SAUSALITO TREES & VIEWS COMMITTEE Thursday, October 7, 2010 Approved Minutes

Call to Order

Chair Colfax called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Conference Room of City Hall, 420 Litho Street, Sausalito.

Present: Chair Grant Colfax, Vice Chair Mary Lee Bickford,

Committee Member Betsy Elliott, Committee Member Wingham Liddell

Absent: Committee Member Ronald Reich,

Community Development Director Jeremy Graves

Staff: Assistant Planner Alison Thornberry, City Attorney Mary Wagner

Committee Member Liddell moved and Committee Member Elliott seconded a motion to continue the discussion of Item 3, Trees & Views Committee Procedures, to the meeting of November 4th due to the absence of the Community Development Director. The motion passed 4-0.

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes

September 7, 2010 September 10, 2010

September 13, 2010

Committee Member Elliott moved and Committee Member Liddell seconded a motion to approve the Minutes. The motion passed 4-0.

Public Comments

None.

Public Hearings

1. TR 10-170, Tree Removal Permit, Back View Claim, 230 Glen Drive. A view claim regarding the obstruction of views from the Claimant's property at 230 Glen Drive (APN 065-141-09) by trees located on the Tree Owner's property at 240 Glen Drive (APN 065-141-44). The Claimant seeks an advisory decision regarding the restoration of unobstructed water views from 230 Glen Drive. The hearing was continued from the meeting of September 13th, 2010.

The continued public hearing was re-opened. Assistant Planner Thornberry presented the Staff Report.

Committee questions to staff:

- What happens in the second year and who pays for it? Staff responded the trees are to be maintained at the historic height and are to be pruned at least every two years. Generally the Claimant, or the person requesting the trimming and benefiting from the view, is the party who pays for the tree work. That is consistent with the recommendation in the Trees and View Preservation Regulations and is what staff recommends.
- Will there be an underground barrier? Staff responded it is also a Condition of Approval that a 24-inch deep root barrier be installed, which is common in this area with Golden Bamboo.

The public comment period was opened.

Presentation was made by Nicole Back, the Claimant:

Committee question to Ms. Back:

• What are the bamboo root barrier requirements? Ms. Back responded that the barrier should be 24- to 26-inches deep with a 4-inch barrier protruding above the ground, and stepped down a steep hill.

Comment by Ms. Back:

 She should not be made to bear the cost of the root barrier, as she did not install it.

Staff comment:

 This hearing is regarding a view claim. There are no provisions in the Trees and Views Regulations that deal with root issues, which are beyond the scope of a view claim proceeding.

The public comment period was closed.

Additional Conditions of Approval:

• Condition 5 shall be modified to read there shall be a bamboo barrier 4-inches aboveground in addition to the belowground barrier of 24- to 26-inches.

Committee Member Liddell moved and Vice Chair Bickford seconded a motion to approve the draft resolution as amended regarding restoration of unobstructed water views from 230 Glen Drive. The motion passed 4-0.

2. TR 10-192, Tree Removal Permit, Armstrong, 63 Central Avenue. Removal of one Coast Live Oak tree located at 63 Central Avenue (APN 065-201-11).

Committee Member Elliott indicated she would recuse herself since one of the parties is a source of income for her.

The public hearing was opened. Assistant Planner Thornberry presented the Staff Report.

Committee question to staff:

• What is the size of the lot? Staff responded 3,166 square feet.

The public comment period was opened.

Presentation was made by Kelly Armstrong, the Property Owner.

Committee comment:

Many of the trees on the subject property are Live Oaks, which are threatened
by disease, and there is one tree that has already begun to decay. Given that, it
would be a good idea to plant another tree as protection for the future. Ms.
Armstrong responded she was not aware of any decaying trees on her property.

Staff comment:

 The arborist's report states there were beginning signs of possible decay with the tree that comes out of the deck, but it was not yet decaying and it would be fine after treatment.

Comment by Ms. Armstrong:

• She received referrals from the arborist for having the soil reinforced around the base of that tree, which she plans to do.

Committee question to Ms. Armstrong:

• Most people are concerned that oaks should not have soil around their roots. Can you describe this reinforcement of soil? Ms. Armstrong responded that the trees have been there a long time and are on a very steep slope. Because of that slope and because the tree's base is under the deck the arborist has recommended soil reinforcement around the base of the tree down to one foot to firmament and solidify where the tree comes out of the ground. The tree roots, which go deep, will not be disturbed.

The public comment period was closed.

Committee comments:

- There is no room on the subject property to plant a replacement tree.
- The question of whether or not there is room left to plant a replacement tree should be left to a professional arborist.
- With so many trees on the property, where would a replacement tree be planted?

Committee Member Bickford moved and Committee Member Liddell seconded a motion to approve the resolution for approval of a Tree Removal Permit for 63 Central Avenue that requires the planting of a replacement tree. The motion failed 1-2 (Noes – Grant, Liddell).

Committee Member Liddell moved and Chair Colfax seconded a motion to amend the resolution to remove the Condition of Approval requiring a replacement tree be planted. The motion passed 2-1 (No – Bickford).

Old Business

None.

New Business

None.

Committee Communications

- Committee Member Bickford recommended the Committee give acknowledgment and recognition to property owners who maintain beautiful and well tended trees and yards, such as best kept trees, best gardens, et cetera, and recommended staff to put the item on a future agenda.
- Committee Member Liddell stated it should be a City requirement that property
 owners be advised they have important and threatened trees on their property,
 such as oak trees that give the City its character. This item should be
 considered as part of the previous recommendations by Committee Member
 Bickford.
- Chair Colfax indicated it would be helpful if Committee Members received their information packets earlier with at least a weekend before the meeting to be able to review the information, especially when there are new claims and issues.

Adjournment

Committee Member Liddell moved and Committee Member Bickford seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed 3-0. The meeting was adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

Submitted by Alison Thornberry

Assistant Planner

Approved by Grant Colfax

Chair

I:\CDD\Boards & Committees\TVC\Minutes\2010\10-07-10-Approved.doc