	600W	25% - 100%	
			SDP-600P	600W	17% - 100%	Best performance
			S-10P	1000W		Not recommended

*Line end of this range is determined by output current which may not directly translate to the permitted light output.
WAC Lighting fixtures are compatible with a variety of dimmers. For your convenience we have included a compatibility chart showing dimmers which have been tested with our products. The recommended list below is based upon testing conducted in a lab, and the results can vary in certain field applications due to the number of fixtures. Exclusion from the list does not imply incompatibility, just that it has not been tested by WAC Lighting. Please reference the dimmer manufacturer's instructions for installation, or contact a WAC Lighting professional at 800-526-2586.




Headquarters/Eastern Distribution Center
1900 Arch Road
Lafayette, CA 94501
Central Distribution Center
1700 Arch Road
Ontario, CA 91764
Western Distribution Center
1700 Arch Road
Ontario, CA 91764
WAC Lighting reserves the right to modify the design of our products at any time as part of the company's continuous improvement program. JLS, 2016

3 EXTERIOR STEP LIGHT SPECS.
NOT TO SCALE

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN

PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
&
BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES

No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021


Checked By: _____ Checker: _____

**3D VIEWS /
MATERIAL
BOARD /
LIGHTING
SPECS.**


Drawing Scale: As indicated
Job No. PROPOSED

A-0.1


BUILDING AREA SQUARE FOOTAGE BREAKDOWN			
NEW HOME			
SPACE	H	V	TOTAL
FIRST FLOOR			
A	7.33	5.67	41.6 SF
B	6.67	9.42	62.8 SF
C	7.67	19.75	151.5 SF
TOTAL 1ST FLOOR BUILDING AREA			255.9 SF
SECOND FLOOR			
H	33.00	14.67	484.1 SF
I	6.00	17.67	106.0 SF
J	8.33	42.25	351.9 SF
K	20.83	26.67	555.5 SF
TOTAL 2ND FLOOR BUILDING AREA			1497.6 SF
THIRD FLOOR			
N	31.50	23.50	740.3 SF
O	13.28	5.08	67.5 SF
P	5.08	5.08	12.9 SF
Q	44.00	25.33	1114.5 SF
R	6.00	12.00	72.0 SF
S	8.33	23.17	193.0 SF
T	9.00	19.50	175.5 SF
U	15.50	23.17	359.1 SF
TOTAL 3RD FLOOR BUILDING AREA			2734.8 SF
V	6.00	16.17	97.0 SF
W	9.00	1.83	16.5 SF
X	9.00	1.83	16.5 SF
TOTAL 3RD FLOOR NON-HABITABLE			130.0 SF
TOTAL 3RD FLOOR			2864.7 SF
TOTAL HABITABLE:			4488.3 SF
TOTAL BUILDING FLOOR AREA			5968.37 SF




1 PROPOSED 1ST. FLOOR - FLOOR AREA DIAGRAM
1/8" = 1'-0"




2 PROPOSED 2ND. FLOOR - FLOOR AREA DIAGRAM
1/8" = 1'-0"



3 PROPOSED 3RD FLOOR - FLOOR AREA DIAGRAM
1/8" = 1'-0"




4 DAYLIGHT PLANE 1
3/16" = 1'-0"



5 DAYLIGHT PLANE 2
3/16" = 1'-0"

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN



PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
&
BEKOM DESIGN, INC
E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES

No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021

Checked By: _____ Checker

SQUARE
FOOTAGE
DIAGRAMS /
DAYLIGHT
PLANES

Drawing Scale: As indicated

Job No. PROPOSED

A-0.2

Certification of Performance⁽³⁾

I, Robert Weatherill 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 appraisal is stated in the attached report and the Terms and Conditions;
- * That I have no current or prospective 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 member of the International Society of Arboriculture and a Certified Arborist. I have been involved in the practice of arboriculture and the care and study of trees for over 20 years.

Signed





Robert Weatherill
Certified Arborist WE 1936A
Date: 12/17/20

Terms and Conditions⁽³⁾

The following terms and conditions apply to all oral and written reports and correspondence pertaining to consultations, inspections and activities of Advanced Tree Care:


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 verbally 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 Advanced Tree Care, is not in violation of 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. Any existing liens and encumbrances have been disregarded.
3. All reports and other correspondence are confidential, and are the property of Advanced Tree Care and it's named clients and their assignees 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. Advanced Tree Care and the consultant assume no liability for the failure of trees or parts of trees, either 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. 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 attend court by reason of this appraisal/report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of additional fees for such services as described by the consultant or in the fee schedules or contract.
7. Advanced Tree Care has no warranty, either expressed or implied, as to the suitability of the information contained in the reports 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 consultants, and the fee for services is in no manner contingent upon the reporting of a specified value nor upon any particular finding to be reported.
9. Any photographs, diagrams, graphs, sketches, or other graphic material included in any report, being 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 reproductions of graphs material or the work product of any other persons is intended solely for the purpose of clarification and ease of reference. Inclusion of said information does not constitute a representation by Advanced Tree Care or the consultant as to the sufficiency or accuracy of that information.




TREE PROTECTION LEGEND

- SIGNIFICANT TREES TO BE REMOVED
- ✕ NOT SIGNIFICANT TREES TO BE REMOVED (POOR CONDITION)
- SIGNIFICANT TREES TO BE PROTECTED
- TREE PROTECTION ZONE (TPZ)

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN



PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
&
BEKOM DESIGN, INC
E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES

No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021


Checked By: _____ Checker

**ARBORIST
REPORT / TREE
PROTECTION
PLAN**

Drawing Scale: As indicated

Job No. PROPOSED

A-0.4



SETBACKS & EASEMENTS
 - - - - - PROPERTY LINES

SITE COVERAGE

	NEW HOUSE FOOTPRINT 3,598 SF
	CONCRETE ACCESS ROAD 9,207 SF
	TURF BLOCK PERMEABLE (40%) 318+354= 672 SF
	GRAVEL / DECOMPOSITE GRANITE: 48 + 161 + 200 + 60 + 48 + 236 + 39 = 792 SF.
	RAISED WOOD DECK: 143 SF.
	CONCRETE / PORCELAIN PAVERS ABOVE CONCRETE 827 + 17 = 844 SF.

TOTAL SITE COVERAGE: 15,160 SF. < 105,967.5 SF


UTILITY LEGEND

UTILITIES


	WATER LINE
	(N) JOINT TRENCH FOR UNDERGROUND ELECTRICAL, GAS, DSL
	(N) AC CONDENSER PADS
	(N) MAIN ELECTRIC PANEL - 200A
	(N) SEPTIC TANK AND PUMP
	(N) LEACH FIELDS

1 PROPOSED SITE PLAN
1/16" = 1'-0"

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
 NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
 OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN



PATRICK J. FLANDERS
 FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
 &
 BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
 E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
 PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES


No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021

Checked By: _____ Checker


**PROPOSED SITE
 PLAN / SITE
 COVERAGE**

Drawing Scale: 1/16" = 1'-0"
 Job No. PROPOSED

A-1.0




1 PROPOSED 3RD FLOOR LANDSCAPE PLAN
 1/8" = 1'-0"



2 PROPOSED 2ND FLOOR LANDSCAPE PLAN
 1/8" = 1'-0"

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
 NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
 OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN



PATRICK J. FLANDERS
 FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
 &
 BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
 E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
 PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES


No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021

Checked By: _____ Checker


LANDSCAPE PLANS

Drawing Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
 Job No. PROPOSED

A-1.01



BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
 NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
 OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN



PATRICK J. FLANDERS
 FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
 &
 BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
 E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
 PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES


No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
2	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021

Checked By: _____ Checker

PROPOSED 1ST FLOOR PLAN


Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"
 Job No. PROPOSED

A-1.1




BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070

NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
 OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN



PATRICK J. FLANDERS
 FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
 &
 BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
 E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
 PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES

No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021


Checked By: _____ Checker

PROPOSED 2ND FLOOR PLAN

Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"

Job No. PROPOSED

A-1.2



BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
 NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
 OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN

PATRICK J. FLANDERS
 FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
 &
 BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
 E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
 PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017

ISSUANCES


No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021

Checked By: _____ Checker


PROPOSED 3RD FLOOR PLAN

Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"
 Job No. PROPOSED

A-1.3



BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
 NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
 OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN



PATRICK J. FLANDERS
 FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
 &
 BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
 E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
 PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES

No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021


Checked By: _____ Checker

**PROPOSED
 ROOF PLAN**

Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"
 Job No. PROPOSED


A-2.0

- ① STUCCO: NATURAL
- ② FASCIA: BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-20
- ③ CUSTOM ROCK BASALT FINISH
- ④ EXPOSED CONCRETE
- ⑤ PERFORATED METAL FINISH (GALVALUME)
- ⑥ WINDOWS STRUCTURE (FASCIA): BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-30
- ⑦ RAILINGS: METAL RODS, SS FINISH
- ⑧ TURF BLOCK+ GROUND COVER
- ⑨ GARAGE DOOR: ANODIZED ALUMINUM - SATIN ANODIZED FINISH + FROSTED GLASS (WHITE)



1 ELEVATION '1' (EAST)
3/16" = 1'-0"

- ① STUCCO: NATURAL
- ② FASCIA: BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-20
- ③ RAILINGS: METAL RODS, SS FINISH
- ④ EXPOSED CONCRETE
- ⑤ WINDOWS STRUCTURE (FASCIA): BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-30



2 ELEVATION '8' (WEST)
3/16" = 1'-0"


BAGERMAN RESIDENCE

SAN CARLOS, CA 94070

NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070

OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN

PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
&
BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES

No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021

Checked By: _____ Checker: _____


ELEVATIONS '1' (EAST) & '8' (WEST)

Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"

Job No. PROPOSED


A-3.0

- ① STUCCO: NATURAL
- ② FASCIA: BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-20
- ③ CUSTOM ROCK BASALT FINISH
- ④ EXPOSED CONCRETE
- ⑤ PERFORATED METAL FINISH (GALVALUME)
- ⑥ WINDOWS STRUCTURE (FASCIA): BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-30
- ⑦ RAILINGS: METAL RODS, SS FINISH
- ⑧ TURF BLOCK+ GROUND COVER
- ⑨ GARAGE DOOR: ANODIZED ALUMINUM - SATIN ANODIZED FINISH + FROSTED GLASS (WHITE)



1 ELEVATION '2' (NORTH)
3/16" = 1'-0"

- ① STUCCO: NATURAL
- ② FASCIA: BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-20
- ③ CUSTOM ROCK BASALT FINISH
- ④ EXPOSED CONCRETE
- ⑤ PERFORATED METAL FINISH (GALVALUME)
- ⑥ WINDOWS STRUCTURE (FASCIA): BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-30
- ⑦ RAILINGS: METAL RODS, SS FINISH
- ⑧ TURF BLOCK+ GROUND COVER
- ⑨ GARAGE DOOR: ANODIZED ALUMINUM - SATIN ANODIZED FINISH + FROSTED GLASS (WHITE)



2 ELEVATION '2A' (NORTH)
3/16" = 1'-0"

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE SAN CARLOS, CA 94070

NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070

OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN

PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
&
BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES

No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021

Checked By: _____ Checker


ELEVATIONS '2' & '2A' (NORTH)

Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"


Job No. PROPOSED

A-3.1

- ① STUCCO: NATURAL
- ② FASCIA: BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-20
- ③ CUSTOM ROCK BASALT FINISH
- ④ EXPOSED CONCRETE
- ⑤ PERFORATED METAL FINISH (GALVALUME)
- ⑥ WINDOWS STRUCTURE (FASCIA): BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-30
- ⑦ RAILINGS: METAL RODS, SS FINISH
- ⑧ TURF BLOCK+ GROUND COVER
- ⑨ GARAGE DOOR: ANODIZED ALUMINUM - SATIN ANODIZED FINISH + FROSTED GLASS (WHITE)



1 ELEVATION '3' (SOUTH)
3/16" = 1'-0"



- ① STUCCO: NATURAL
- ② FASCIA: BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-20
- ③ CUSTOM ROCK BASALT FINISH
- ④ EXPOSED CONCRETE
- ⑤ PERFORATED METAL FINISH (GALVALUME)
- ⑥ WINDOWS STRUCTURE (FASCIA): BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-30
- ⑦ RAILINGS: METAL RODS, SS FINISH
- ⑧ TURF BLOCK+ GROUND COVER
- ⑨ GARAGE DOOR: ANODIZED ALUMINUM - SATIN ANODIZED FINISH + FROSTED GLASS (WHITE)


2 ELEVATION '7' (NORTH-EAST)
3/16" = 1'-0"

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070

NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070

OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN

PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
&
BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017




ISSUANCES		
No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021


Checked By: _____ Checker

ELEVATIONS '3' (SOUTH) & '7' (NORTH-EAST)

Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"
Job No. PROPOSED




2 ELEVATION '4' (NORTH-WEST)
3/16" = 1'-0"



1 ELEVATION '6' (SOUTH-EAST)
3/16" = 1'-0"

- 1 STUCCO: NATURAL
- 2 FASCIA: BENJAMIN MOORE 2121-20




3 ELEVATION '5' (SOUTH-WEST)
3/16" = 1'-0"

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070

NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN

PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
&
BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017




No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021

Checked By: _____ Checker


**ELEVATIONS '4',
'5' & '6'**

Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"
Job No. PROPOSED

A-3.3



1 SECTION A
3/16" = 1'-0"



2 SECTION B
3/16" = 1'-0"


BAGERMAN RESIDENCE

SAN CARLOS, CA 94070

NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070

OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN

PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
&
BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017



ISSUANCES		
No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021


Checked By: _____ Checker

SECTIONS 'A' & 'B'


Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"

Job No. PROPOSED

A-4.0



1 SECTION C
3/16" = 1'-0"




2 SECTION D
3/16" = 1'-0"

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070

NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070
OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN

PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
&
BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017




ISSUANCES		
No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
2	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021


Checked By: _____ Checker

SECTIONS 'C' & 'D'


Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"
Job No. PROPOSED



1 SECTION F
3/16" = 1'-0"



2 SECTION E
3/16" = 1'-0"




3 SECTION G
3/16" = 1'-0"

BAGERMAN RESIDENCE
SAN CARLOS, CA 94070

NEW RESIDENCE - APN 049-020-070

OWNERS: TATYANA & ALEXANDER BAGERMAN

PATRICK J. FLANDERS
FLANDERS BAY COMPANY
&
BEKOM DESIGN, INC.
E-MAIL: INFO@BEKOMDESIGN.COM
PH: 408.203.4686 / 408.726.0017




ISSUANCES		
No.	Description	Date
1	PLANNING SUBMITTAL	12.22.2020
1	PLANNING COMMENTS 1	09.15.2021

Checked By: _____ Checker

SECTIONS 'E', 'F'
& 'G'

Drawing Scale: 3/16" = 1'-0"
Job No. PROPOSED



GENERAL GRADING NOTES:

- (A) **GENERAL**
- (1) ALL FINISHED GRADING SHALL BE BLENDED WITH THE EXISTING GRADE TO FORM A SMOOTH TRANSITION WHERE POSSIBLE.
- (2) CUTS AND FILLS SHALL BE BALANCED ON SITE, UNLESS AN EXCEPTION IS GRANTED BY THE TOWN ENGINEER AND PLANNING DIRECTOR. BASEMENT GRADING IS EXEMPT FROM THIS REQUIREMENT.
- (B) **EXCAVATIONS.**
- (1) STEEPNESS. NO SURFACE GRADING SHALL BE MADE WITH A CUT FACE STEEPER THAN TWO HORIZONTAL TO ONE VERTICAL UNLESS ALLOWED BY THE TOWN ENGINEER AND TOWN GEOLOGIST IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED GRADING SPECIFICATIONS.
- (2) SETBACK FROM PROPERTY LINES. THE TOPS AND TOES OF ALL CUTS AND FILLS SHALL BE AT LEAST TEN FEET FROM ANY PROPERTY LINE AND FIVE FEET FROM A PROPOSED BUILDING.
- (3) CONTOUR GRADING. CONTOUR GRADING OF ALL TOPS AND TOES SHALL BE REQUIRED FOR A MINIMUM OF TEN FEET HORIZONTAL DISTANCE.
- (4) STRICTER STANDARDS. THE TOWN ENGINEER MAY REQUIRE AN EXCAVATION TO BE MADE WITH A CUT FACE FLATTER IN SLOPE THAN TWO HORIZONTAL TO ONE VERTICAL IF HE/SHE FINDS THE MATERIAL IN WHICH THE EXCAVATION IS TO BE MADE IS SUBJECT TO SIGNIFICANT EROSION OR IF OTHER CONDITIONS MAKE SUCH FLATTER CUT SLOPE NECESSARY FOR STABILITY OR SAFETY TO ADJOINING PROPERTY.
- (C) **FILLS.**
- (1) STEEPNESS. NO FILL SHALL BE MADE WHICH CREATES ANY EXPOSED SURFACE STEEPER IN SLOPE THAN TWO HORIZONTAL TO ONE VERTICAL.
- (2) STRICTER STANDARDS. THE TOWN ENGINEER MAY REQUIRE THAT THE FILL BE CONSTRUCTED WITH AN EXPOSED SURFACE FLATTER THAN TWO HORIZONTAL TO ONE VERTICAL IF HE/SHE FINDS THAT, UNDER THE PARTICULAR CONDITIONS, SUCH FLATTER SURFACE IS NECESSARY FOR STABILITY, SAFETY, AND PLANTING.
- (3) FILL MATERIAL. ALL FILLS SHALL BE MADE OF CLEAN EARTH, SAND, GRAVEL, OR ROCK.
- (4) SURFACE PREPARATION. THE GROUND SURFACE SHALL BE PREPARED TO RECEIVE THE FILL BY REMOVING VEGETATION, TOPSOIL, AND OTHER UNSUITABLE MATERIALS AND SHALL BE SCARIFIED TO PROVIDE A BOND WITH NEW FILL. WHERE SLOPES ARE STEEPER THAN FIVE TO ONE, AND THE HEIGHT IS GREATER THAN FIVE FEET, BENCHING OR KEYING INTO SOUND BEDROCK OR OTHER COMPONENT MATERIAL AS DETERMINED BY THE SOILS ENGINEER MAY BE REQUIRED.
- (5) COMPACTION OF FILLS. ALL FILLS INTENDED TO SUPPORT BUILDINGS OR STRUCTURES OR WHERE OTHERWISE REQUIRED TO BE COMPACTED FOR STABILITY OF MATERIAL SHALL BE COMPACTED, INSPECTED, AND TESTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE APPROVED GEOTECHNICAL REPORT. WHERE NO GEOTECHNICAL REPORT EXISTS, THE FOLLOWING PROVISIONS SHALL APPLY:
- (a) SURFACE PREPARATION. THE NATURAL GROUND SURFACE SHALL BE PREPARED BY THE REMOVAL OF TOPSOIL AND VEGETATION AND, IF NECESSARY, SHALL BE GRADED TO A SERIES OF TERRACES.
- (b) MOISTURE CONTROL. THE MOISTURE CONTENT OF THE FILL MATERIAL SHALL BE CONTROLLED AT THE TIME OF SPREADING AND COMPACTION TO OBTAIN THE REQUIRED MAXIMUM DENSITY.
- (c) COMPACTION DENSITY. THE FILL MATERIAL SHALL BE COMPACTED TO A RELATIVE COMPACTION DENSITY OF NOT LESS THAN 90%, DETERMINED BY THE CURRENT ASTM STANDARD.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

- ① CONSTRUCT SWALE PER DETAIL 1 ON SHEET C3
- ② CONSTRUCT INLET PER DETAIL 2 ON SHEET C3
- ③ CONSTRUCT OUTLET PER DETAIL 3 ON SHEET C3
- ④ CONSTRUCT CATCH BASIN PER DETAIL 4 ON SHEET C3
- ⑤ CONSTRUCT SLOUGH WALL PER DETAIL 5 ON SHEET C3
- ⑥ CONSTRUCT SPLASH WALL PER DETAIL 6 ON SHEET C3
- ⑦ UNDERGROUND DETENTION SYSTEM

LEGEND

	PROPERTY LINE
	STREET CENTER LINE
	RETAINING WALL
	DAY LIGHT LINE
	FLOW LINE
	EXISTING POINT ELEVATION
	PROPOSED POINT ELEVATION

TW	TOP OF WALL	TG	TOP OF GRATE
TF	TOP OF FOOTING	STA	STATION
TC	TOP OF CURB	EL	ELEVATION
BW	BACK OF WALK	INV	INVERT
FL	FLOW LINE	CB	CATCH BASIN
FF	FINISHED FLOOR	MH	MANHOLE
FS	FINISHED SURFACE		

EARTHWORK QUANTITIES:


	BUILDING	DWY	YARD	TOTAL
CUT:	670 C.Y.	950 C.Y.	140 C.Y.	1760 C.Y.
FILL:	50 C.Y.	0 C.Y.	20 C.Y.	70 C.Y.
EXPORT:				1690 C.Y.

QUANTITIES SHOWN ARE FOR PLAN CHECK PURPOSES AND ARE NOT TO BE USED FOR BID PURPOSES.

REVISIONS	BY
06-20-2021	VZ
12-17-2021	VZ
09-29-2022	VZ
03-20-2023	VZ


GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN

PORTION OF A.P.N. 049-020-070
 CHESHAM AVENUE, SAN CARLOS
 OWNER: ALEXANDER & TATYANA BAGERMAN




DRAWN O.F.
CHECKED V.G.
DATE 09/14/22
SCALE AS SHOWN
JOB NO.
SHEET C1
OF SHEETS


INFILTRATIVE AREA per EMITTER:
(NOT TO SCALE)



PD TRENCH SETBACK TO DRIPFIELDS: 2 ft downslope position
(see infiltrative area per drip emitter diagram to left) **0 ft upslope position**
Note that PD trench dispersal is 18" depth, Dripline burial depth is 12"



INSPECTION WELL DETAIL: (5)
(NOT TO SCALE)



- SP1, 2** = soil profile test hole (2)
- P1** = perc test hole (12)
- T** = concrete thrust block (14)
- = common return line (2" PVC)
- = supply line to field B (2" PVC)
- = supply line to field A (2" PVC)

Worksheet 1 - Field Flow for Geoflow Drip Dispersal Fields

Total field		450 gallons / day	
Total quantity of effluent to be disposed per day		450 gallons / day	
Hydraulic loading rate		1.23 gallons / sq ft / day	
Minimum Dispersal Field Area		375 square ft	
Total Dispersal Field Area		380 square ft	
Flow per zone			
Number of Zones	1 zone(s)		
Dispersal area per zone	380 square ft		
Choose line spacing between WASTEFLOW lines	2 ft		
Choose emitter spacing between WASTEFLOW emitters	2 ft		
Total linear ft per zone (minimum required)	190 ft per zone		
Total number of emitters per zone	114 emitters per zone		
Select Wasteflow dripline (1/2mm)	Wasteflow PC - 1/2gph dripline		
Pressure at the beginning of the dripline	20 psi		
Feet of Head at the beginning of the dripline	48.2 ft		
What is the flow rate per emitter in gph?	0.53 gph		
Dose flow per zone	1.01 gpm		
If required, choose flush velocity	0.5 ft/sec		
How many lines of WASTEFLOW per zone?	3 lines		
Fill in the actual length of longest dripline lateral	76 ft		
Flush flow required at the end of each dripline	0.37 gpm		
Total Flow required to achieve flushing velocity	1.11 gpm		
Total Flow per zone - worst case scenario	2.12 gpm		
Select Filters and zone valves			
Select Filter Type	BioDisc Self Flushing Battery		
Recommended Filter (item no.)	BioDisc Battery 2	40-70 gpm / 40 psi	
Select Zone Valve Type	Electric Solenoid		
Recommended Zone Valve (item no.)	0	0	
Dosing			
Number of doses per day / zone	7.7 doses		
Timer ON - Pump run time per dose/zone	58.02 mins.secs		
Timer OFF - Pump off time between doses	2.08 hrs.mins		
Per Zone - Pump run time per day/zone	7.20 hrs.mins		
All Zones - Number of doses per day / all zones	7.7 doses / day		
Allow time for field to pressurize	0.05:00 hrs.mins.secs		
Filter flush timer	0.01:00 hrs.mins.secs		
Drain timer	0.05:00 hrs.mins.secs		
Field flush timer	0.05:00 hrs.mins.secs		
Field flush counter	3 cycles		
Time required to complete all functions per day	8.30 hrs.mins		
Dose volume per zone	58 gallons per dose		

PRESSURE DOSED TRENCH LENGTHS

PRIMARY 1:	PRIMARY 2:	EXPANSION 1:	EXPANSION 2:
D1 - 57'	D6 - 25'	D9 - 120'	DF12 - 45'
D2 - 49'	D7 - 114'	DF10 - 94'	DF13 - 102'
D3 - 30'	D8 - 125'	DF11 - 33'	DF14 - 55'
D4 - 76'	264'	247'	DF15 - 45'
D5 - 35'			247'

INFILTRATIVE AREA CALCULATIONS & SPECIFICATIONS FOR Pressure Distribution Trench System

DESIGN CALCULATIONS:
TRENCH DIMENSIONS: (not to scale)

Average Percolation Rate: 4.5 in/hr (non-stabilized holes included in average)
Wastewater Flow: 450 gpd (3 bedrooms)
Infiltrative Area: 3,950 sq. ft. (4 x 70 linear ft x 12 ft²/ft)
Proposed Trench Dimensions: 3 ft depth x 18" width
Drainrock Below Pipe: 1.7 ft.
Infiltrative Area/Linear ft. Drainfield: 3.4 ft²
Linear ft. Drainfield Required: 988 ft (3,950 sq. ft. / 3.4 sq. ft. per ft)
Soil Profile (SP2) - No GW to 6 ft (3 ft separation to trench bottom)
16% to 49% SLOPE Trench Spacing: 12.5 ft o.c. (11 ft edge to edge)

DEPTH TO GROUNDWATER:
DRAINFIELD AREA SLOPE:

PD TRENCHES: 988 ft required to be shown feasible
(4 x 247 ft for primary & reserve drainfields)
NOTE: PD TRENCHES INSTALLATION IS NOT PART OF THIS PLAN.

DRIP DISPERSAL PERCOLATION TEST DATA:

SAN MATEO COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DIVISION

MEASUREMENTS	P3	P5	P6	P4	P2	P1
16 HOUR INTERVALS						
HOLE #1	HOLE #2	HOLE #3	HOLE #4	HOLE #5	HOLE #6	
START	START	START	START	START	START	
1 8:46	1 8:46	1 8:46	1 8:46	1 8:46	1 8:46	
2 9:19	2 9:19	2 9:19	2 9:19	2 9:19	2 9:19	
3 10:52	3 10:52	3 10:52	3 10:52	3 10:52	3 10:52	
4 10:53	4 10:53	4 10:53	4 10:53	4 10:53	4 10:53	
5 11:25	5 11:25	5 11:25	5 11:25	5 11:25	5 11:25	
6 11:56	6 11:56	6 11:56	6 11:56	6 11:56	6 11:56	

Average of Last 3 Readings: 3.1 4.2 0.75* 2.9 3.9 4.3
Ave. 6 holes: 6.4 in/hr (9.4 MPI) * = slowest of last 3 readings for unstabilized hole

PRESSURE DOSED TRENCH PERCOLATION TEST DATA:

SAN MATEO COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DIVISION

MEASUREMENTS	P7	P10	P12	P11	P8	P9
16 HOUR INTERVALS						
HOLE #7	HOLE #10	HOLE #12	HOLE #11	HOLE #8	HOLE #9	
START	START	START	START	START	START	
1 8:46	1 8:46	1 8:46	1 8:46	1 8:46	1 8:46	
2 9:19	2 9:19	2 9:19	2 9:19	2 9:19	2 9:19	
3 10:52	3 10:52	3 10:52	3 10:52	3 10:52	3 10:52	
4 10:53	4 10:53	4 10:53	4 10:53	4 10:53	4 10:53	
5 11:25	5 11:25	5 11:25	5 11:25	5 11:25	5 11:25	
6 11:56	6 11:56	6 11:56	6 11:56	6 11:56	6 11:56	

Average Last 3 Readings: 2.3 1.1* 0.5* 3.4 3.8 1.7
Ave. 6 holes: 4.2 in/hr (14 MPI) * = slowest of last 3 readings for unstabilized holes

ENLARGEMENT: 1" = 5'







Table DD-2. Drip Dispersal System Management Requirements

Inspection	Work	Minimum Frequency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct routine visual observations of drip field, downslope area and surroundings for wet areas, pipe leaks or damage, soil erosion, drainage issues, abnormal vegetation, gophers or other problems. Conduct routine physical inspections of system components, including valves, filters, and headworks boxes (if). Perform special inspections of drip field at time of any landscaping work or other digging in drip field area. Perform inspections of dosing pumps) and appurtenances (per system O&M manual, and Performance Evaluation Guidelines, Section 5 of this Manual). Record observations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct routine visual observations of drip field, downslope area and surroundings for wet areas, pipe leaks or damage, soil erosion, drainage issues, abnormal vegetation, gophers or other problems. Conduct routine physical inspections of system components, including valves, filters, and headworks boxes (if). Perform special inspections of drip field at time of any landscaping work or other digging in drip field area. Perform inspections of dosing pumps) and appurtenances (per system O&M manual, and Performance Evaluation Guidelines, Section 5 of this Manual). Record observations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Every 6 to 12 months.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manually remove and clean filter. Clean and check operation of pressure reducing valves. Clean flush valves and vacuum release valves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manually remove and clean filter. Clean and check operation of pressure reducing valves. Clean flush valves and vacuum release valves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clean filter every 6 months. Other maintenance annually.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure and record water levels in dispersal field monitoring wells, as applicable, per permit requirements. Obtain and analyze water samples from dispersal field monitoring wells, as applicable, per permit requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure and record water levels in dispersal field monitoring wells, as applicable, per permit requirements. Obtain and analyze water samples from dispersal field monitoring wells, as applicable, per permit requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to permit conditions, if applicable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report findings to Environmental Health per permit requirements. Standard report to include dates, monitoring well and other data collected, work performed, corrective actions taken, and performance summary. Report public health/water quality emergency to Environmental Health immediately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report findings to Environmental Health per permit requirements. Standard report to include dates, monitoring well and other data collected, work performed, corrective actions taken, and performance summary. Report public health/water quality emergency to Environmental Health immediately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to permit conditions, typically every year, depending on system size, usage, history, location.

BASIS OF ELEVATIONS
ELEVATIONS SHOWN HEREON ARE ON AN ASSUMED DATUM. THE CENTER OF A SEWER MANHOLE LID IN CHESHAM AVENUE AT THE DRIVEWAY TO THE SITE IS A TEMPORARY BENCHMARK. ASSUMED ELEVATION 274.36 FEET.

- LEGEND**
- FLOWLINE OF DITCH
 - SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
 - FIRE HYDRANT
 - WATER METER
 - WATER VALVE
 - LEACH FIELD TEST HOLE PER 10/5/2017 SURVEY
 - AREA WITH A SLOPE 50% OR GREATER



TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY EXHIBIT


PORTION OF A.P.N. 49-202-070
CHESHAM AVENUE, SAN CARLOS
FOR
ALEXANDER & TATYANA BAGERMAN
SAN MATEO COUNTY SCALE 1"=20'
CALIFORNIA OCTOBER 2017
MERIDIAN SURVEYING ENGINEERING, INC.
NORTH BAY 777 GRAND AVE #202 SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901 (415) 456-5450
CORPORATE 2858 VAN NESS AVE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109 (415) 440-4131
EAST BAY 5179 LONE TREE WAY ANTIOCH, CA 94531 (925) 778-0626

TANKS & TREATMENT:


Effluent Filter:

Orengo Biotube Filter
Model FTS0444-36V

SEPTIC TANK: TRAFFIC RATED due to location next to drive. (Risers/Lids Non-Traffic Rated)




PUMP TANK:




TREATMENT UNIT:

AX20RT Treatment System - Gravity Discharge



HEADWORKS AND PUMP:



Worksheet - Pump Sizing

Section 1 - Summary from Worksheet 1	Flow	Pressure
Flow required to dose field	1.01 gpm	
Flow required to flush field	1.11 gpm	
Flow required to dose & flush field	2.12 gpm	
Filter	BioDisc Battery 2	
No. of Zones	1	
Zone valve	-	
Dripline	Wasterflow PC - 1/2gph	
Dripline longest lateral	76.00 ft	

Section 2

Section 2	Ft of head	Pressure
A. Flush line - Losses through return line		
Select Pipe from dropdown menu	PVC schedule 40	
Select Flush Line Diameter	2" inch	
Length of return line	570 ft	
Equivalent length of fittings	127 ft	
Elevation change (if downhill enter 0)	0 ft	
Pressure loss in 100 ft of pipe	0.00 ft	0.00 psi
Total pressure loss from end of dripline to return tank	0.0 ft	0.01 psi
B. Dripline - Losses through Wasterflow dripline		
Length of dripline lateral	88 ft	
Minimum dosing pressure required at end of dripline	23.10 ft	10.00 psi
Loss through dripline during flushing	2.59 ft	1.12 psi
Total minimum required dripline pressure	25.69 ft	11.12 psi
A+B. Minimum Pressure required at beginning of dripline		
CALCULATED pressure required at beginning of drip	25.71 ft	11.13 psi
SPECIFIED pressure at beginning of dripline from	46.2 ft	20.00 psi
Great! SPECIFIED Pressure is greater than CALCULATED Pressure requirement. Go to next step		
C. Drip components - Losses through headworks		
Filter	11.1 ft	4.80 psi
Zone valve pressure loss (not in diagram)	- ft	- psi
Flow meter pressure loss (not in diagram)	- ft	- psi
Other pressure losses	- ft	- psi
Total loss through drip components	11.09 ft	4.80 psi
D. Supply line - Minimum Pressure head required to get from pump tank to top of dripline		
Select Supply line diameter	PVC schedule 40	
Length of supply line	540 ft	
Equivalent length of fittings	1329 ft	
Height from pump to tank outlet	39 ft	1.71 psi
Elevation change (if downhill enter 0)	137 ft	
Pressure loss/gain in 100 ft of pipe	0.01 ft	0.01 psi
Total gain or loss from pump to field	142.2 ft	61.58 psi
Total dynamic head	199.5 ft	86.38 psi
Pump capacity * - Field Flush Flow	2.1 gpm	61.58 psi
- Field Dose Flow	1.0 gpm	
- Filter Flush Flow	40.0 gpm	40.00 psi
Pump Model Number	Franklin 10LE05P4-2W115	
Voltz / Hp / phase	115 / 0.5 / 1	

PUMP SELECTION CALCULATIONS & GEOFLOW WORKSHEET INPUTS:

FLOW RATE - From Geoflow Worksheet **2.1 gpm** **PRESSURE** - From Worksheet & Calc. Below: **199.5 ft**

Note: All PVC is Schedule 40. * = (10/100) * (SOURCE: COWI Manual, p. 154) Lengths, elevations & fittings exaggerated for conservative calculation

Note: Note that calculations for Field B will be sufficient to ensure requirements for Field A are met due to longer pipe run to Field B.

A. 2" Return Line: Equivalent Length of Fittings = 127 ft 2" Solenoid in Headworks = 0 ft 3 x 90° + 5 x 45° + 3 x 5.5 ft + 5 x 2.5 ft + 29 ft
 Returns line length = 570 ft T-Through Runs (5) = 5 x 4 ft = 20 ft T-Branch Runs (3) = 3 x 12 ft = 36 ft
 Elevation Change: 0 ft (downhill run) 3/4"-2" pipe expansion = 42 ft

B. Dripline (Length of longest lateral (88 ft): 76 ft emitter line + 3 ft blank tubing + 3 ft PVC to supply/return + 4 ft for 2x90° 3/4" PVC.

C. Drip Components: 2" Solenoid headloss is zero. (From Geoflow headloss chart)
 Equivalent Length Headworks Fittings = 2.4 ft (2xGate Valve) + 19 ft (Check valve) + 12 ft (T-Branch) + 5.5 ft (90 Elbow) = 39 ft
 Headloss due to Equivalent Length of Fittings = 39 ft (2.1 gpm/284.5 ft) = 0.0 ft
D. Supply Line: Length of Supply Line: 540 ft (15 ft in tank, 525 ft across manifold and to end of Field B)
 Equivalent Length of Fittings: 1,329 ft (6 x 90° + 5 x 45° (46 ft) // 4 x T-Branch, (48 ft) // 4 x T-Through (16 ft) // 3/4"-2" fitting at lateral (1,200 ft) // check v (19 ft)
 Lift in Pump Tank: 5 ft // Elevation Change: 137 ft (497 updr dripline - 360 pump tank outlet)

This design point (2 gpm @ 200 ft) is labeled on the performance curve for the selected pump.

Geoflow Fittings:

Air Vents: (8)
3 in headworks
4 ends of supply/returns
1 on return between fields

Pressure Regulators: (2)
2 in headworks

Solenoid Valves: (4)
4 in headworks

Check Valves: (4)
2 in headworks
1 on return between fields
1 in pump tank on supply line

BioDisc Filter: (1)
1 in headworks




Item No.	Outlet Pressure	Flow Range	Max. Inlet Pressure	Inlet/Outlet
PMR-20-LF	20 psi	1/8-8 gpm	150 psi / 347ft	3/4" / 3/4" ftg
PMR-20-MF	20 psi	2-20 gpm	150 psi / 347ft	1" / 1" ftg
PMR-20-HF	20 psi	10-32 gpm	100 psi / 231ft	1.25" / 1" ftg
PMR-20-SF	20 psi	20-90 gpm	90 psi / 208 ft	3" / 3" ID slip
PMR-30-LF	30 psi	2-20 gpm	150 psi / 347 ft	1" / 1" ftg
PMR-30-MF	30 psi	10-32 gpm	100 psi / 231 ft	1.25" / 1" ftg
PMR-30-HF	30 psi	20-90 gpm	100 psi / 231 ft	1.25" / 1" ftg
PMR-30-SF	30 psi	20-90 gpm	125 psi / 289 ft	3" / 3" ID slip

Part No.	BioDisc-150FM	BioDisc-200FM
Inlet/Outlet	1.5 in. MPT	2 in. MPT
Flush port	0.75 in. MPT	2 in. MPT
Max. Flow Rate	30 gpm	40 gpm
Max. Rec. Daily Flow Rate	600 gpd	1500 gpd
Max. Temp.	140 °F	140 °F
Max. Pressure	116 psi/270 ft	145 psi/335 ft.
Dimensions	10.5" x 13.5"	20" x 12.2"
Filtration	150 mesh (100 micron)	150 mesh (100 micron)


ORIGINAL: 7/17/21
 REV 1:
 REV 2:
 OWNER: Alex & Tanya Bagerman
 239 Alamo Dr., San Carlos, CA 94070
 Tel. 650-504-7424
 Email: bagerman@gmail.com
 0 DEVONSHIRE RD., SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
 APN 049-020-070
 Detail Sheet
 DRIP DISPERSAL SEPTIC DESIGN
 To Serve Proposed 3 BR House
 OWTS 2

REVISIONS	BY
06-20-2021	VZ
09-29-2022	VZ

GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
 ADDRESS: PORTION OF A.P.N. 049-020-070
 CHESHAM AVENUE, SAN CARLOS
 OWNER: ALEXANDER & TATYANA BAGERMAN





DRAWN O.F.
CHECKED V.G.
DATE 06/21/21
SCALE AS SHOWN
JOB NO.
SHEET C2
OF SHEETS




CONSTRUCTION NOTES:


- ① CONSTRUCT SWALE PER DETAIL 1 ON SHEET C3
- ② CONSTRUCT INLET PER DETAIL 2 ON SHEET C3
- ③ CONSTRUCT OUTLET PER DETAIL 3 ON SHEET C3
- ④ CONSTRUCT CATCH BASIN PER DETAIL 4 ON SHEET C3
- ⑤ CONSTRUCT SLOUGH WALL PER DETAIL 5 ON SHEET C3
- ⑥ CONSTRUCT SPLASH WALL PER DETAIL 6 ON SHEET C3
- ⑦ CONSTRUCT UNDERGROUND DETENTION SYST. PER DET. ON SHT. C3




DETAILS



SECTION A-A




SECTION B-B




SECTION C-C


DETENTION SYSTEM ⑦




① SWALE DETAIL
N.T.S.




② INLET DETAIL
N.T.S.




③ OUTLET DETAIL
N.T.S.



④ CATCH BASIN DETAIL
N.T.S.



⑤ SLOUGH WALL DETAIL
N.T.S.



⑥ SPLASH WALL DETAIL
N.T.S.

FLO-GARD-PLUS FILTER
RECYCLED PVC CATCH BASIN

KrisStar Enterprises, Inc.
CATCH-BASIN FILTER RESERT
(FRAM-BLANK)
FLAT GRATED RELET


MODEL NO.	GRID	GRID TYPE	GRID SIZE	GRID WEIGHT	GRID AREA	GRID PERIMETER	GRID WEIGHT	GRID AREA	GRID PERIMETER	GRID WEIGHT	GRID AREA	GRID PERIMETER
1000	1/2"	1/2"	12"	1.5	144	48"	1.5	144	48"	1.5	144	48"
1001	1/2"	1/2"	18"	2.25	324	72"	2.25	324	72"	2.25	324	72"
1002	1/2"	1/2"	24"	4.5	576	96"	4.5	576	96"	4.5	576	96"
1003	1/2"	1/2"	30"	6.75	864	120"	6.75	864	120"	6.75	864	120"
1004	1/2"	1/2"	36"	9.0	1296	144"	9.0	1296	144"	9.0	1296	144"
1005	1/2"	1/2"	42"	11.25	1764	168"	11.25	1764	168"	11.25	1764	168"
1006	1/2"	1/2"	48"	13.5	2304	192"	13.5	2304	192"	13.5	2304	192"
1007	1/2"	1/2"	54"	15.75	2916	216"	15.75	2916	216"	15.75	2916	216"
1008	1/2"	1/2"	60"	18.0	3600	240"	18.0	3600	240"	18.0	3600	240"
1009	1/2"	1/2"	66"	20.25	4356	264"	20.25	4356	264"	20.25	4356	264"
1010	1/2"	1/2"	72"	22.5	5184	288"	22.5	5184	288"	22.5	5184	288"

REVISIONS	BY
06-20-2021	VZ.
09-29-2022	VZ.


SECTIONS AND DETAILS
 ADDRESS: PORTION OF A.P.N. 049-020-070
 CHESHAM AVENUE, SAN CARLOS
 OWNER: ALEXANDER & TATYANA BAGERMAN



DRAWN O.F.
CHECKED V.G.
DATE 09/14/22
SCALE AS SHOWN
JOB NO.
SHEET C3 OF SHEETS



MATCH LINE



- EC-1 - SCHEDULING
- EC-4 - HYDROSEEDING
- EC-7 - GEOTEXTILES AND MATS
- EC-9 - EARTH DIKES AND DRAINAGE SWALES
- EC-10 - VELOCITY DISSIPATION DEVICES
- NS-2 - DEWATERING OPERATIONS
- NS-3 - PAVING AND GRINDING OPERATIONS
- NS-8 - VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT CLEANING
- NS-9 - VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT FUELING
- NS-10 - VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE
- SE-3 - SEDIMENT TRAP
- SE-4 - CHECK DAMS
- SE-8 - SAND BAG BARRIER
- SE-10 - STORM DRAIN INLET PROTECTION
- TC-1 - STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE
- WE-1 - WIND EROSION CONTROL
- WM-1 - MATERIAL DELIVERY AND STORAGE
- WM-2 - MATERIAL USE
- WM-4 - SPILL PREVENTION AND CONTROL
- WM-5 - SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT
- WM-6 - HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT
- WM-8 - CONCRETE WASTE MANAGEMENT
- WM-9 - SANITARY/SEPTIC WASTE MANAGEMENT

JOB ADDRESS:

PORTION OF A.P.N. 049-020-070
CHESHAM AVENUE, SAN CARLOS

PROPERTY OWNER:

ALEXANDER & TATYANA BAGERMAN

CIVIL ENGINEER:




XXX

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. INSTALL SEDIMENTATION BARRIER PER SE-8 OR EQUIVALENT BMP MEASURE PER SE-1, SE-6 OR SE-9. PRIOR TO CLEAR AND GRAB.
2. CONCRETE WASTE MANAGEMENT PER WM-8 TO BE LOCATED BY THE CONTRACTOR.
3. INSTALL STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE/EXIT PER TC-1 TO BE INSTALLED WHERE EROSION CONTROL PROTECTION HAS NOT BEEN APPLIED. AFTER CLEAR AND GRUB.
4. INSTALL CATCH BASIN PROTECTION PER SE-10, AFTER CATCH BASIN INSTALLATION.
5. IMPLEMENT STAGING AREA PER NS-8 VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT CLEANING, NS-9 VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT FUELING, NS-10 VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE, WM-1 MATERIAL DELIVERY AND STORAGE. PRIOR TO MATERIAL DELIVERY AND VEHICLE STORAGE. LOCATION CAN BE REVISED BY THE CONTRACTOR.
6. INSTALL MATS ON SLOPES PER EC-7.

NOTE:

INSTALL CATCH BASIN PROTECTION PER CONSTRUCTION NOTE 4 AT ALL CATCH BASINS AFTER INSTALLATION.




REVISIONS	BY
06-20-2021	VZ
12-17-2021	VZ
09-29-2022	VZ

EROSION CONTROL PLAN

ADDRESS: PORTION OF A.P.N. 049-020-070
CHESHAM AVENUE, SAN CARLOS

OWNER: ALEXANDER & TATYANA BAGERMAN





DRAWN O.F.
CHECKED V.G.
DATE 09/14/22
SCALE 1"=20'
JOB NO.
SHEET C4
OF SHEETS




REVISIONS	BY
12-17-2021	VZ
09-29-2022	VZ

EROSION CONTROL PLAN
 ADDRESS: PORTION OF A.P.N. 049-020-070
 CHESHAM AVENUE, SAN CARLOS
 OWNER: ALEXANDER & TATYANA BAGERMAN



SEDIMENTATION BARRIER
 DIRECTIONAL FLOW



DRAWN O.F.
CHECKED V.G.
DATE 09/14/22
SCALE 1"=20'
JOB NO.
SHEET C6
OF SHEETS



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT D

Alex and Tatyana Bagerman
239 Manor Dr
San Carlos, CA 94070

Site: Chesham Ave., San Carlos

Dear Alex and Tatyana,

At your request I visited the above site for the purpose of inspecting and commenting on the regulated trees around the property. A new home is planned, prompting the need for this tree protection report.

Method:

San Mateo County regulates Significant Trees whereby a “SIGNIFICANT TREE” shall mean any live woody plant rising above the ground with a single stem or trunk of a circumference of 38” (Diameter 12.1”) or more measured at 4 1/2’ vertically above the ground or immediately below the lowest branch, whichever is lower, and having the inherent capacity of naturally producing one main axis continuing to grow more vigorously than the lateral axes. In this district, all trees greater than 6” in diameter are considered Significant.

The location of the Significant trees on this site can be found on the plan provided by you. Each tree is given an identification number. The trees are measured at 54 inches above ground level (DBH or Diameter at Breast Height). A condition rating of 1 to 100 is assigned to each tree representing form and vitality on the following scale:

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

The height and spread of each tree is estimated. A Comments section is provided for any significant observations affecting the condition rating of the tree.

A Summary and Tree Protection Plan are at the end of the survey providing recommendations for maintaining the health and condition of the trees during and after construction.

If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to call.

Sincerely



Robert Weatherill
Certified Arborist WE 1936A

Tree Survey

Tree#	Species	DBH	Ht/Sp	Con Rating	Comments
1	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	13.9/11.0/16.0"	30/20	60	Fair health and condition, codominant at grade, Significant
2	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	6.5"	20/10	50	Fair health and condition Significant
3	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	11.2"	10/15	20	Poor health and condition, almost dead, suppressed and leaning, Significant
4	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	10.5"	20/15	30	Poor health and condition, suppressed, leaning, Significant
5	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	14.2"	30/20	55	Fair health and condition, thin canopy, decay at base, Significant
6	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	20.4"	40/30	55	Fair health and condition, suppressed by adjacent, Significant
7	California bay <i>Umbellularia californica</i>	7.2"	30/10	60	Good health and condition, Significant
8	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	8.3"	15/20	40	Poor health and condition, leaning Significant
9	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	26.1"	40/40	60	Fair health and condition, codominant at 4', Significant
10	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	6.4"	20/10	50	Fair health and condition Significant
11	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	21.0"	20/30	60	Fair health and condition, leaning Significant
12	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	5.0"	15/10	40	Poor health and condition, decay at base, Significant
13	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	20.4"	40/25	60	Fair health and condition, slight lean Significant
14	California bay <i>Umbellularia californica</i>	9.5/6.0"	35/20	50	Fair health and condition, codominant at 3', Significant
15	California bay <i>Umbellularia californica</i>	10.0/6.7"	40/15	40	Poor health and condition, decay at base, codominant at grade Significant
16	California bay <i>Umbellularia californica</i>	9.3"	40/10	50	Fair health and condition, leaning Significant
17	California bay <i>Umbellularia californica</i>	12.6"	40/20	50	Fair health and condition, leaning Significant
18	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	6.3"	15/10	40	Poor health and condition Significant

Tree Survey

Tree#	Species	DBH	Ht/Sp	Con Rating	Comments
19	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	7.8"	15/15	50	Fair health and condition, leaning Significant
20	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	24.2"	40/40	40	Poor health and condition, <i>phytophthora</i> on trunk, Significant
21	California bay <i>Umbellularia californica</i>	15.0/17.1/14.3/15.1/6.0"	60/30	70	Good health and condition Significant
22	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	12.9"	20/20	0	Dead Significant
23	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	24"est	25/20	0	Dead Significant
24	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	12.5/18.5"	25/20	50	Fair health and condition, thin canopy, Significant
25	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	15.4/14.0/11.6"	25/20	50	Fair health and condition, codominant at grade, Significant
26	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	13.0"	20/10	45	Poor health and condition, cavity at 3', Significant
27	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	18.7"	20/25	50	Fair health and condition, decay at base leaning, Significant
28	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	17.9"	25/15	40	Poor health and condition, decay at base, Significant
29	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	20.5/7.0"	20/20	50	Fair health and condition, decay at base codominant at grade, Significant
30	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	10.5"	15/15	40	Poor health and condition, decay throughout, Significant
31	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	13.9"	15/20	40	Poor health and condition Significant
32	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	17.3/18.5"	35/20	55	Fair health and condition, codominant at 2', Significant
33	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	15.7/18.3/18.5"	35/30	55	Fair health and condition, codominant at 3', Significant
34	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	10.2"	12/8	55	Fair health and condition, suppressed by #9, Significant
35	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	20.2"	20/15	60	Fair health and condition Significant
36	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	19.6/9.5/19.1"	30/35	60	Fair health and condition, codominant at grade, Significant

Tree Survey

Tree#	Species	DBH	Ht/Sp	Con Rating	Comments
37	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	9.7"	20/8	30	Poor health and condition Significant
38	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	16.3"@2'	30/15	50	Fair health and condition Significant
39	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	14.1/8.6"	25/20	50	Fair health and condition, codominant at grade, Significant
40	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	12.1/11.5/11.1/6.0/8.1"	25/25	50	Fair health and condition, codominant at grade, Significant
41	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	18.1"	25/20	50	Fair health and condition, broken branch Significant
42	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	7.8/7.8"	20/10	60	Fair health and condition, Significant
43	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	4.1/2.0"	15/10	50	Fair health and condition, Significant
44	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	21.8"/11.8"	35/20	65	Good health and condition, included bark at 8 feet Significant

Summary:

The property is a previously undeveloped lot. Many of the trees are in only fair health and condition due to many years of neglect.

The trees on the site are a variety of natives in varying health and condition.

There are 44 Significant trees on the property.

Tree #s 20, 22, 23 and 28 are all in poor health and condition and should be removed.

The tree removals to accommodate the driveway consist of 10 coast live oaks, 4 buckeyes and 2 bays Tree #s 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 41, 42, 43 and 44. **The driveway has been realigned, see Addendum.**

Tree #s 24, 25, 27, 29, 30 and 34 will be removed as they stand within the foot print of the proposed new buildings. All these trees are only in fair condition (50%) and have issues with decay or and health that cannot be rectified.

Tree #s 8, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 26, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40, should be protected during construction.

Tree Protection Plan

1. The Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) should be defined with protective fencing. This should be cyclone or chain link fencing on 1½” or 2” posts driven at least 2 feet in to the ground standing at least 6 feet tall. Normally a TPZ is defined by the dripline of the tree. I recommend the TPZ’s as follows:-

Tree #s 8, 18 and 19: TPZ should be at 6 feet from the trunk closing on the fence line in accordance with Type I Tree Protection as outlined and illustrated in image 2.15-1 and 2⁽⁶⁾. The TPZ can be reduced to edge of construction for Tree # 19.

Tree #s 15, 16 and 17: TPZ should be at 8 feet from the trunk closing on the fence line in accordance with Type I Tree Protection as outlined and illustrated in image 2.15-1 and 2⁽⁶⁾.

Tree # 21: TPZ should be at 20 feet from the trunk closing on the fence line in accordance with Type I Tree Protection as outlined and illustrated in image 2.15-1 and 2⁽⁶⁾.

Tree # 26: TPZ should be at 10 feet from the trunk closing on the fence line in accordance with Type I Tree Protection as outlined and illustrated in image 2.15-1 and 2⁽⁶⁾.

Tree # 31: TPZ should be at 10 feet from the trunk closing on the fence line in accordance with Type I Tree Protection as outlined and illustrated in image 2.15-1 and 2⁽⁶⁾.

Tree # 32: TPZ should be at 20 feet from the trunk closing on the fence line in accordance with Type I Tree Protection as outlined and illustrated in image 2.15-1 and 2⁽⁶⁾.

Tree # 33: TPZ should be at 20 feet from the trunk closing on the fence line in accordance with Type I Tree Protection as outlined and illustrated in image 2.15-1 and 2⁽⁶⁾.

Tree #s 35, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 40 are along the west side of the driveway up to the proposed house. The TPZ fencing should follow the edge of the driveway and extend out to 10 feet from the trunk of the tree where possible.



IMAGE 2.15-1
Tree Protection Fence at the Dripline





IMAGE 2.15-2
Tree Protection Fence at the Dripline

• **Type I Tree Protection**

The fences shall enclose the entire area under the **canopy dripline or TPZ** of the tree(s) to be saved throughout the life of the project, or until final improvement work within the area is required, typically near the end of the project (*see Images 2.15-1 and 2.15-2*). Parking Areas: If the fencing must be located on paving or sidewalk that will not be demolished, the posts may be supported by an appropriate grade level concrete base.

2. Any pruning and maintenance of the tree shall be carried out before construction begins. This should allow for any clearance requirements for both the new structure and any construction machinery particularly along the driveway. This will eliminate the possibility of damage during construction. **The pruning should be carried out by an arborist, not by construction personnel.** No limbs greater than 4" in diameter shall be removed.
3. Any excavation in ground where there is a potential to damage roots of 1" or more in diameter should be carefully hand dug. Where possible, roots should be dug around rather than cut.⁽²⁾
4. If roots are broken, every effort should be made to remove the damaged area and cut it back to its closest lateral root. A clean cut should be made with a saw or pruners. This will prevent any infection from damaged roots spreading throughout the root system and into the tree.⁽²⁾
5. **Do Not:**⁽⁴⁾
 - a. Allow run off or spillage of damaging materials into the area below any tree canopy.
 - b. Store materials, stockpile soil, park or drive vehicles within the TPZ of the tree.
 - c. Cut, break, skin or bruise roots, branches or trunk without first obtaining permission from the city arborist.
 - d. Allow fires under any adjacent trees.
 - e. Discharge exhaust into foliage.
 - f. Secure cable, chain or rope to trees or shrubs.
 - g. Apply soil sterilants under pavement near existing trees.

6. Where roots are exposed, they should be kept covered with the native soil or four layers of wetted, untreated burlap. Roots will dry out and die if left exposed to the air for too long.⁽⁴⁾
7. Route pipes into alternate locations to avoid conflict with roots.⁽⁴⁾
8. Where it is not possible to reroute pipes or trenches, the contractor is to bore beneath the dripline of the tree. The boring shall take place no less than 3 feet below the surface of the soil in order to avoid encountering “feeder” roots.⁽⁴⁾
9. Compaction of the soil within the dripline shall be kept to a minimum.⁽²⁾ If access is required to go through the TPZ of a protected tree, the area within the TPZ should be protected from compaction either with steel plates or with 4” of wood chip overlaid with plywood.
10. Any damage due to construction activities shall be reported to the project arborist or city arborist within 6 hours so that remedial action can be taken.
11. Ensure upon completion of the project that the original ground level is restored



Location of proposed new house, protected trees and their Tree Protection Zones

Glossary

Canopy	The part of the crown composed of leaves and small twigs. ⁽²⁾
Cavities	An open wound, characterized by the presence of extensive decay and resulting in a hollow. ⁽¹⁾
Decay	Process of degradation of woody tissues by fungi and bacteria through the decomposition of cellulose and lignin ⁽¹⁾
Dripline	The width of the crown as measured by the lateral extent of the foliage. ⁽¹⁾
Genus	A classification of plants showing similar characteristics.
Root plate	The point at which the trunk flares out at the base of the tree to become the root system.
Species	A Classification that identifies a particular plant.
Standard height	Height at which the girth of the tree is measured. Typically 4 1/2 feet above ground level

References

(1) Matheny, N.P., and Clark, J.P. Evaluation of Hazard Trees in Urban Areas. International Society of Arboriculture, 1994.

(2) Harris, R.W., Matheny, N.P. and Clark, J.R.. Arboriculture: Integrated Management of Landscape Trees, Shrubs and Vines. Prentice Hall, 1999.

(3) Carlson, Russell E. Paulownia on The Green: An Assessment of Tree Health and Structural Condition. Tree Tech Consulting, 1998.

(4) Extracted from a copy of Tree Protection guidelines. Anon

(5) T. D. Sydnor, Arboricultural Glossary. School of Natural Resources, 2000

(6) D Dockter, Tree Technical Manual. City of Palo Alto, June, 2001

Certification of Performance⁽³⁾

I, Robert Weatherill 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 appraisal is stated in the attached report and the Terms and Conditions;
- * That I have no current or prospective 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 member of the International Society of Arboriculture and a Certified Arborist. I have been involved in the practice of arboriculture and the care and study of trees for over 20 years.

Signed



Robert Weatherill
Certified Arborist WE 1936a
Date: 4/6/23

Terms and Conditions(3)

The following terms and conditions apply to all oral and written reports and correspondence pertaining to consultations, inspections and activities of Advanced Tree Care :

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 verbally 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 Advanced Tree Care, is not in violation of 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. Any existing liens and encumbrances have been disregarded.
3. All reports and other correspondence are confidential, and are the property of Advanced Tree Care and it's named clients and their assignees 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. Advanced Tree Care and the consultant assume no liability for the failure of trees or parts of trees, either 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. No warrantee 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 attend court by reason of this appraisal/report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of additional fees for such services as described by the consultant or in the fee schedules or contract.
7. Advanced Tree Care has no warrantee, either expressed or implied, as to the suitability of the information contained in the reports 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 consultants, and the fee for services is in no manner contingent upon the reporting of a specified value nor upon any particular finding to be reported.
9. Any photographs, diagrams, graphs, sketches, or other graphic material included in any report, being 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 reproductions of graphs material or the work product of any other persons is intended solely for the purpose of clarification and ease of reference. Inclusion of said information does not constitute a representation by Advanced Tree Care or the consultant as to the sufficiency or accuracy of that information.

Addendum

Sceptic system


A septic system is planned for the property that may impact further Significant trees. The location of the trees can be found on the following plan. The trees are numbered continuing from the original inventory.

Tree#	Species	DBH	Ht/Sp	Con Rating	Comments
45	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	25.2"/13.0"	18/25	30	Fair health and very poor condition, cavities throughout, Significant
46	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	25.7"/15.0"	30/40	60	Fair health and condition, Significant
47	Coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	20.7"/17.6"	30/25	50	Poor health and condition, <i>Phytophthora</i> , Significant
48	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	12.2/6.5/6.6/4.3/6.8"	20/30	50	Fair health and condition Decay at base, Significant
49	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	7.5"	15/10	50	Fair health and condition leaning, Significant
50	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	4.3/4.2/3.8/2.0/2.8"	15/20	50	Fair health and condition Significant
51	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	3.6/ 4.1/4.4/4.8/3.0/3.8"	15/20	50	Fair health and condition Decay at base Significant
52	Buckeye <i>Aesculus californica</i>	7.5/6.3"	10/10	50	Fair health and condition co-dominant at 2', Significant

TPZs for Tree #s 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, and 51 should be at 20 radius feet from the trunk of each tree. This is shown as a red line. I do not think it is necessary to install Type I Tree Protection fencing around those trees however the TPZ should be observed and noted

TPZ for Tree #s 49 and 52 should be at 10 radius feet from the trunk of each tree. This is shown as a red line. I do not think it is necessary to install Type I Tree Protection fencing around those trees however the TPZ should be observed and noted

Excavation of the leach field within the TPZ of Tree # 45, 46, 47, 48, 50 and 51 should be dug by hand with no roots greater than 2" in diameter being cut. Shown in blue.



Location of proposed leach field

Realignment of driveway

The proposed driveway to the property has been re-aligned. See attached drawing.

Previous driveway alignment

Tree #s 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 are in the proposed driveway and will have to be removed.

Tree #s 1, 11, 13, 41, 42 and 44 are along the east side of the driveway up to the proposed house. The TPZ fencing should follow the edge of the driveway and extend out to 10 feet from the trunk of the tree where possible.

Tree #s 35, 36, 38, 39 and 40 are along the west side of the driveway up to the proposed house. The TPZ fencing should follow the edge of the driveway and extend out to 10 feet from the trunk of the tree where possible.

Updated driveway alignment

The tree removals to accommodate the driveway consist of 10 coast live oaks, 4 buckeyes and 2 bays
Tree #s 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 41, 42, 43 and 44

Tree #s 35, 36, 38, 39 and 40 are along the west side of the driveway up to the proposed house. The TPZ fencing should follow the edge of the driveway and extend out to 10 feet from the trunk of the tree where possible.


Tree Removals and Replacements

The trees recommended for removal due to poor health and condition are 4 coast live oaks.
Tree #s 20, 22, 23 and 28

The tree removals to accommodate the driveway consist of 10 coast live oaks, 4 buckeyes and 2 bays
Tree #s 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 41, 42, 43 and 44

The tree removals to accommodate the new home consists of 4 coast live oaks and 1 buckeye
Tree #s 24, 25, 27, 29, 30 and 34

The lot is heavily planted with trees but overrun with poison oak, scotch broom and general understory. There may be room for replacement trees around the property but it is difficult to determine any precise locations until the site has been cleared of understory, poison oak and scotch broom. I think 19 replacements with 3 at 24" box size and 16 at 15 gallon size is very fair and possible on the lot. The trees may be planted outside the formal landscape plan on the hillside that surrounds the property. Precise locations to be determined.



Location of re-aligned driveway



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT E

February 7, 2022

Alexander Bagerman
239 Manor Drive
San Carlos, CA 94070

Dear Mr. Bagerman:

SUBJECT: Bayside Design Review Continuance
Chesham Drive/Devonshire Boulevard, Devonshire
APN 049-020-070; County File No. PLN 2020-00467

At its February 2, 2022 meeting, Bayside Design Review Committee (Committee) considered your design review application for construction of a new three-story, 5,742 sq. ft. single-family residence with a 501 sq. ft. attached garage on a legal, 9.73-acre parcel. The project includes removal of 23 significant trees. The project requires a hearing-level Grading Permit for 1,930 cubic yards (c.y.) of earthwork (950 c.y. for the driveway/access road from Chesham Avenue and 980 c.y. for the residence) which will be reviewed at a Planning Commission public hearing at a later date.

All property owners within 300 feet of the subject property were notified on January 23, 2022. Prior to the hearing, eight letters sent via email were received by the DRO which expressed concerns related to numerous aspects of the project. including, access via a private road, the amount of tree removal, erosion control, and project size. At the hearing, four members of the public spoke on these topics and about the easement on the adjacent parcel.

The Committee was unable to make the findings for a design review recommendation of approval based due to the lack of clarity about a proposed easement for a firetruck turnaround. A change in the firetruck turnaround could change a proposed retaining wall and possibly the siting of the project. At the meeting, the Committee stated that there was not enough information to demonstrate that the project adequately complies with Section 6565.15.A, the Design Standards for Devonshire, as discussed below:

- A. Site planning – 1. *Minimize tree removal and 3. Respect the privacy of neighboring houses and outdoor living areas*

Project consistency with this standard may be impacted by changes to the fire truck turnaround.



The item has been continued to allow you time to resolve easement concerns with the owners of the adjacent parcel. The presented easement fails to include the area of the proposed improvements. Please ensure that the encroachment of the firetruck turnaround onto the neighbor's property is resolved either by revising the plans to utilize only the existing easement or proposing new boundaries for the easement. Alternatively, if you propose to change the easement, please provide a copy of the revised easement with signatures of all parties. This document shall be recorded prior to the issuance of a building permit. It is suggested that the project civil engineer is available to answer any questions at the next meeting for this project.

You were presented with the following available options at the end of the BDRC's deliberation of the project: (i) request for a decision from the BDRC on the plans presented or (ii) request that the project be considered at a future meeting to provide you with ample time to consider and incorporate the information necessary to recommended the project. You chose the second option, and the BDRC directed staff to schedule your project for consideration at a later date. To be on the March 2, 2022 hearing, revised plans (a complete consolidated set of architectural, civil and septic) need to be submitted by February 7, 2022 for review by the required reviewing agencies.

Sincerely,



Erica D, Adams, Bayside Design Review Officer

EDA:agv – EDAGG0030_WAN.DOCX

Cc: Bayside Design Review Committee
Interested Parties

March 15, 2023

Alexander Bagerman
239 Manor Drive
San Carlos, CA 94070

Dear Alexander Bagerman:

SUBJECT: Bayside Design Review Recommendation of Approval
Chesham Drive/Devonshire Boulevard, Devonshire
APN 049-020-070; County File No. PLN 2020-00467

At its January 4, 2023 meeting, Bayside Design Review Committee (Committee) considered your design review application for construction of a new three-story, 5,742 sq. ft. single-family residence with a 501 sq. ft. attached garage on a legal, 9.73-acre parcel. The project includes removal of 23 significant trees. The project requires a hearing-level Grading Permit for 1,930 cubic yards (c.y.) of earthwork (950 c.y. for the driveway/access road from Chesham Avenue and 980 c.y. for the residence), which will be reviewed at a Planning Commission public hearing at a later date. The driveway/access road will be constructed on the subject parcel and within an existing easement on APN 049-020-110.

The project was continued from the February 7, 2022 hearing to allow you time to resolve easement concerns with the owners of the adjacent parcel, as, at the time, the proposed access improvements were not included within the legal boundaries of the existing access easement. The easement considered on January 4, 2023 keeps access-related improvements within the boundaries of the easement.

All property owners within 300 feet of the subject property were notified on January 23, 2022 prior to the hearings, letters sent via email were received by the Design Review Officer which expressed concerns related to numerous aspects of the project, including, access via a private road, the amount of tree removal, erosion control, and house size. At the hearing, members of the public spoke on these topics and about the house's compatibility with the community, potential glare from project windows, and the easement on the adjacent parcel. The neighbors who own the property with the subject easement expressed concerns that the new driveway and turnaround, as designed, made access to their property more difficult and that all improvements should be kept within the easement. The Project Planner clarified that the matter of the easement and proposed access improvements are civil matters in nature (between two private property owners), where the County has little to no authority.



The Committee encouraged the parties to work to resolve their conflict over the proposed access improvements. Subsequently, the two parties met regarding the easement, with the Project Planner in attendance, but a resolution was not reached.

At the January 4, 2023 meeting, the Committee made the findings for a design review recommendation of approval and stated that the project adequately complies with Section 6565.15 the Design Standards for Devonshire. The Committee considered concerns relating to compatibility and glare and determined that the house was compatible with other homes in the area, as the proposed house is sited on a very large parcel and away from other homes, and that the more modern design was compatible with the wooded site. It was also stated that there would be tree canopy around the house to mitigate glare. The Committee required that "Dark sky" fixtures are used, and it was recommended that any solar array not be higher than the parapet. The Committee stated that the tree removal proposed is directly related to the access to the proposed residence and within the construction zone of the proposed residence. They stated that proposed residence has facades which are well-articulated and proportioned and the design is compatible with the predominant architectural styles and the natural surroundings of the immediate area. In addition, the proposal conforms to the existing topography, and that a majority of the grading work is necessary for access to the site.

Project requirements of the Committee will be made a recommended condition of approval of the Design Review and Grading Permits for review by the Planning Commission.

Please note that the decision of the Bayside Design Review Committee is a recommendation regarding the project's compliance with design review standards, not the final decision on this project, which requires a hearing-level Grading Permit. The consideration of the Grading Permit and Design Review Permit will occur at a Planning Commission hearing to be scheduled at a later date. A public notice will be sent to property owners within 300 feet and interested parties a minimum of 10 days prior to the scheduled hearing date. For more information, please contact Erica Adams, at 650/363-1828, or by email at eadams@smcgov.org.

Sincerely,

FOR STEVE MONOWITZ
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR, By:



Erica Adams, Design Review Officer



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT F

Erica Adams

From: Barbara Rodriguez <starborne2012@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 5:00 AM
To: Erica Adams
Cc: Art Rodriguez; Barbara Rodriguez
Subject: Bayside Design Review Committee Agenda - Wednesday, Feb 2, 2022 3:00 p.m.

Categories: Purple category

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Dear Committee, please find below our questions concerning the following property development-

Owner: Alexander Bagerman
Fil No.: PLN2020-00467
Location : Devonshire Ave./Chesham Ave
Assessor's Parcel No. 049-020-070

1. Is the new property address on Chesham Ave or Devonshire?
2. Why are they accessing via Chesham vs Devonshire? Devonshire Ave is far more capable to accept heavy load equipment than our decades old, small Chesham street.
3. If Chesham access is required then what precautions are being taken to protect the trees and street from damage?
4. In the event there is damage, will the owners take responsibility?
5. Is traffic control part of the construction? Chesham is a small, one lane road. We are concerned about blockage, along with being a hazard in the event of a fire, etc.

Thank you for taking the time to review our questions.

Sincerely, Art and Barbara Rodriguez

Erica Adams

From: Judy Richardson <judyarichardson@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, January 31, 2022 2:55 PM
To: Erica Adams
Subject: Bayview Design Review, Devonshire

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Bagerman
File Number: PLN2020-00467
Parcel No 049-020-070
Devonshire/Chesham

Mr. Adams,

I am writing in regards to our concerns over the Bergerman project I sited above. The plan is to remove 3,000 cubic yards of earth. What is a hearing level grade? We know from past development above us that their could very likely be erosion, slides, and debris coming off the hills when we get rain. In the past years, from the condos on Crestview, parts of our street were in over 3 feet of mud. Homeowners living at 351, 361 and 344 couldn't continue on to their homes at the end of the 300 block of Chesham. The culvert was completely made of mud. A tractor had to be used to remove it.

Are there plans to widen the existing road, up the hill towards 361 Chesham? (Starting at the end of Chesham)? If so, are you planning to cut trees there? Build a retaining wall there?

Will the property owners be allowed to build 1 or more homes later on this 9.73 acre parcel?

Will the Bagermans be responsible to repave the 300 block of Chesham Ave after multiple trips with heavy trucks? All the homeowners on the 300 block paid, out of their own pockets to originally have it paved some 25 or so years ago. Prior to that it was just gravel & potholes.

What is the projected start date for this project?

After viewing the arborists report, it looks like over 50 trees will eventually be cut down for this project? How sad people purchase a property because of the trees beauty, then cut them all down.

Why isn't the county considering entering the Bagerman property from the dead end of Devonshire?

Thank you for addressing the above issues.

Judy Richardson
343 Chesham Ave
San Carlos
Sent from my iPad

Tuesday, January 3, 2023

Hello Erica ,

I am writing to express several concerns related to incomplete information provided in the design review for APN 049-020-070.

1. Leach Fields, Septic Tank & Pump:
Leach fields are not clearly indicated on cover sheets. Septic tank and pump is located very close to creek, which is a contamination concern. Discharge goes directly down drainage to Pulgas creek. Is design being reviewed concurrently by County of San Mateo to ensure location of home is viable location to properly handle septic design?
2. Design concern:
Home does not fit whatsoever with the character of the neighborhood. The proposal is for nearly 6,000 square foot residence. Neighboring homes on the same street are substantially smaller. The overall massing seems out of
3. Light Pollution concern:
Nearly the entire front of the home consists of full length windows that will substantially impact the amount of light directly downhill into the neighborhood.
4. Drawings unclear of proposal onto neighboring property:
Cover sheet indicates potential wall? Please clarify what is being proposed.
5. Easement information inconsistent/unclear:
Cover sheet indicates easement. Please provide easement details to ensure applicant is complying with agreement. Should side setbacks begin at agreed easement? The proposed building appears very close to the neighboring property line.
6. How is haul of over 1,000 cubic feet of dirt proposed to be safely removed from site? Road is very old and unsure how it can handle construction vehicles. Construction staging should be considered during design review phase.
7. How will surface runoff be handled? The project will create more impervious surface and runoff. The street nearly floods now with sheets of water flowing down. Please consider during design review phase.

Thank you,

Jamie Bourne


Bourne2organize@gmail.com

Erica Adams

From: THERESE ROBERTS <roberts4gutters@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2023 3:26 PM
To: Erica Adams
Subject: Report

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

The Roberts are adding to this report to reiterate the unacceptable changes the Baggermans have added to their plans. It was agreed-upon that this is a dual access road for them and us to access our land/property. The first plans submitted went well over our property line and was halted there. The current plans as I can show clearly block existing access to our property with a 13 foot wall. Mr. Bagerman “assured” the planning department this wasn’t so. I can show this it’s. Also mentioned that the wall can be “removed” later for construction, illuminates the fact that it will be blocking and will require an expensive removal. Who is to pay for this is not mentioned, but we have in writing that. This project is not to cost the Roberts any money. Reasonably, we would never agreed to either of these scenarios. The claim that this 13 foot wall is within the easement and that makes it OK to affect so negatively and block your neighbors seems borderline illegal, and certainly not neighborly. Also, it is stated that the 5000 square-foot house is OK because they have 9 acres however, the Home is as close as possible to our property. It’s not inside their 9 acres. It’s a sliver right next to, or bleeding into our property. It is not “far away from everybody”, and is three times larger than any house on this tiny Street. The plans for the road show that is wider than the easement the Baggermans claim it’s not, but they have failed to show that to us or the department. Our request for a second site visit we’re not accommodated, which we believe would’ve made important insights to the situation. I’m enclosing photos one for each highly questionable proposals. We appreciate your careful and professional consideration and trust in the in-depth knowledge of your department. Thank you,




The dual access road leading to
Bagermans & Roberts

Ron & Therese




Current access to Roberts property


Fence shows proposed wall location
blocking property access



Roberts yard accessed
from existing road








Erica Adams

From: THERESE ROBERTS <roberts4gutters@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2023 11:25 AM
To: Erica Adams
Subject: Photo stating blocking wall will need extension for our access

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.



Erica Adams

From: THERESE ROBERTS <roberts4gutters@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 3, 2022 11:42 AM
To: Erica Adams
Subject: Re: Bagerman
Attachments: Cilil plans - Revision 3.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hi Erica
Thank you for keeping me updated I really appreciate it.
This is all new for us so your input is appreciated.
Therese Roberts
Sent from my iPhone

> On Nov 2, 2022, at 10:34 AM, Erica Adams <eadams@smcgov.org> wrote:

>
> Hello Therese,
>
> A revised driveway has been submitted for the house on Chesham. It will likely be at a Dec. hearing. I have attached the plans. Basically all of the driveway has been placed in the easement.
>
> The dispute that you have about trees and retaining walls is a civil one that the County will not be involved in. I spoke to County counsel and they indicated that we can approve something that meets our requirements. The fact that there is an easement that allows for access and the proposed development is either on the subject parcel or within a legal easement meets that bar.
>
> I wanted to give you this information that I had clarified before the meeting. I copied to the applicant so that he is aware of your concerns.
>
> Best regards.

>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: THERESE ROBERTS <roberts4gutters@yahoo.com>
> Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 10:44 AM
> To: Erica Adams <eadams@smcgov.org>
> Subject: Bagerman

>
> CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

>
> Hello Erica,
> I am writing in regards to The Bagerman building project in San Carlos permit number 20 20-00467.
> We had a design review back in February via Zoom you were present along with Chip Jessup and other colleagues I can't remember.

Erica Adams

From: THERESE ROBERTS <roberts4gutters@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 10:44 AM
To: Erica Adams
Subject: Bagerman

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hello Erica,

I am writing in regards to The Bagerman building project in San Carlos permit number 20 20-00467.

We had a design review back in February via Zoom you were present along with Chip Jessup and other colleagues I can't remember.

If you recall it was only at the end of that meeting we discovered they nearly passed this plan although they were way out of the easement. It worries me that they got so far along with serious property line issues.

I'm writing with great concern because they have a new plan that entails widening our road cutting into our hill, and the removal of 23 Heritage Oak trees that belong to us as well as building a 11 foot retaining wall that will block access to a large part of our property.

The new plan involving the wall feels like a threat to block our property because we wouldn't go along with the last plan and give away our land For their project and break the easement agreements without a conversation they just were trying to push it through and they almost did.

For these reasons frankly we don't trust them and I am asking for your help and diligence and looking at his new plan.

We well appreciated your demeanor at the last review.

Thank you in advance,

Ron Therese Roberts

361 Chesham Ave

Ron 650-222-0345

Teresa 650-678-2411

Sent from my iPhone

Erica Adams

From: THERESE ROBERTS <roberts4gutters@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2022 9:23 AM
To: Erica Adams
Subject: Re: Bagerman
Attachments: Cilil plans - Revision 3.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hello Erica

I hope you enjoyed some time off.

I'm not real clear on the scope of your responsibilities regarding revised Bagerman plans but I have been referred back to your department regarding the retaining wall.

If you remember at the last meeting it was at the last moment The realization arose that they did never have permission to go over our easement, I am guessing they were just hoping to push it on through and we were very disturbed that they were able to come so close apparently there was an oversight of monitoring the easements.

The section of the retaining wall that Will block access to our land, your department would be involved in.

I've been told this is not a civil issue it's a County planning detail.

They do not have our permission to block access to our property.

We have access now so there would be no reason we would allow the Bagermans project to block this existing access we already have.

We agreed to give them access on our property to build their driveway and a turnaround for the fire trucks, this plan has you going up our road to the turnaround for the fire trucks and facing a large retaining wall, this is where the wall blocks access to our property and this does not seem OK to anybody I have spoken to.

Perhaps a site visit would be helpful I saw a gentleman here one time before the last meeting I don't know if that was his only visit but on that day he did not get out and walk around I think it was muddy and he wasn't dressed for it.

Again I do believe your department would be involved in a plan that's so very much affects our property.

Thank you again for your help and if you could please forward your supervisors contact information I would appreciate it.

Thanks Erica

Therese Roberts

650 678 2411

Sent from my iPhone

> On Nov 3, 2022, at 11:42 AM, THERESE ROBERTS <roberts4gutters@yahoo.com> wrote:

>

> Hi Erica

> Thank you for keeping me updated I really appreciate it.

> This is all new for us so your input is appreciated.

> Therese Roberts

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On Nov 2, 2022, at 10:34 AM, Erica Adams <eadams@smcgov.org> wrote:

>>

>> Hello Therese,

>>

>> A revised driveway has been submitted for the house on Chesham. It will likely be at a Dec. hearing. I have attached the plans. Basically all of the driveway has been placed in the easement.

>>

>> The dispute that you have about trees and retaining walls is a civil one that the County will not be involved in. I spoke to County counsel and they indicated that we can approve something that meets our requirements. The fact that there is an easement that allows for access and the proposed development is either on the subject parcel or within a legal easement meets that bar.

>>

>> I wanted to give you this information that I had clarified before the meeting. I copied to the applicant so that he is aware of your concerns.

>>

>> Best regards.

>>

>>

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: THERESE ROBERTS <roberts4gutters@yahoo.com>

>> Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 10:44 AM

>> To: Erica Adams <eadams@smcgov.org>

>> Subject: Bagerman

>>

>> CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

>>

>> Hello Erica,

>> I am writing in regards to The Bagerman building project in San Carlos permit number 20 20-00467.

>> We had a design review back in February via Zoom you were present along with Chip Jessup and other colleagues I can't remember.

>> If you recall it was only at the end of that meeting we discovered they nearly passed this plan although they were way out of the easement. It worries me that they got so far along with serious property line issues.

>> I'm writing with great concern because they have a new plan that entails widening our road cutting into our hill, and the removal of 23 Heritage Oak trees that belong to us as well as building a 11 foot retaining wall that will block access to a large part of our property.

>> The new plan involving the wall feels like a threat to block our property because we wouldn't go along with the last plan and give away our land For their project and break the easement agreements without a conversation they just were trying to push it through and they almost did.

>> For these reasons frankly we don't trust them and I am asking for your help and diligence and looking at his new plan.

>> We well appreciated your demeanor at the last review.

>> Thank you in advance,

>> Ron Therese Roberts

>> 361 Chesham Ave

>> Ron 650-222-0345

>> Teresa 650-678-2411

>> Sent from my iPhone

>>

> If you recall it was only at the end of that meeting we discovered they nearly passed this plan although they were way out of the easement. It worries me that they got so far along with serious property line issues.

> I'm writing with great concern because they have a new plan that entails widening our road cutting into our hill, and the removal of 23 Heritage Oak trees that belong to us as well as building a 11 foot retaining wall that will block access to a large part of our property.

> The new plan involving the wall feels like a threat to block our property because we wouldn't go along with the last plan and give away our land For their project and break the easement agreements without a conversation they just were trying to push it through and they almost did.

> For these reasons frankly we don't trust them and I am asking for your help and diligence and looking at his new plan.

> We well appreciated your demeanor at the last review.

> Thank you in advance,

> Ron Therese Roberts

> 361 Chesham Ave

> Ron 650-222-0345

> Teresa 650-678-2411

> Sent from my iPhone

>

Erica Adams

From: THERESE ROBERTS <roberts4gutters@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 9:35 AM
To: Erica Adams
Subject: Re: Retaining wall

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Hello Erica

yes this is frustrating for all of us

I don't believe you can approve their retaining wall blocking existing access to our property.

Firstly they misrepresented the "vacant parcel".

This is very active land that we are able to drive to.

Also every bit of the road and the turnaround is on our property.

We made very preliminary agreements with them they have pushing the boundaries, Just as with going over our easement last time.

You mentioned Mr. Beggerman told you that the wall is not blocking our property this is wildly untrue he was knowingly dishonest with you.

A site visit would show that. The wording right on the plans that mentions could be extended in the future tells at all he's blocking us.

How high is the retaining wall at the blockage to our property?

Is it a small curb we can put a ramp and drive in?

The idea that we will need to extend on their project, to "gain" access to our own property on our dime in the future is not something one would agree to.

Again our road that leads to our parcel is totally accessible for our needs.

The Baggermans need to greatly fortify the road so they can build their big house which is fine.

Their house needs to go deeper into the hill and closer towards the creek and none of this will be a problem I understand that's costly and he doesn't want to spend the money to do it fairly.

The same reason he tried to go on our property last time was to save money you must be used to these tactics.

I don't see how your department can approve this and refer us on to somebody else. Building projects are not allowed to impede on the neighbors.

In your opinion if we were needing get involved in litigation would it be with the neighbors or your department?
Or both?

We don't want litigation.

We don't want to block their building

and we are not giving up our as in the first design attempt, Nor blockage to our property, the current attempt.

I am formally requesting contact information for The supervisor .

Is there a project engineer? This person could be very helpful.

And I believe site visits are a normal part of your departments duties and I would like another one as the man before never got out of his car.

The part of the plans that you circled and showed to me is the problem.

Unless it is a curb it will be a huge retaining wall that's there for us to deal with later.

I am sending more photos. Although untrained it appears to me the plans show a very clear blockage to our parcel.

I'd like you to look at the road you'll see my car you turn to the right and up by the movable fence is where it appears to be a large retaining wall?

The lot is not vacant we are up there now with trucks eradicating poison oak.

We haul dirt we do landscaping our families play we will not have our property blocked.

thanks again

> If you recall it was only at the end of that meeting we discovered they nearly passed this plan although they were way out of the easement. It worries me that they got so far along with serious property line issues.

> I'm writing with great concern because they have a new plan that entails widening our road cutting into our hill, and the removal of 23 Heritage Oak trees that belong to us as well as building a 11 foot retaining wall that will block access to a large part of our property.

> The new plan involving the wall feels like a threat to block our property because we wouldn't go along with the last plan and give away our land For their project and break the easement agreements without a conversation they just were trying to push it through and they almost did.

> For these reasons frankly we don't trust them and I am asking for your help and diligence and looking at his new plan.

> We well appreciated your demeanor at the last review.

> Thank you in advance,

> Ron Therese Roberts

> 361 Chesham Ave

> Ron 650-222-0345

> Teresa 650-678-2411

> Sent from my iPhone

>