AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION

7:30 p.m.
Wednesday, March 20, 2019
El Cerrito City Hall
Council Chambers
10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito

This Meeting Place Is Wheelchair Accessible

Roll Call – Chair: Carla Hansen; Commissioners: Brendan Bloom, Greg Crump, Erin Gillett, Andrea Lucas, Leslie Mendez, and Joy Navarrete.

1. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

2. Comments from the Public
   (Each speaker is limited to a maximum of 3 minutes.)

3. Approval of Minutes
   Approval of the January 16, 2019 meeting minutes.

4. Commissioner Communication/Conflict of Interest Disclosure
   This time on the agenda is reserved for Commissioners to disclose communications from individuals regarding specific agenda items or to state a potential conflict of interest in relation to a specific agenda item.

5. Public Hearing – 10300 San Pablo Avenue
   Application: PL18-0098
   Applicant: Little Hill LLC.
   Location: 10300 San Pablo Avenue
   APN: 503-392-028
   Zoning: Transit Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)
   General Plan: Transit Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use (TOMIMU)
   Request: Planning Commission consideration of a Final Parcel Map for one parcel, APN 503-392-028 (Chapter 18.16, ECMC).
   CEQA: This project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to Section 15315 of the CEQA Guidelines, Class 15: Minor Land Subdivisions.

COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION
To request a meeting agenda in large print, Braille, or on cassette, or to request a sign language interpreter for the meeting, call Sean Moss, Staff Liaison at (510) 215-4330 (voice) at least FIVE (5) WORKING DAYS NOTICE PRIOR TO THE MEETING to ensure availability.

10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA 94530 Tel: (510) 215-4330 E-mail: smoss@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us
6. Public Hearing – 2603 Tassajara Avenue
   Application: PL18-0179
   Applicant: Janice Yeh, Adaptive Architecture
   Location: 2603 Tassajara Avenue
   APN: 500-100-001
   Zoning: PS (Public and Semipublic)
   General Plan: Institutional and Utility
   Request: Planning Commission consideration of a Conditional Use Permit Amendment for site improvements and allowing for pre-school at the existing school facility at 2603 Tassajara Avenue (Chapter 19.34, ECMC)
   CEQA: This project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to Section 15314 of the CEQA Guidelines, Class 14: Minor Additions to Schools.

   Application: PL18-0084
   Applicant: Joseph Timar Jr.
   Location: 978 Arlington Boulevard
   APN: 505-321-010
   Zoning: RS-10 (Single Family Residential)
   General Plan: Very Low Density Residential
   Request: Planning Commission consideration of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a fence taller than 6 feet (19.06.030.U.1, ECMC)
   CEQA: This project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines, Class 1: Existing Facilities.

8. Public Hearing – 922 Clark Place
   Application: PL17-0109
   Applicant: Kazuo Negishi
   Location: 922 Clark Place
   APN: 505-301-033
   Zoning: RS-5 (Single Family Residential)
   General Plan: Low Density Residential
   Request: Planning Commission consideration of an exception to Title 18 of the City’s Municipal Code for minor subdivisions in which frontage on a public street is not provided for all parcels (18.32.050, ECMC).
   CEQA: This project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines, Class 32: In-fill Development Projects.

9. Adjournment

Appeals:
A decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council, by the applicant or any El Cerrito resident or property owner, through the filing of a written statement and the payment of the applicable appeal fee with the City Clerk within ten calendar days after the decision date. (The applicant may file an appeal for the cost of half the original permit fee.)
Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Planning Division office located at 10890 San Pablo Avenue during normal business hours.
MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION

7:30 p.m.
Wednesday, January 16, 2019
El Cerrito City Hall
Council Chambers
10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito

This Meeting Place Is Wheelchair Accessible

Roll Call – Chair: Carla Hansen; Commissioners: Brendan Bloom, Greg Crump, Erin Gillett, Andrea Lucas, Leslie Mendez, and Joy Navarrete.

1. Comments from the Public
   Cordell Hindler of Richmond spoke about the need for a tranquil spa in El Cerrito.

2. Approval of Minutes
   Motion to approve the November 21, 2018 meeting minutes: Mendez; second: Navarrete.
   Vote:
   Ayes: Crump, Hansen, Mendez, Navarrete
   Noes: None
   Abstain: Lucas, Gillett
   Absent: Bloom

3. Commissioner Communication/Conflict of Interest Disclosure
   Commissioner Lucas noted that she was a neighbor of the property at 966 Seaview Drive and that she was recusing herself from the item.

   Commissioner Lucas left the Council Chambers.

4. Adoption of the Consent Calendar (Item 4A)
   A. Final Subdivision Map – 966 Seaview
      Application: PL17-0184
      Applicant: I Kuan Choi
      Location: 966 Sea View Drive
      APN: 505-221-041
      Zoning: RS-5 (Single-Family Residential)
      General Plan: Low Density Residential

COMMUNICATION ACCESS INFORMATION
To request a meeting agenda in large print, Braille, or on cassette, or to request a sign language interpreter for the meeting, call Sean Moss, Staff Liaison at (510) 215-4330 (voice) at least FIVE (5) WORKING DAYS NOTICE PRIOR TO THE MEETING to ensure availability.

10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA 94530  Tel: (510) 215-4330
E-mail: smoss@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us
Request: Request Planning Commission consideration of a Final Parcel Map consisting of three lots (ECMC Chapter 18.16 Subdivision Ordinance). The Tentative Parcel Map was approved by the Subdivision Committee on May 19, 2018.

CEQA: Categorically Exempt, CEQA Guidelines Section 15315, Class 15: Minor Land Divisions.

Associate Planner Jeff Ballantine presented the staff report and answered questions from the Commission.

The public comment period was opened.

The following speakers addressed the Commission:
Howdy Goudey, El Cerrito

The public comment period was closed.

Motion to find the Final Map in conformity with the Tentative Map and to recommend approval of the Final Map to the City Council: Navarrete; second: Crump.

Vote:
Ayes: Crump, Gillett, Hansen, Mendez, Navarrete
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Bloom, Lucas

5. Adjourment
7:45 p.m.
PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT
March 20, 2019
10300 SAN PABLO AVENUE FINAL PARCEL MAP

DETAILS

Application Number: PL18-0098
Applicant: Little Hill LLC
Location: 10300 San Pablo Avenue
APN: 503-392-028-0
Zoning: TOMIMU (Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use)
General Plan: TOMIMU (Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use)
Request: Planning Commission consideration of a Final Parcel Map for a one lot subdivision (ECMC Chapter 18.16 Subdivision Ordinance)
CEQA: Statutorily exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15268(b)(3).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The requested action before Planning Commission is to verify conformance of a Final Map for a one-lot subdivision consisting of 32 condominiums with the previously approved Tentative Parcel Map.

The Tentative Parcel Map was approved by the Planning Commission on October 18, 2017.

Based on the information in this report, staff recommends approval of the project.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The project site is located at the northeast corner of San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue, within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area. The site is a total of 25,000 square feet (0.57 acres). The site is an ‘L’ shaped parcel with three street frontages, extending through the entire block from San Pablo Avenue to Kearney Street, along Eureka Avenue. The site slopes up gently from San Pablo Avenue.

Vicinity Map

Existing/Previous Land Use

The site has been utilized as a retail location for a number of years. It was originally constructed as a Safeway grocery store. Most recently, the site housed the Guitar Center. The site has been vacant since Guitar Center relocated in approximately 2012.
Site Photo

Looking northeast from the intersection of San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue

Adjacent Land Uses

North: Retail businesses on San Pablo Avenue; a three-story apartment building on Kearney Street.
Zoning: TOMIMU. General Plan: TOMIMU.

East: Fairmont Elementary School, across Kearney Street.

South: Two-story commercial building at 10290 San Pablo Avenue, across Eureka Avenue, which has been entitled for a 14-unit residential project.
General Plan: TOHIMU. Zoning: TOHIMU.

West: Commercial uses in the City of Richmond, across San Pablo Avenue.
Analysis

Final Map

The California Government Code and the El Cerrito Municipal Code include relevant sections regarding the requirements of Tentative and Final Maps and the role of the Planning Commission regarding purview of the Final Map, respectively.

California Government Code Sections 66444 – 66450 contain requirements for the preparation and filing of tentative and final parcel maps.

Section 18.16.140 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code requires the Planning Commission to verify conformance of the Final Map with the Tentative Map along with all changes permitted and all requirements imposed as a condition to its acceptance. If the Planning Commission can find the Final Map is in compliance with the Tentative Map and all changes and conditions have been met, it shall certify its approval thereon and shall transmit said map to the City Clerk, together with any documents which may have been filed therewith for presentation to the City Council. If it cannot, it shall advise the subdivider of the changes or additions that must be made for such purposes and shall allow the applicant time to make the necessary changes.

City staff, including the City surveyor, have reviewed the proposed Final Map (Attachment 2) and have found that the Final Map is in conformance with the Tentative Map.

City Requirements

The project includes realigning an existing public storm drain main line. The applicant is granting to the City an exclusive 35-foot-long, 5-foot-wide subsurface storm drain easement located on the northwest corner of the property for the right to construct, alter, operate, maintain and repair such storm drain mainline and appurtenances thereto in such sizes and configurations as the City deems necessary. The easement includes free right of ingress and egress over and across the remaining portion of the property, insofar as such right of ingress and egress is necessary to the proper use of rights granted herein.

San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Compliance

In its August 16, 2017 approval of the project, the Planning Commission determined that the overall project would implement the following policies of the San Pablo Avenue General Plan:

Strategy A.4: Attract pedestrian activity to key nodes to foster community and identify places of interest.

_The project is located along a San Pablo Avenue Commercial Street in the Stockton Avenue node. The project contains 2 new ground-level live-work units along San Pablo Avenue and a public plaza which will enhance the existing commercial environment and attract pedestrian activity to this node._

Strategy B.1: Maximize TOD potential (BART and AC Transit)

_The project will provide 30 new residential units and 2 new live-work units in close proximity to existing AC Transit lines and the El Cerrito Plaza BART station. The project includes bike parking_
as required by the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and will face San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue, providing a pleasant pedestrian environment along the adjacent streets.

**Strategy B.2:** Stimulate investment in vacant/underutilized sites at key focus areas.

The project utilizes an underutilized site. The site contains a commercial building which has been vacant for seven years (since 2012). The proposed project will provide 30 new residential units and 2 new live-work units in close proximity to public transit in the Stockton Avenue node.

**Strategy E.1:** Promote infill development through increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure.

The project will provide 30 new residential units and 2 new live-work units in close proximity to existing public transit infrastructure.

**General Plan Compliance**

In its August 16, 2017 approval of the project, the Planning Commission determined that the overall project would implement the following policies of the San Pablo Avenue General Plan:

**LU1.5: Suitable Housing.** Promote suitably located housing and services for all age groups within the city. Within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area, allow ground floor residential development and increased land use intensity close to existing transit infrastructure to promote residential infill development and catalyze mode shift.

The project will provide 30 new housing units and 2 live-work units on San Pablo Avenue, with close proximity to public transportation and commercial uses.

**LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area.** Promote retail, office, and mixed uses within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area to provide more tax revenues to the city.

In accordance with the goals of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, the proposed project will add housing units to San Pablo Avenue which will promote a balanced mixture of land uses in the corridor. The new residents of the project will support new and existing businesses along San Pablo Avenue.

**CD2.1: Street Frontages.** Encourage street frontages that are safe, by allowing for surveillance of the street by people inside buildings and elsewhere, and are interesting for pedestrians. Require buildings in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan area to be directly abutting sidewalks, with window openings, entries and high levels of transparency along the pedestrian frontage.

The building will abut the sidewalk on San Pablo Avenue and Eureka Avenue and features ample window openings, decks, and doors along the street. These windows and decks will allow surveillance of streets from the units within the project. The project meets or exceeds the transparency standards of the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

**CD3.2: Usable Open Space.** Require the provision of usable open space in the form of ground-floor patios, upper-floor decks, and balconies, as well as common recreational facilities and amenities.

The project features decks on both ground floor and upper floor units. The project also provides public open space in excess of the requirement.

**H2.2:** Encourage the construction of transit-oriented developments (TODs) that seek to maximize opportunities for the use of public transit and transportation corridors through high-density
residential and mixed-use projects along those corridors in accordance with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and the City’s Incentives Program (Chapter 19.23 of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance.)

The project provides high-density housing along a transit corridor, consistent with the Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use Transect Zone in the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

Public Notice and Comment

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times and mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site on February 27, 2019. No comments have been received as of the preparation of this staff report.

Environmental Review

Approval a final subdivision maps is a ministerial action and is statutorily exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15268(b)(3).

Required Findings

Section 18.16.140 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code requires the Planning Commission to verify conformance of the Final Map with the Tentative Map along with any requirements imposed as a condition to its acceptance. Staff proposes the following language: The City Engineer determined that the subdivision as shown in the Final Map is substantially the same as it appeared on the Tentative Map, consistent with California Government Code Sections 66444 – 66450 and with Title 18 of the City’s Municipal Code.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends that the Planning Commission find that the Final Parcel Map for a one-lot subdivision for 32 condominiums at 10300 San Pablo Avenue conforms with the approved Tentative Map as conditioned; and therefore, recommend approval of the Final Map to City Council.

Proposed Motion

Move adoption of Planning Commission Resolution PC19-02 that finds the Final Map is in conformance with the requirements of Title 18 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code, in that it conforms with the Tentative Map including any requirements imposed as a condition to its acceptance and hereby recommends approval of the Final Map to the City Council.

Attachments

1. Draft Resolution PC19-02
2. Final Parcel Map
3. Planning Commission Resolution PC17-14
Planning Commission Resolution No. 19-02

APPLICATION NO. PL18-0098

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO PLANNING COMMISSION VERIFYING COMPLIANCE OF AND RECOMMENDING APPROVAL FOR A FINAL PARCEL MAP FOR A ONE-LOT SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 32 CONDOMINIUMS ON A SITE LOCATED AT 10300 SAN PABLO AVENUE WITH ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER 503-392-028-0

WHEREAS, the existing address of the site is 10300 San Pablo Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 503-392-028; and

WHEREAS, on August 23, 2017, the applicant submitted a Tentative Parcel Map to create 32 condominiums on a parcel of 25,000 square feet, consisting of 30 residential units and 2 live-work units; and

WHEREAS, the Tentative Parcel Map for the project was approved by the El Cerrito Planning Commission on October 18, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is TOMIMU (Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use); and

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is TOMIMU (Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use); and

WHEREAS, the project is statutorily exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15268(b)(3); and

WHEREAS, approval of the Final Parcel Map is governed by Sections 66444 – 66450 of the State of California Government Code (Subdivision Map Act) and Title 18, Divisions of Land, of the El Cerrito Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, the project is realigning the existing public storm drain main line so the Grantor, Little Hill LLC, is granting to the Grantee, City of El Cerrito, an exclusive 35-foot-long, 5-foot-wide subsurface storm drain easement located on the northwest corner of the property for the right to construct, alter, operate, maintain and repair such storm drain mainline and appurtenances thereto in such sizes and configurations as the Grantee deems necessary, along with free right of ingress and egress over and across the remaining portion of the Grantor’s property insofar such right of ingress and egress is necessary to the proper use of the easement rights;

WHEREAS, the staff report includes facts determining that the Final Map is in conformity with the requirements of Title 18 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code; further, it conforms with the Tentative Parcel Map, including all changes permitted and all requirements imposed as a condition to its acceptance; and
WHEREAS, the Final Parcel Map is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, General Plan, and San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan of the City of El Cerrito; and

WHEREAS, on March 20, 2019, the Planning Commission of El Cerrito, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review, does find and determine the following:

1. The Final Map and its attachments are found to be in conformance with the Tentative Map along with all requirements imposed as conditions of acceptance listed in the Planning Commission Resolution PC17-14.

2. The project is consistent with the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and will implement the following policies of the Specific Plan: Strategy A.4, Strategy B.1, Strategy B.2, and Strategy E.1.

3. The project is consistent with the El Cerrito General Plan and will implement the following policies of the General Plan: LU1.5, LU2.1, CD2.1, CD3.2, and H2.2.

4. Approval of the Final Map would allow the creation of 32 condominiums on the subject parcel, consisting of 30 residential units and 2 live-work units. The proposal is consistent with the purposes of the TOMIMU district where it is located and conforms in all significant respects with the El Cerrito General Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Planning Commission hereby finds the Final Map is in conformity with the requirements of Title 18 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code in that it conforms with the Tentative Map including all changes permitted and all requirements imposed as a condition to its acceptance and hereby recommends approval of the Final Map to the City Council.

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY that this resolution was adopted by the El Cerrito Planning Commission at a regular meeting held on March 20, 2019 upon motion of Commissioner ________, second by Commissioner ________:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

_________________________
Sean Moss, AICP
Acting Planning Manager
PARCEL MAP
MS NO. 452-18
10300 SAN PABLO AVENUE
BEING A ONE LOT SUBDIVISION FOR CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
CONSISTING OF 32 RESIDENTIAL UNITS, OF ALL OF LOT B
AS DESIGNATED ON THE MAP SUBDIVISION NO.
FILED DECEMBER 15, 1981 IN BOOK 261 OF MAPS, PAGE 30
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY RECORDS
CITY OF EL CERRITO, COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, CALIFORNIA
Carlson, Barbee & Gibson, Inc.
CIVIL ENGINEERS     SURVEYORS     PLANNERS
SAN RAMON       WEST SACRAMENTO
MARCH 2019

TRUSTEE'S STATEMENT

A NOTICE PUBLIC OR OTHER NOTICE CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATE ENTERED ONLY THE
EXISTING OF THE LANDS AND STATES THE DOCUMENT ON WHICH THE CERTIFICATE IS
ATTACHED, AND NOT THE INSTRUMENT, ACCORDING TO VARIOUS OF THAT DOCUMENT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ON NO NOTICE PUBLIC OR OTHER NOTICE CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATE ENTERED ONLY THE
EXISTING OF THE LANDS AND STATES THE DOCUMENT ON WHICH THE CERTIFICATE IS
ATTACHED, AND NOT THE INSTRUMENT, ACCORDING TO VARIOUS OF THAT DOCUMENT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

WITNESS MY HAND:

SIGNATURE

NAME (PRINT)

PRINCIPAL COUNTY OF BUSINESS

COMMISSION NUMBER

COMMISSION EXPIRES

SOILS REPORT

A SOILS REPORT WAS PREPARED BY FRANK ASHKIRE, INCORPORATED. DATED
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1981, PROJECT NO. 2642-000, SIGNED BY FRANK ASHKIRE AND HAS BEEN FILED
AS THE ATTACHMENT OF THE CITY ENGINEER.
CITY CLERK'S STATEMENT

I, ______________________________________, Clerk of the City Council of the City of El Cerrito, County of Contra Costa, State of California, do hereby state that the above and foregoing Map entitled "Parcel Map No. 452-18, 10300 San Pablo Avenue" was presented to the City Council as provided by law, at a regular meeting thereof held on the day of __________, __________, and that the said City Council, after full consideration and adoption at said regular meeting, approved said map.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said City Council.

____________________________________
Clerk
City of El Cerrito
State of California

SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE STATEMENT

This map has been approved by the Subdivision Committee of the City of El Cerrito by resolution at their meeting held on the day of __________, __________, and that the said resolution was adopted at said regular meeting. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said City Council.

____________________________________
Chairman
Subdivision Committee
City of El Cerrito
State of California

CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' STATEMENT

I, ______________________________________, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Contra Costa, State of California, do hereby state that:

[ ] A tax bond assuming payment of all taxes which are now or hereafter may be levied thereon for the purpose of paying the interest and principal of said bond has been issued and filed with the Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County, State of California.

[ ] All taxes due and taxes which are payable in the Contra Costa County, State of California.

____________________________________
Clerk
Board of Supervisors
Contra Costa County
State of California

CITY ENGINEER'S STATEMENT

I, ______________________________________, Acting City Engineer of the City of El Cerrito, County of Contra Costa, State of California, do hereby state that I have examined the herein enclosed subdivision map entitled "Parcel Map No. 452-18, 10300 San Pablo Avenue" and find the same to be correct and approved. I hereby certify that the said subdivision map is hereby approved and accepted by me as the final subdivision map. This certificate is issued under the authority of the California Subdivision Map Act of 1953, and any petition of异议 filed under the Act of 1953 have been perfected with.

____________________________________
City Engineer
City of El Cerrito
State of California

CITY SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT

I, ______________________________________, Acting City Surveyor of the City of El Cerrito, County of Contra Costa, State of California, do hereby state that I have examined the herein enclosed subdivision map entitled "Parcel Map No. 452-18, 10300 San Pablo Avenue" and find the same to be correct and approved. I hereby certify that the herein enclosed map is technically correct.

____________________________________
City Surveyor
City of El Cerrito
State of California
PARCEL MAP
MS NO. 452-18
10300 SAN PABLO AVENUE
BEING A ONE LOT SUBDIVISION FOR CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
CONSISTING OF 32 RESIDENTIAL UNITS, OF ALL OF LOT B
AS DESIGNATED ON THE MAP SUBDIVISION 5826,
FILED DECEMBER 15, 1981 IN BOOK 261 OF MAPS, PAGE 30
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY RECORDS
CITY OF EL CERRITO, COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, CALIFORNIA
Carlson, Barbee & Gibson, Inc.
CIVIL ENGINEERS       SURVEYORS       PLANNERS
SAN RAMON        WEST SACRAMENTO

BASIS OF BEARINGS:
THE BASIS OF BEARINGS FOR THIS SURVEY IS BETWEEN PLANT CROSSINGS ON THE
NORTHWESTERN LINE OF EUREKA AVENUE, BEING WIREFIELD NO. 997184, FOR 201 WAYS 33.

LEGEND
- - - - - SUBURBAN BOUNDARY LINE
- - - - - ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE
- - - - - LOT LINE
- - - - - MONUMENT LINE
- - - - - CENTERLINE
- - - - - EXCEPT LINE
TOTAL
- - - - - FOUND STANDARD STREET MONUMENT
- - - - - FOUND MONUMENT AS NOTE
- - - - - SET OUT MONUMENT AND CAP ON HAIL
- - - - - SAT/ALT. LE 7890
SITE
- - - - - STRIP BURN EXCAVATION
- - - - - PUBLIC ACCESS EXCAVATION

REFERENCES:
(1) 201 WAYS 33
(2) 997184
(3) 146 W 27
(4) W 1 M
(5) 12738 OR 828

MS NO. 452-18
10300 SAN PABLO AVENUE
LOT 1
25,000 SF

LOT E
24 M 90

SAN PABLO AVENUE
(120' WIDE R/W)

LEGEND
- - - - - SUBURBAN BOUNDARY LINE
- - - - - ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE
- - - - - LOT LINE
- - - - - MONUMENT LINE
- - - - - CENTERLINE
- - - - - EXCEPT LINE
TOTAL
- - - - - FOUND STANDARD STREET MONUMENT
- - - - - FOUND MONUMENT AS NOTE
- - - - - SET OUT MONUMENT AND CAP ON HAIL
- - - - - SAT/ALT. LE 7890
SITE
- - - - - STRIP BURN EXCAVATION
- - - - - PUBLIC ACCESS EXCAVATION

REFERENCES:
(1) 201 WAYS 33
(2) 997184
(3) 146 W 27
(4) W 1 M
(5) 12738 OR 828

SHEET 3 OF 3
Planning Commission Resolution PC17-14

APPLICATION NO. PL16-0139

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVING A TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (FOR CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES) FOR A PROJECT CONTAINING 30 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND 2 LIVE-WORK UNITS AT 10300 SAN PABLO AVENUE.

WHEREAS, the site is located within the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan Area;

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use;

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is Transit-Oriented Mid-Intensity Mixed Use and the project is located on San Pablo Avenue Commercial Street and Neighborhood Street designations;

WHEREAS, the site is located at 10300 San Pablo Avenue;

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 503-392-028;

WHEREAS, on October 17, 2016, the applicant submitted an application for Tier IV Design Review and a Tentative Parcel Map;

WHEREAS, on August 16, 2017, the El Cerrito Planning Commission, granted Tier IV Site Plan and Design Review approval to the project;

WHEREAS, on September 6, 2017, the Design Review Board, granted Tier IV Design Review approval to the project; and

WHEREAS, on October 18, 2017, the Planning Commission, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review does find and determine the following:

As determined by the Planning Commission in its August 16, 2017 approval of Tier IV Design Review for the project, the project is consistent with the El Cerrito General Plan and the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. The project will implement the following standards of the General Plan: LU1.5: Suitable Housing, LU2.1: San Pablo Avenue, LU4.1: Mixture of Uses, LU6.2: Circulation Alternatives, CD1.9: Building Design, CD2.1: Street Frontages, CD2.3: Streetscape Improvements, CD3.2: Usable Open Space, CD3.3: Site Landscaping, CD3.12: Landscape Species, CD4.2: Building Articulation, CD5.1: Design Review Process, T2.1: Land Use Patterns, T2.2: Project Design, and Policies H2.2, H2.3 of Housing Element Goal H2: New Housing Development. Approval of this Tentative Parcel Map will permit the creation of condominium housing units consistent with the prior approvals for the project and is therefore consistent with the El Cerrito General Plan and the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Planning Commission hereby approves Application No. PL16-0139, subject to the following conditions:

Planning Division:
1. Any and all Final Maps shall be developed and recorded consistent with the plans dated August 24, 2017. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. All improvements shall be installed in accordance with these approvals. Once constructed or installed, all improvements shall be maintained as approved.

2. If Applicant constructs buildings or makes improvements in accordance with these approvals, but fails to comply with any of the Conditions of Approval or limitations set forth in these Conditions of Approval and does not cure any such failure within a reasonable time after notice from the City of El Cerrito, then such failure shall be cause for nonissuance of a certificate of occupancy, revocation or modification of these approvals or any other remedies available to the City.

3. These Conditions of Approval shall apply to any successor in interest in the property and Applicant shall be responsible for assuring that the successor in interest is informed of the terms and conditions of this approval.

4. If not used, this Tentative Parcel Map approval shall expire two years from the date of this action.

5. All conditions of approval of Resolution DRB17-02 remain in effect and remain applicable to the project.

6. If any units in the project are rented prior to being offered for sale, prior to the conversion of rental units to for-sale units, the then-owner of the property shall comply with all provisions of Chapter 19.45 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code (Condominium Conversions), except that a use permit and tentative and final map shall not be required. For the purposes of this condition, “conversion of rental units to for-sale units” means the sale of the first rental unit as a condominium. This condition of approval shall be documented in a manner satisfactory to the City Attorney to ensure that any future owner of the property receives notice of the requirement.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that this resolution was adopted by the El Cerrito Design Review Board at a regular meeting held on October 18, 2017, upon motion of Commissioner Mendez, second by Commissioner Bloom:

AYES: Bloom, Hansen, Iswalt, Lucas, Mendez, Motoyama
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Colin

Sean Moss, AICP
Senior Planner
DETAILS

Application Number: PL18-0179
Applicant: Little Tree Montessori
Location: 2603 Tassajara Avenue
APN: 500-100-001
Zoning: PS (Public and Semipublic)
General Plan: Institutional and Utility
Request: Planning Commission consideration of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a Day Care Center at 2603 Tassajara Avenue (19.08.020, ECMC).

CEQA: This project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to Section 15314 of the CEQA Guidelines, Class 14: Minor Additions to Schools.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The requested entitlement for consideration by the Planning Commission is a Conditional Use Permit to allow a Day Care Center at 2603 Tassajara Avenue. Little Tree Montessori proposes to operate a Day Care Center at the existing school site. This includes a preschool program for ages 1.5 to 6 years old and an afterschool program for ages 6 to 12 years old. Proposed site improvements include converting outdoor basketball courts to a parking area and adding numerous trees and landscaped areas within and surrounding the existing and proposed parking areas.

As discussed in detail in this report, the project is expected to be harmonious and compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability or appropriate development of abutting properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

Based on the evidence contained in this report, staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The subject property at 2603 Tassajara Avenue is located in the hills of El Cerrito. A school is located on the approximately 2.98-acre parcel, that was formerly used by Tehiyah Day School. Existing school facilities include classrooms, administration offices, a library, a multi-purpose room, outdoor play areas, and a parking lot. The lot is upsloping away from Carquinez Avenue. The surrounding neighborhood largely consists of single-family houses along with Tassajara Park located immediately south of the project site.

Vicinity Map
Site Photos

Looking southwest

Looking northwest

Looking southeast

Adjacent Designations and Land Uses

**North:** Single family dwellings within Contra Costa County jurisdiction.

**East:** Single Family Residential (RS-5) Zoning and Low Density Residential General Plan designation. Single family dwelling.

**South:** Parks and Recreation (PR) Zoning and Parks & Open General Plan designation. Tassajara Park.

**West:** Single Family Residential (RS-5) Zoning and Low Density Residential General Plan designation. Single family dwelling.
Analysis

Project Description

The applicant, Little Tree Montessori, is requesting approval for a Conditional Use to allow a Day Care Center to be operated at the existing school at 2603 Tassajara Avenue. Little Tree Montessori currently operates six schools in the East Bay and the South Bay. These schools offer bilingual education services for English and Mandarin. The Day Care Center would include full and half day toddler classes, preschool classes, pre-kindergarten and transitional kindergarten classes for ages 1.5 to 6 years old and an afterschool program for ages 6 to 12 years old. The preschool program would operate year-round and summer camp programs would also be offered for school-age children.

Proposed site improvements include converting two outdoor basketball courts to additional parking spaces and adding numerous trees and landscaped areas within and surrounding the existing and proposed parking areas (see Attachment 3). The applicant proposes creating 11 additional parking spaces for a total of 60 parking spaces. A new outdoor artificial turf area is proposed. Between the parking lot and the campus, a 5-foot-tall wrought iron fence would be installed for safety and security purposes. Bollard lights would also be added throughout the parking lot to increase visibility during the evening hours.

School History

Tehiyah Day School obtained a use permit in 1983 to operate a private school on the site of the former Mira Vista Annex public school, at 2603 Tassajara Avenue. The use permit was amended in 1992 to allow an increase in enrollment to 300 students, with stipulations regarding any future increase to as many as 400 students. The 1992 use permit also established additional requirements for operations and City reviews. On March 6, 1996, the Planning Commission approved an amendment to the use permit via Planning Commission Resolution 96-11 to allow school enrollment to increase to a maximum of 360 students and to approve a Master Plan for future development in three phases. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was also adopted as part of Resolution 96-11. The approval was appealed to the City Council. City Council denied the appeal and upheld the Planning Commission approval via City Council Resolution 96-26 on April 15, 1996.

On April 29, 1996, the Design Review Board adopted DRB Resolution 96-3 approving the design of Phase 1 of the Master Plan for approximately 4,000 square feet of new construction consisting of four classrooms and support spaces. Subsequently, the landscaping plan was approved by the Board and the project was completed in the Fall of 1996. Subsequently, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution 99-17 approving a Negative Declaration and request to amend the use permit and approved master plan to allow the multipurpose/gymnasium building (Phase II) to increase in size from 6,450 square feet to 10,230 square feet. Subsequently the Design Review Board adopted DRB Resolution 00-07 approving the design of the revised multipurpose/gymnasium building. On November 21, 2000, Tehiyah Day School entered into a private agreement with the Mira Vista Neighborhood Association. This agreement specified criteria for usage of the multi-purpose room, dimensions of the multi-purpose room, tree removal, and landscaping and fencing improvements. The City of El Cerrito is not a party to this agreement, and the agreement is separate from the conditions of approval that governed Tehiyah Day School.

Finally, on June 18, 2008, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution 08-05 approving an amendment to the existing use permit for a temporary modular building.

Tehiyah Day School closed school operations after the 2017/2018 school year and the school is not currently occupied.
Previous Use Permit Requirements

Many of the Conditions of Approval in the Draft Resolution (Attachment 1) are taken from conditions of approval that applied to previous approvals for Tehiyah Day School described above in this staff report. Requirements pertaining to enrollment limit (360 students); noise complaint procedure; traffic and parking; and landscaping are examples of conditions that were taken from previous Tehiyah Day School approvals.

Day Care Center Requirements

Table 19.08-A within Section 19.08.020 ECMC allows Day Care Centers in the Public and Semi-Public Zoning District with a Conditional Use Permit. Section 19.20.060 ECMC includes the following requirements for Day Care Centers:

(a) Landscaping and buffer yards. A periphery wall constructed of wood or masonry shall be provided for purposes of securing outdoor play areas and screening the site and shall achieve 75 percent opacity. In addition, per Section 19.25.090, a buffer yard at least 5 feet wide with a 6-foot-tall wall shall be provided where a public and semi-public use is adjacent to a residential use.

There is a single-family residence immediately north of the project site, in unincorporated Contra Costa County, and there is a wooden fence approximately six feet tall as well as a chain link fence with slats immediately next to the wooden fence that separates the residence from the project site. An existing landscaping strip of approximately at least 5 feet in width also separates the school site from this residence, and the project proposes increases the width of this strip in certain areas as well as providing additional plants in this landscaping strip.

(b) Hours of Operation. 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

The proposed Day Care Center proposes hours of operation between 8 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. Monday through Friday and will comply with this requirement with the exception of occasional special events as provided in the Project Description (Attachment 2). One of the special events, Back to School Night, is proposed to occur from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

(c) Noise. Outdoor play shall not occur before 8:00 a.m. when the site is located within or adjacent to a residential district. Day care centers shall comply with the requirements of the City's noise ordinance limits.

Condition of Approval 8 requires that outdoor play shall not occur before 8:00 a.m. Section 19.21.050 (B) ECMC provides noise standards that will apply to the Day Care Center. In addition, Condition of Approval 12 provides a process for neighbors to submit noise complaints to the Day Care Center, as well as to the City if the Day Care Center does not address the complaint.

(d) Passenger Loading and Drop-off. One curbside passenger loading zone designated by the City shall be located near the entrance of the day care center or in an off-street location acceptable to staff.

Passenger drop-off and pick-up can be accommodated in the on-site parking lot. An existing curbside passenger loading zone is also located on southbound Tassajara Avenue just north of the intersection with Barrett Avenue.
Traffic Analysis

The Transportation Assessment prepared for the project (Attachment 4) and the Draft Resolution (Attachment 1) include analysis regarding potential traffic and parking impacts as well as conditions of approval (starting with Condition of Approval 15) to mitigate potential impacts. As described in the Transportation Assessment, assuming that the pick-up and drop-off times for the proposed Day Care Center continue to be staggered, the estimated peak period traffic volume at full enrollment in either the AM or PM peak 30-minute period is lower than the maximum of 109 vehicles allowed for Tehiyah. The greatest estimated vehicle volume for Little Tree during any 30-minute period is 67 vehicles in the morning (from 8:15 – 8:45 a.m. and from 9:00 – 9:30 a.m.) and 77 vehicles in the afternoon (from 5:15 – 5:45 p.m.). Additional traffic analysis will be required for the proposed Day Care Center 6 months following the start of operations and once enrollment reaches 75 percent of the maximum capacity of 360 students.

Conditions of Approval starting with Condition #15 in Attachment 1 include a number of requirements pertaining to traffic and parking, and many of these were carried over from requirements that applied to Tehiyah Day School. For instance, the Day Care Center will need to provide a Compliance Form to staff and families of students describing the traffic and parking restrictions. In addition, a transportation planning committee comprised of parent volunteers (or, alternatively, a permanent employee) shall be created to implement these traffic and parking requirements.

Additional Concerns

The species of proposed trees in the landscaping plan were changed from Forest Green Hungarian Oak to Chinese Pistache in order to reduce the height of the proposed trees at mature growth. In addition, Condition of Approval 7 requires that the Day Care Center hold a community meeting sometime between 8 months and 12 months after the Day Care Center begins operations to allow neighbors to raise concerns.

Public Notice and Comment

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times and mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site on or before February 27, 2019. In addition, Little Tree Montessori staff held a public meeting at the project site on Monday, March 4, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. and owners of property within 300 feet of the project site were invited to this meeting. Eleven neighbors attended the community meeting and they raised concerns pertaining to: traffic flows and parking on Carquinez Avenue and Tassajara Avenue; use of the gymnasium during the evening; summer programs; heights of proposed trees; general noise impacts; and the desire for a follow-up meeting after the new school begins operations. Staff did not receive written comments for this project.

In response, staff notes that the concerns identified have been addressed though the inclusion of conditions of approval as discussed above.

Environmental Review

The project is Categorically Exempt under Section 15314 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines for Class 14, Minor Additions to Schools. This section consists of minor additions to existing schools within existing school grounds where the addition does not increase the Section 15332 – Class 32, In-fill Development Projects, of the California Environmental Quality Act. This section consists of projects characterizes as in-fill development meeting the following conditions: (a) consistent with the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance; (b) occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses; (c) the project site has no value as
habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species; (d) would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and (e) the site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. The proposed vesting tentative parcel map complies with all of these conditions.

Compliance with the General Plan

The Conditional Use Permit to allow an exception to the maximum fence height is consistent with the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan:

LU4.1: Mixture of Uses. Encourage a mix of uses that promotes such community values as convenience, economic vitality, fiscal stability, public safety, a healthy environment, and a pleasant quality of life.

The proposed use permit will allow a day care center to occupy the existing school facility and will provide pre-school services for ages 1.5 to 6 years and after-school services for ages 6 to 12. The proposed day care center will provide another option for pre-school services and for after-school services for the community and will assist in assuring that the existing school facility is occupied.

CD3.3: Site Landscaping. Improve the appearance of the community by requiring aesthetically designed screening and landscaping on public and private sites. Ensure that public landscaping includes entry areas, street medians, parks, and schools. Require landscaping for all private sites, yard spaces, parking lots, plazas, courtyards, and recreational areas.

The project proposes to significantly increase and improve landscaped areas within and surrounding the existing and proposed parking area with new planters, trees, shrubs, and groundcover.

Required Findings

In order to approve the Conditional Use Permit to allow an exception to the maximum fence height, the Planning Commission must make the following findings, contained in 19.34.040 of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance:

1. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed development will be harmonious and compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability or appropriate development of abutting properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

The only physical changes to the project site proposed include converting outdoor basketball courts to a parking and adding numerous trees and landscaped areas within and surrounding the existing and proposed parking areas. The proposed use will continue to comply with the operating characteristics that were required in the use permit for the previous school occupant, Tehiyah Day School. A transportation assessment dated March 1, 2019 was prepared for the proposal to allow pre-school children and conditions of approval are included below to mitigate potential parking and traffic impacts of the proposed new use.

2. The location and design of the proposal will provide a convenient and functional living, working, shopping, or civic environment that will be an attractive amenity for the City.

The proposed use permit will allow a day care center to occupy the existing school facility and will provide pre-school services for ages 1.5 to 6 years and after-school services for ages 6 to 12. The proposed parking lot improvements will assist in mitigating parking and traffic impacts to surrounding neighbors.
3. The proposal is consistent with the purpose of the district where it is located and conforms in all significant respects with the El Cerrito General Plan and with any other applicable plan adopted by the City Council.

A Day Care Center is a permitted use in the Public and Semipublic zoning district with a Conditional Use Permit, per Table 19.08-A in Section 19.08.020 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code. The proposal is consistent with General Plan Policies LU4.1: Mixture of Uses and CD3.3: Site Landscaping.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a Day Care Center.

Proposed Motion

1. Move adoption of Planning Commission Resolution PC19-05 approving a Conditional Use Permit to allow a Day Care Center at 2603 Tassajara Avenue.

Appeal Period

Within ten (10) calendar days after the date of the decision, the Planning Commission action may be appealed to the City Council.

Attachments

1. Draft Resolution
2. Project Description
3. Project Plans, submitted on 3/14/19
4. Transportation Assessment
5. Arborist Report
Planning Commission Resolution PC19-05

APPLICATION NO. PL18-0179

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A DAY CARE CENTER AT 2603 TASSAJARA AVENUE

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Institutional and Utility;

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is PS (Public and Semipublic);

WHEREAS, the site is located at 2603 Tassajara Avenue;

WHEREAS, the Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 500-100-001;

WHEREAS, Tehiyah Day School obtained a use permit in 1983 to operate a private school on the site of the former Mira Vista Annex public school. The use permit was amended in 1992 to allow an increase in enrollment to 300 students, with stipulations regarding any future increase to as many as 400 students. The 1992 use permit also established additional requirements for operations and City reviews;

WHEREAS, on March 6, 1996, the Planning Commission approved an amendment to the use permit via Planning Commission Resolution 96-11 to allow school enrollment to increase to a maximum of 360 students. A Master Plan for future development in three phases was also approved. The application also included a review of compliance with prior use permit conditions, as required for any expansion proposal. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted as part of Resolution 96-11. The approval was appealed to City Council. City Council denied the appeal and upheld the Planning Commission approval via City Council Resolution 96-26 on April 15, 1996;

WHEREAS, on April 29, 1996, the Design Review Board adopted DRB Resolution 96-3 approving the design of Phase 1 of the Master Plan for approximately 4,000 square feet of new construction consisting of four classrooms and support spaces. Subsequently, the landscaping plan was approved by the Board and the project was completed in fall of 1996;

WHEREAS, on October 20, 1999, the Planning Commission held a public hearing and adopted Resolution 99-17 approving a Negative Declaration and request to amend the use permit and approved master plan to allow the multipurpose/gymnasium building (Phase II) to increase in size from 6,450 square feet to 10,230 square feet. Subsequently the Design Review Board adopted DRB Resolution 00-07 approving the design of the revised multipurpose/gymnasium building;

WHEREAS, on June 18, 2008, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution 08-05 approving an amendment to the existing use permit for a temporary modular building;

WHEREAS, the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15314 of the CEQA Guidelines, Class 14: Minor Additions to Schools;

WHEREAS, on November 9, 2018, Little Tree Montessori submitted Application PL18-0179 for a conditional use permit to allow for a day care center to operate at the existing school site at 2603 Tassajara Avenue;

WHEREAS, on March 20, 2019, the Planning Commission, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review does find and determine the following:
1. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed development will be harmonious and compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability or appropriate development of abutting properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

*The only physical changes to the project site proposed include converting outdoor basketball courts to a parking and adding numerous trees and landscaped areas within and surrounding the existing and proposed parking areas. The proposed use will continue to comply with the operating characteristics that were required in the use permit for the previous school occupant, Tehiyah Day School. A transportation assessment dated March 1, 2019 was prepared for the proposal to allow pre-school children and conditions of approval are included below to mitigate potential parking and traffic impacts of the proposed new use.*

2. The location and design of the proposal will provide a convenient and functional living, working, shopping, or civic environment that will be an attractive amenity for the City.

*The proposed use permit will allow a day care center to occupy the existing school facility and will provide pre-school services for ages 1.5 to 6 years and after-school services for ages 6 to 12. The proposed parking lot improvements will assist in mitigating parking and traffic impacts to surrounding neighbors.*

3. The proposal is consistent with the purpose of the district where it is located and conforms in all significant respects with the El Cerrito General Plan and with any other applicable plan adopted by the City Council.

*A Day Care Center is a permitted use in the Public and Semipublic zoning district with a Conditional Use Permit, per Table 19.08-A in Section 19.08.020 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code. The proposal is consistent with General Plan Policies LU4.1: Mixture of Uses and CD3.3: Site Landscaping.*

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Planning Commission hereby approves Application No. PL18-0179, subject to the following conditions:

**Planning Division:**

**General Conditions**

1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans presented to the Planning Commission on March 20, 2019 and received by the City on February 8, 2019. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. All improvements shall be installed in accordance with these approvals. Improvements shall be maintained as approved.

2. If applicant makes improvements in accordance with these approvals, but fails to comply with any of the Conditions of Approval or limitations set forth in these Conditions of Approval and does not cure any such failure within a reasonable time after notice from the City of El Cerrito, then such failure shall be cause for non-issuance of a certificate of occupancy, revocation or modification of these approvals or any other remedies available to the City.

3. These Conditions of Approval shall apply to any successor in interest in the property and Applicant shall be responsible for assuring that the successor in interest is informed of the terms and conditions of this approval.
4. If not used, this approval shall expire two years from the date of this action.

Prior to Site Improvements

5. Landscaping. Prior to making any site improvements, the project applicant shall provide the Planning Division with a plan showing all existing trees proposed for removal and all existing trees proposed for preservation within the general vicinity of proposed work areas. This plan shall be accompanied with a landscaping plan showing proposed new trees and plantings.

   a. The Planning Division will review proposed trees for removal and replacement trees, for general consistency with previously approved landscape plans for the project site.


Operational Conditions

6. Enrollment limit. This use permit authorizes a maximum enrollment of 360 students for a Day Care Center. This includes a preschool program for ages 1.5 to 6 years old and an afterschool program for ages 6 to 12 years old. The number of classrooms serving any grade level is not regulated.

7. Community Meeting. Sometime between 8 months and 12 months after the Day Care Center begins operations, the Day Care Center shall hold a community meeting on the project site to provide property owners within 300 feet of the project site with the opportunity to raise any concerns. The Day Care Center shall distribute a notification of the meeting to all owners of property within 300 feet of the project site a minimum of 14 days prior to the meeting.

8. Outdoor Play. Outdoor play shall not occur before 8:00 a.m.

9. Hours of Operation. Hours of Operation for the Daycare Center shall be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, pursuant to Section 19.20.060 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code, or as permitted by any future amendments to the Municipal Code.

10. Evening/Weekend Use. Activities determined by the Zoning Administrator to be a permitted Accessory Use shall be permitted on weekends or after 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Such activities shall require approval from the Zoning Administrator prior to the commencement of said activity. One annual parent event, such as ‘Back to School Night,’ shall be permitted each school year without further approval by the Zoning Administrator, and shall conclude by 9:00 p.m. All evening activity shall be confined to the interior of buildings, with the exception of pedestrian traffic related to such activities. The Day Care Center shall provide property owners within 300 feet of the project site notification of all special events and their anticipated duration. This notification may be distributed annually or more periodically, as determined by the day care center, but shall be distributed a minimum of 14 days prior to any event.

11. Amplification: There shall be no use of amplified sound or music equipment outside the buildings at any time, except:

   a. In the courtyard area, amplification will be allowed only at such volume as needed for communication purposes, and;
b. Other outdoor areas shall be allowed amplification upon obtaining a Temporary Use Permit from the Zoning Administrator.

12. Noise Complaint Procedure. In approving this use permit, the Planning Commission recognizes that playground noise and the sounds of conversation from children en route to or from the day care center on foot will be audible to the surrounding neighborhood. The Commission further recognizes that this noise source is a normal aspect of any facility which accommodates children and desires to separate substantiated, on-going noise problems resulting from use of the facility inconsistent with the these use permit conditions from occasional annoyance caused by the sound of children's play activity.

a. A complaint alleging noise disturbance resulting from a violation of these conditions of approval shall be submitted in writing to the Day Care Center, and shall include the name, address and telephone number of the complainant, and shall be copied to the City of El Cerrito Planning Division. The complainant shall provide appropriate detail as to the time, date and nature of the alleged noise offense. If, after ten (10) calendar days from the date of submitting the written complaint to day care center officials, the complainant remains unsatisfied with resolution of the alleged noise problem, the complainant may request assistance in resolving the matter from the City Planning Division. The complainant shall furnish to the Planning Division copies of correspondence identifying the original complaint and records of contact with day care center officials in responding to the complaint. The Planning Division shall then determine the validity of the complaint and attempt to resolve it with day care center officials if said complaint is found valid. If, 90 days after the written notice, complainant does not contact the City for action, the complaint shall be deemed dismissed without prejudice to the day care center. If three verified complaints from three separate parties are submitted to the Zoning Administrator over a 120-day period in regard to noise impacts, the Zoning Administrator may require that a new noise evaluation shall be conducted and additional measures shall be investigated.

13. Tassajara Park. If the Day Care Center wishes to use Tassajara Park for any purpose, the Day Care Center shall first enter into an agreement with the City of El Cerrito for use of Tassajara Park by students during the school day as part of day care center instruction, specifying such fees and other contributions as may be recommended by the Park and Recreation Commission. The Day Care Center shall also enter into an Indemnification and Hold Harmless Agreement with the City, as well as any other conditions required by the City.

14. Landscaping. Landscaping, as shown in approved landscaping, shall be maintained in good condition. Dead or dying trees, plants, and groundcover shall be appropriately replaced. Landscaping near parking lot entrances shall be appropriately pruned as needed to allow for safety.

Traffic and Parking Conditions

The Day Care Center shall operate in a manner consistent with the Transportation Assessment for Little Tree Montessori, International at 2603 Tassajara Avenue dated March 1, 2019 and comply with the following conditions:

15. Six months following the start of operations with students attending the Day Care Center, the project applicant shall hire a traffic engineering consultant approved by the City to conduct analysis on drop-off and pick-up hours as well as observation and analysis of overall traffic operations on-site, and off-street parking utilization. The Public Works Department may require implementation additional requirements depending on the results of the analysis and recommendations of this study.
16. Once enrollment reaches 75 percent of the maximum capacity of 360 students, or approximately 186 students enrolled in preschool programs and 84 students enrolled in the afterschool program, driveway counts shall be collected at the on-site parking lot entry and exit for two weekdays. Counts should also include any pedestrians entering and exiting the school site.

   a. In addition, observations of on-site parking utilization and dwell times during AM and PM periods shall be made, as well as observation and analysis of overall traffic operations on-site. Information on off-street parking utilization shall also be collected.

   b. A survey shall be administered to families to determine how they travel to and from the day care center and average vehicle occupancy for those who arrive by car or van. Data collection and analysis shall be conducted by an independent, third party transportation or traffic engineering consultant approved by the City, and the results and analysis, along with any recommended modifications, should be reported to the City’s Planning Division and Public Works Department. The Public Works Department may require implementation additional requirements depending on the results of the analysis and recommendations.

17. Compliance form. The new proposed Day Care Center shall provide families of students and staff with a transportation compliance form that they must read and acknowledge. The form shall clearly explain pick-up and drop-off procedures, site circulation and access, and neighborhood parking restrictions. This form shall be reviewed and approved by the City’s Planning Division before the Day Care Center begins operation. Provisions in the form shall include but not be limited to the following:

   a. Parking is not allowed on Tassajara Avenue or on Carquinez Avenue north of Barrett Avenue at any time.
   b. Do not park in the school driveway/emergency entrance on Tassajara Ave. near Barrett Ave.
   c. Do not use any driveways – those of the day care center or its neighbors – to turn around, back up, or facilitate a three-point or U turn.
   d. Do not make a three-point or U turn at either the intersection of Barrett and Tassajara, or Barrett and Carquinez. U-turns are not permitted on any street within a two-block radius of the Day Care Center at any time.
   e. All student drop-off and pick-up activity shall take place in the parking lot or on Barrett Avenue.
   f. Parents electing to use the onsite drop-off/pick-up area shall use the Day Care Center’s one-way circulation system. This includes northbound only on Carquinez from Barrett to the parking lot, eastbound only through the parking lot, and southbound only on Tassajara from the parking lot to Barrett.
   g. Adopt day care center guidelines for issuance of warnings and mandatory financial penalties by the Day Care Center for violation of entry, exit, and parking restrictions by Day Care Center parents and staff.
   h. If additional parking capacity is needed, day care center staff shall park on Barrett Avenue between Tassajara and Carquinez Avenues and immediately adjacent to Tassajara Park.

18. At any time, the City may require the Day Care Center to prepare analysis to determine if a designated drive through pick-up area in the parking lot is needed and to then require the existing day care center to design and to provide a drive through pick-up area, subject to approval by the City’s Public Works Department. For instance, if parking space is limited during the afternoon or early evening, a drive through pick-up area may be warranted.

19. The day care center shall implement an annual Traffic Monitoring Program to evaluate onsite and offsite circulation and parking, and pedestrian and vehicle safety, and to assess the day care center’s adherence to performance standards. The report shall be provided to the City’s Planning Division.
20. The Day Care Center shall maintain a transportation planning committee comprised of parent volunteers. (Alternatively, the Day Care Center may retain a permanent employee to perform required functions). As a primary function, the committee shall provide traffic monitors trained and authorized to direct onsite peak hour and special event traffic circulation to optimize vehicle and pedestrian safety and efficiency of movement.

21. The Day Care Center shall prepare a parent/teacher manual setting forth traffic and parking policies. The manual shall include specific procedures, maps, and diagrams. At the beginning of each school term, the Day Care Center shall conduct at least one "orientation/ training" session which shall be mandatory for new families.

22. Enforcement. The Day Care Center, through its administration and its transportation planning committee, shall be responsible for assuring the above-listed conditions are met. The Planning Division shall monitor performance through review of annual monitoring program report provided by the day care center, and by monitoring any complaints of violations of performance standards. Three years after maximum enrollment is reached, the Zoning Administrator shall have the discretion to determine the frequency of subsequent reports.

23. The maximum number of day care center employees onsite at any one time shall not exceed 51, unless the Day Care Center provides clear demonstration to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Zoning Administrator that any increase will not cause a corresponding increase in parking demand.

24. For the existing loading zone currently designated by a yellow curb and located adjacent to the school site on southbound Tassajara Avenue just north of the intersection with Barrett Avenue, the new proposed Day Care Center shall add appropriate signage identifying the area as a loading zone during day care center operating hours.

Public Works Department:

25. Prior to issuance of a building permit or any site improvements, project applicant shall address Storm Water Control Plan requirements from the Contra Costa Clean Water Program Stormwater C3 Guidebook to the satisfaction of the City’s Public Works Department.

26. Project applicant must repair any cracked and uneven sidewalk and/or driveway approach along project frontage. These improvements along with the new driveway approach will require a Public Works Encroachment Permit.

27. For any work in the Public Right-of-Way, street cuts, street tree, sidewalk, curb/gutter, and driveway work, applicant must obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees. Any sidewalk, curb ramp and driveway work shall meet current ADA and City of El Cerrito Standards. Please refer to the Maximum Driveway Profile, LL1031, adopted October 2002 and Standard Driveway Profile, dated April 23, 2010, prepared by the City of El Cerrito Public Works Department.

28. Prior to the issuance of a building permit or any site improvements, applicant shall submit an estimate of grading and earthwork to be completed for the project. Any earthwork and/or grading operations in excess of 50 cubic yards will require the applicant to submit a detailed grading plan, obtain a Grading & Transportation Permit and pay all associated fees.

29. Before the start of ANY work in the public right-of-way, including any street tree, sidewalk and driveway work, applicant must obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees.
30. Prior to the issuance of a building permit or any site improvements, the applicant shall submit a landscaping plan, showing all planting in the right-of-way. All new street trees are to be installed, they must be selected from the City Master Tree List and approved by the City Arborist before installation. Tree species, location, spacing, tree well size, and planting details, are to be approved by the City Arborist before installation. Any new street trees are required to have irrigation and an establishment period of 3 years prior to acceptance by the City.

31. Prior to the issuance of a building permit or any site improvements, include an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for construction.

32. Prior to the issuance of a building permit or any site improvements, the applicant shall submit a complete Stormwater O&M Agreement for the Public Works Department to review and approve.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that this resolution was adopted by the El Cerrito Planning Commission at a regular meeting held on March 20, 2019, upon motion of Commissioner __________, second by Commissioner ____________:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

____________________________________
Sean Moss, AICP
Acting Planning Manager
I. BUSINESS BACKGROUND

Since 2004, Little Tree Montessori and its sister school, Growing Tree Learning Center, have been providing bilingual education services to families looking for English and Mandarin learning environment for their preschool-age children. In the last 14 years, the business has grown to six locations in the South Bay and East Bay:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name of Business</th>
<th>Year Est.</th>
<th>No. of Preschool Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga 1</td>
<td>Growing Tree Learning Center</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga 2</td>
<td>Growing Tree Learning Center</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Little Tree Montessori International School</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>Little Tree Montessori</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Little Tree Montessori International School of Fremont</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Little Tree Montessori International School of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school’s mission statement is to provide high quality bilingual education in a Montessori environment at a reasonable cost. To educate young children (1.5 to 6 years old) in a bilingual setting, teachers immerse children in two languages constantly by listening, speaking, reading, and writing in both languages. The schools also follow the Montessori teaching method in providing an environment that allows each child to learn at his/her own pace. Combine the advantageous teaching methods with convenient locations, flexible schedule, and competitive pricing, the business continues to grow and enjoys a strong demand for its services.

In addition to the preschool program, the schools also offer after-school care for school-age children (6 to 12 years old). Many of the young children who graduate from the preschool program continue to participate in the after-school programs because of the established trust with the schools. During the summer months, three of the six locations also offer summer camp programs for school-age children with weekly themes such as science, art, sports, etc.
II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

At the new El Cerrito location, Little Tree will be able to offer its educational services to the surrounding neighborhoods in El Cerrito. The existing campus that formerly housed Tehiyah Day School operated under the use permit approved on March 6, 1996. The proposed business intends to stay consistent with Tehiyah’s use permit in terms of maximum number of students, with changes only to the age of children and programs offered. The programs proposed at this site include full day and half day toddler classes, preschool classes, Pre-K / Transitional Kindergarten, and afterschool care. Below is a summary of the proposed business operation*:

- Age of Children: 2 to 12 years old
- Max. Number of children: 360
- Max. Number of staff at one time: 25
- Hours of Operation: 8:00AM - 6:30PM, Monday – Friday
- Drop-off/Pick-up: Parents must park and walk each child in to the classroom. Daily sign-in and sign-out at the office is mandatory.

*Please refer to page 3 for proposed pick-up/drop-off schedule, and pages 4-8 for detailed daily schedule for each program.

III. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

The majority of the improvements will be in the parking lot area. Little Tree proposes to increase the number of parking spaces by 12 spaces, from 46 to 58. Between the parking lot and the campus, a 5’-0” tall wrought iron fence will be installed for safety and security purposes. In the parking lot, new landscaping islands with shrubs and trees are proposed to beautify and provide shade to the parking stalls. Additionally, bollard lights will be added throughout the parking lot to increase visibility during the evening hours.

Minor improvements are proposed for the classroom buildings, including new paint, lighting, and carpeting. Additional emergency egress doors will be installed per Building Code requirements. New toilets will be added to comply with number of fixtures required by Child Care Licensing.

IV. COMMUNITY USE OF GYMNASIUM

Little Tree is an active participant in community service activities at each of its current locations. At the proposed El Cerrito location, Little Tree will continue the tradition of sharing its Gymnasium building with local sports leagues and community groups as needed. The existing gymnasium facility may be used during evenings and weekends which are outside of Little Tree’s normal business hours.
## Drop-Off and Pick-Up Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room #</th>
<th>No. of Students per Room</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Drop off time</th>
<th>Pick up time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,9,10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Full Day PK/TK/K</td>
<td>8:00~8:30</td>
<td>16:15~16:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Half Day Preschool</td>
<td>8:15~8:30</td>
<td>11:40~12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Full Day Preschool</td>
<td>8:30~9:15</td>
<td>16:45~17:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Full Day Toddler</td>
<td>9:15~9:30</td>
<td>17:30~17:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,15,16,17,18</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Afterschool</td>
<td>14:30~15:00</td>
<td>17:45~18:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max number of students Preschool: 248
Max number of students Afterschool: 112
Total: 360
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM 9:15 ~ 9:50</td>
<td>Work Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 9:50 ~ 10:00</td>
<td>Snack Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 10:00 ~ 10:30</td>
<td>Playground Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 10:30 ~ 10:50</td>
<td>Bathroom/ Diaper Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 10:50 ~ 11:20</td>
<td>Morning Circle (Demonstration/ Music &amp; Movement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 11:20 ~ 11:40</td>
<td>Bathroom/ Wash Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 11:40 ~ 12:40</td>
<td>Lunch Time/ Clean Up/ Bathroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 12:40 ~ 2:40</td>
<td>Nap Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2:40 ~ 3:00</td>
<td>Clean Up/ Diaper Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3:00 ~ 3:20</td>
<td>Bathroom/ Wash Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3:20 ~ 3:35</td>
<td>Snack Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3:35 ~ 4:05</td>
<td>Playground Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 4:05 ~ 4:50</td>
<td>Work Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 4:50 ~ 5:10</td>
<td>Circle Time/ Story/ Music &amp; Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 5:10 ~ 5:25</td>
<td>Diaper Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 5:25 ~ 5:30</td>
<td>Free Play &amp; Getting Ready for Dismissal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full day Toddler Program
< AM 9:15 ~ PM 5:30 >

Room 1 & 2
## Daily Schedule

**Room 3 & 4 & 5 & 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM 8:30 ~ 9:00</td>
<td><strong>Circle Time</strong>&lt;br&gt;Greeting, Demonstrate Montessori Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 9:00 ~ 10:00</td>
<td><strong>Work Time (Snack Provided)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Free choice individual and small group lesson given by teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 10:00 ~ 10:30</td>
<td>Playground Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 10:30 ~ 10:50</td>
<td><strong>Bathroom</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 10:50 ~ 11:20</td>
<td><strong>Work Time/ Small Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 11:20 ~ 11:45</td>
<td><strong>Music &amp; Movement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 11:45 ~ PM 12:00</td>
<td><strong>Bathroom/ Set Up Table</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 12:00 ~ 12:40</td>
<td><strong>Lunch Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 12:40 ~ 12:50</td>
<td><strong>Clean Up/ Bathroom</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 12:50 ~ 2:50</td>
<td><strong>Nap Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2:50 ~ 3:10</td>
<td><strong>Circle Time</strong>&lt;br&gt;Demonstrate Montessori Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3:10 ~ 4:00</td>
<td><strong>Work Time (Snack Provided)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Free choice individual and small group lesson given by teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 4:00 ~ 4:30</td>
<td><strong>Playground Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 4:30 ~ 4:45</td>
<td><strong>Ready for Dismissal</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full day Preschool Program**<br><AM 8:30 ~ PM 4:45>
## Daily Schedule

**Room 8 & 9 & 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM 8:00 ~ 9:00</td>
<td>Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 9:00 ~ 9:50</td>
<td>Work Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 9:50 ~ 10:00</td>
<td>Clean Up/ Bathroom Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 10:00 ~ 10:30</td>
<td>Circle Time (Greeting, Demonstrate Montessori Job)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 10:30 ~ 11:00</td>
<td>Playground Time/ Snake Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 11:00 ~ 11:15</td>
<td>Bathroom Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 11:10 ~ 11:40</td>
<td>Music &amp; Movement/ Story Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 11:40 ~ PM 12:00</td>
<td>Set Up Bedding/ Bathroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 12:00 ~ 12:30</td>
<td>Lunch Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 12:30 ~ 12:40</td>
<td>Bathroom Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 12:40 ~ 2:30</td>
<td>Nap Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2:30 ~ 2:40</td>
<td>Clean Up Bedding/ Bathroom Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 2:40 ~ 3:10</td>
<td>Playground Time/ Snake Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3:10 ~ 3:25</td>
<td>Circle Time (Demonstrate Montessori Job)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 3:25 ~ 4:10</td>
<td>Work Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 4:10 ~ 4:15</td>
<td>Getting Ready for Dismissal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full day PK/TK/K Program
< AM 8:00 ~ PM 4:15 >
# Daily Schedule

## Room 11 & 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AM 8:15 ~ 8:45| Circle Time  
Greeting, Demonstrate Montessori Job                                      |
| AM 8:45 ~ 10:10| Work Time (Snack Provided)  
Free choice individual and small group lesson given by teachers           |
| AM 10:10 ~ 10:25| Clean Up/ Bathroom                                                       |
| AM 10:25 ~ 11:00| Music & Movement                                                         |
| AM 11:00 ~ 11:30| Playground Time                                                          |
| AM 11:30 ~ 11:40| Bathroom                                                                  |
| AM 11:40 ~ PM 12:00| Story Time & Ready for Dismissal                                         |
# Afterschool Program Daily Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Time (PM)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:30 ~ 3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drop-off Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 ~ 3:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snack Time / Sports Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 ~ 4:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:15 ~ 4:30 Chinese Public Speaking &amp; Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 ~ 4:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20 ~ 4:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homework Coach / Worksheet Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>4:30 ~ 4:50 Recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50 ~ 5:05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recess/Sports Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:05 ~ 5:45</td>
<td>Chinese Reciting</td>
<td>Math Class</td>
<td>Chinese Culture</td>
<td>Math Worksheet Practice</td>
<td>4:50 ~ 6:00 Art / Music &amp; Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 ~ 6:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare for Dismissal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 ~ 6:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pick-up Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Anticipated Special Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Attendee</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back to School Night</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd week of September</td>
<td>6:30PM - 8:00PM</td>
<td>Preschool parents</td>
<td>Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Performance</td>
<td>1st Friday of December</td>
<td>5:00PM - 6:30PM</td>
<td>Preschool parents</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Performance</td>
<td>2nd Friday of December</td>
<td>5:00PM - 6:30PM</td>
<td>Afterschool parents</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of School Year Performance</td>
<td>2nd week of June</td>
<td>5:00PM - 6:30PM</td>
<td>Afterschool parents</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation (oldest preschool class only)</td>
<td>2nd week of June</td>
<td>9:00AM - 10:30AM</td>
<td>Preschool parents</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To replace the failing olives, the flamboyant Persian ironwood is a candidate to flank the existing playground area (1, 2). It has year round interest and can tolerate shade. The Pink Champagne smoke tree provides a colorful and airy buffer from the parking lot (3), while the Chinese Pistache is compact, yet potent, in its seasonal display (4).

Suggestions of hardy plant specimens for planting areas around the project scope.

Small shrubs to be considered: airy deer grass, native cleveland sage, breezy reed grass, and the adaptable berkeley sedge (above).

To provide screening in the parking lot, stately pittosporum or the native wax myrtle could be trained in tight spaces (1,3).

Pineapple guava, interspersed between the aforementioned specimens, bear exceptional fruits mid-summer to autumn (2).

Lastly, a couple more manzanitas around the site would improve the resiliency of the existing grove (4).

Concepts for containment and accentuation of play areas include low, tubular fencing and interactive turf cubes that would function as seats (right).

Different LED bollards increase visibility around the site (above). The first from Urban Accessories and three it has year round interest and can tolerate shade. Standardized options from Tournesol Siteworks. Encouraging the mobility of older students, Dero bike parking will be added (right).
MEMORANDUM

Date: March 1, 2019
To: Janice Yeh, AIA, Adaptive Architecture
From: Kara Vuicich, AICP and Kathrin Tellez, AICP, PTP
Subject: Transportation Assessment for Little Tree Montessori, International at 2603 Tassajara Avenue, El Cerrito, California

This technical memorandum assesses the potential transportation and traffic impacts of Little Tree Montessori, International (Little Tree), proposed to be located at 2603 Tassajara Avenue in El Cerrito, California and compares them with those of the site’s former occupant, Tehiyah Day School (Tehiyah), which closed in July 2018. The purpose of this comparison is to determine what, if any, transportation effects Little Tree’s operations may have that are equivalent to or greater than Tehiyah’s. This memo also assesses overall vehicle circulation and parking for Little Tree’s operations. Lastly, it recommends a circulation, parking, and traffic monitoring plan that provides for safe access to the school and minimizes any adverse impacts to the surrounding neighborhood.

Summary

Little Tree is proposing a different use on the site (a preschool and afterschool program instead of a kindergarten through eighth grade school) than its prior occupants, and as such, it has applied for a new Conditional Use Permit (CUP). In response to its CUP application, the City of El Cerrito requested that Little Tree provide further information on the number of vehicles estimated to travel to the school, and review the Tehiyah Transportation Demand Management Program (TDMP) to describe how its proposed operations and proposed site changes would be consistent and in compliance with the TDMP. The City also asked Little Tree to address how it would comply with Tehiyah’s requirements regarding drop-off, pick-up, and on-street parking; curbside parking restrictions; traffic controls; warning signage; restrictions and guidelines for traffic and parking; a parking lot pedestrian pathway; and stationing crossing guards.
Based on the projected enrollment and schedule provided by Little Tree, Fehr & Peers estimated the traffic volumes that would be generated by Little Tree’s operations at full enrollment. Assuming that Little Tree’s pick-up and drop-off times continue to be staggered, the estimated peak period traffic volume in either the AM or PM peak 30-minute period is lower than the maximum of 109 vehicles allowed for Tehiyah. During weekday mornings, the greatest estimated vehicle volume for Little Tree during any 30-minute period is 67 vehicles (from 8:15-8:45 AM and from 9:00-9:30 AM). During weekday afternoons, the greatest estimated vehicle volume during any 30-minute period is 77 vehicles (from 5:15-5:45 PM).

Because the peak period vehicle volumes generated by Little Tree are estimated to be less than the vehicle volume cap of 109 vehicles that was mandated for Tehiyah and are also less than the TDMP goal of achieving a peak period vehicle volume of no more than 87 vehicles, neither a traffic impact analysis nor any off-site transportation improvements are recommended. Furthermore, we do not recommend that Little Tree implement additional transportation demand management measures beyond stagger start and end times at this time due to the lower vehicle volumes estimated for Little Tree (in comparison to the maximum vehicle volume thresholds established for Tehiyah).

It is important to note that our conclusions are based on the projected schedule and enrollment, and that actual traffic patterns could vary once the school opens. Consequently, we have included a recommendation that Little Tree collect and analyze parking and traffic data once enrollment reaches 75 percent, or approximately 186 students enrolled in preschool programs and 84 students enrolled in the afterschool program.

This memorandum consists of five sections:

1. **Tehiyah TDMP** – summarizes the key requirements and definitions from the Tehiyah TDMP.

2. **Project Description** – provides an overview of Little Tree’s operations, including start and end times and the number of students to be enrolled in each of its programs.

3. **Estimated Vehicle Volumes** – details the estimated number of vehicles expected to be generated by student drop-off and pick-up activity throughout the average school day.

4. **Site Access, Circulation, and Parking** – assesses site access and circulation for vehicles and pedestrians, loading zones, on-site and on-street parking needs and restrictions, and signage.
5. Recommendations – provides recommendations for traffic monitoring, parking management, and signage.

**Tehiyah TDMP**

The project site was formerly occupied by Tehiyah Day School, a kindergarten through eighth grade independent school whose CUP allowed for up to 360 students to be enrolled. To mitigate traffic impacts on the surrounding neighborhood that might be caused by Tehiyah’s operations and to improve safety, the CUP required the school to develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management Program (TDMP) which is summarized below and provided in Appendix A.

The goals of the Tehiyah TDMP were as follows:

- Traffic volumes do not increase over that in the base year (1995/96), as required by Tehiyah’s Use Permit;
- Traffic volumes decrease over time to a level that is 80 percent of that in the base year (1995/96). The 80 percent figure goes beyond the requirements of Tehiyah’s Use Permit and represents Tehiyah’s efforts to satisfy concerns of neighborhood residents; and
- Demand for off-street parking does not exceed that experienced in the base year (1995/96).

The TDMP defined the terms listed above as follows:

- Traffic Volume is measured by the number of vehicles carrying students to and from Tehiyah during any single peak period.¹ This number excludes staff and faculty vehicles.
- Base Year Traffic Volume, or 109 vehicles, is that peak traffic volume reported by the Initial Study of Tehiyah’s Master Plan.²
- Base Year Parking Volume is 50 on-street parked vehicles, during either the AM or PM peak period, as reported in the Initial Study.

---

¹ It is understood that a peak period is approximately 30 minutes based on observations from the 1992 Tehiyah Day School Traffic Study (see Appendix B).
² It is understood that this is the number of vehicles leaving the school during a specific time period. This is based on the fact that the TDMP specified that the number of vehicles exiting the Tehiyah parking lot be counted in order to monitor traffic volume.
The TDMP specified that the following counts be collected as part of the school’s traffic monitoring program for the AM and PM peak periods:\textsuperscript{3}

- The number of vehicles exiting the Tehiyah parking lot.
- The number of vehicles parking on Tassajara south of Barrett.
- The number of vehicles parking on Tassajara north of Barrett.
- The number of vehicles parking on Barrett between Tassajara and Carquinez, and east (uphill) of Tassajara.

The TDMP also specified that a student survey be conducted twice a year (in the fall and spring) to assess student access modes and vehicle trips per student, and that all monitoring information and data trends be reported to the City of El Cerrito Planning Division on an annual basis.

Project Description

Little Tree Montessori and its sister school, Growing Tree Learning Center, have been providing bilingual English/Mandarin education for preschool-age children at six locations in the South and East Bay Area. Little Tree proposes to open a new school at the former site of Tehiyah Day School. Tehiyah Day School was a kindergarten through 8th grade independent school that closed at the end of the 2017-2018 school year. Little Tree proposes to operate both a preschool program for children ages 1.5 to 6 years old and an afterschool program for children ages 6 to 12 years old.

Table 1 summarizes the proposed program for Little Tree’s proposed El Cerrito location, including pick-up and drop-off times, and the total number of students. In total, up to 360 students could be enrolled with a maximum of 312 students expected on campus at any given time.

Little Tree anticipates that the maximum number of staff on site at one time would be 25. Staff arrivals and departures may vary throughout the day, although it is anticipated that most staff would arrive by 8:30 AM. Some staff would depart in the early afternoon, and less than a quarter of staff (six or fewer staff members) would remain on site after 6:00 PM.

\textsuperscript{3} The AM and PM peak periods for Tehiyah were approximately 8:00-8:40 AM and 3:25-3:50 PM.
Table 1: Program Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Drop-Off Time</th>
<th>Pick-Up Time</th>
<th>Number of Classrooms</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Students per Room</th>
<th>Maximum Total Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Day PK/TK/K</td>
<td>8:00-8:30 AM</td>
<td>4:15-4:45 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Day Preschool</td>
<td>8:15-8:30 AM</td>
<td>11:40 AM-12:00 PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Day Preschool</td>
<td>8:30-9:15 AM</td>
<td>4:45-5:30 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Day Toddler</td>
<td>9:15-9:30 AM</td>
<td>5:30-5:45 PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterschool Program</td>
<td>2:30-3:00 PM</td>
<td>5:45-6:30 PM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Little Tree, Fehr & Peers.

Estimated Vehicle Volumes

This section details the estimated number of vehicles expected to be generated by student drop-off and pick-up activity throughout the average school day. In addition to vehicle trips generated by student pick-ups and drop-offs, it is assumed that all 25 staff members would drive and park at or near the school site. To be consistent with the definitions and performance measures used in the Tehiyah TDMP, this assessment defines vehicle volumes as the number of vehicles leaving the school site during a specific time period for the purpose of student drop-off or pick-up.

To develop vehicle volume estimates, Fehr & Peers reviewed data from Little Tree’s other sites regarding student arrival and departure times and the average percentage of students who had siblings at the school or within the same program. We also reviewed trip generation tables from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (*ITE Trip Generation Manual*, 10th Edition). Day Care Center is the land use that most closely matches the proposed preschool use. However, none of the survey sites accommodated the range of the number of children proposed for the project. Furthermore,
while some of the surveyed sites were noted to provide afterschool care for school age students, it is not feasible to isolate the trip generation rates from sites most similar to the proposed project. Therefore, we estimated vehicle volumes by using population characteristic data from Little Tree’s existing sites, the proposed level of enrollment, and the proposed schedule.

Table 2 summarizes the information about program start and end times, the maximum number of students, and estimated vehicle volumes. Based on data from other schools operated by Little Tree, the vehicle volume estimates assume that 20 percent of preschool students and 35 percent of afterschool program students have siblings at the school or in the same program and thus arrive in the same vehicle. This is a conservative estimate (errin on the side of estimating a higher vehicle volume) since it assumes that all students are driven to school, and that none walk from the surrounding neighborhood.

**Table 2: Summary of Estimated Vehicle Volumes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Day PK/TK/K</th>
<th>Half Day Preschool</th>
<th>Full Day Preschool</th>
<th>Full Day Toddler</th>
<th>Afterschool Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start Time</strong></td>
<td>8:00-8:30 AM</td>
<td>8:15-8:30 AM</td>
<td>8:30-9:15 AM</td>
<td>9:15-9:30 AM</td>
<td>2:30-3:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End Time</strong></td>
<td>4:15-4:45 PM</td>
<td>11:40 AM-12:00 PM</td>
<td>4:45-5:30 PM</td>
<td>5:30-5:45 PM</td>
<td>5:45-6:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Students</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM Vehicle Volume</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM Vehicle Volume</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Average Vehicle Occupancy (Students per Vehicle)</strong></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Little Tree Montessori, Fehr & Peers.

*Note: Based on information collected from Little Tree's six other locations in the South and East Bay Area, approximately 20 percent of students have a sibling enrolled in one of the full or half day programs. For the afterschool program, approximately 35 percent of students have a sibling enrolled in the program. To estimate the number of vehicle trips generated by the school, it is assumed that siblings arrive and depart together in the same vehicle.*

**Vehicle Volumes During the AM Peak**

Unlike Tehiyah Day School, start and end times for Little Tree’s programs are staggered. Additionally, data collected from Little Tree’s other Bay Area locations show that full-day and half-
day students do not all arrive promptly; instead, students arrive up to an hour or more after the official program start time on a regular basis. **Table 3** summarizes estimated vehicle volumes over the morning period as full-day and half-day students arrive at the school. Vehicle volumes (the number of vehicles leaving the school during a particular time period) are shown for 15-minute increments. **Figure 1** shows how estimated vehicle volumes related to student arrivals are distributed throughout the morning.

During weekday mornings, the greatest estimated vehicle volume during any 15-minute period is 40 vehicles (from 9:15-9:30 AM), and the greatest estimated vehicle volume during any 30-minute period is 67 vehicles (from 8:15-8:45 AM and from 9:00-9:30 AM). This is less than the peak vehicle volume of 109 vehicles that was not to be exceeded by Tehiyah and is also less than the TDMP vehicle volume goal of 87 vehicles.

**Table 3: Estimated Vehicle Volumes in the AM Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrival Time</th>
<th>Full Day PK/TK/K</th>
<th>Half Day Preschool</th>
<th>Full Day Preschool</th>
<th>Full Day Toddler</th>
<th>Total Estimated Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:15 AM</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15-8:30 AM</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-8:45 AM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45-9:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-9:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-9:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:00 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:15 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:30 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Little Tree Montessori, Fehr & Peers.
Figure 1: Estimated Vehicle Volumes in the AM Period

Source: Little Tree Montessori, Fehr & Peers.

Vehicle Volumes During the PM Peak

In the afternoon, full- and half-day students depart the campus and other students arrive for the afterschool program. Like the morning period, departures are staggered throughout the afternoon, and it is assumed that students do not all depart at the same time, based on information provided by Little Tree from its other sites. Table 4 summarizes the estimated vehicle volumes over the afternoon period as afterschool program students arrive at the school (between 2:15-3:00 PM) and full-day, half-day, and afterschool program students depart from the school. Figure 2 shows how estimated vehicle volumes are distributed throughout the afternoon and early evening.

During weekday afternoons, the greatest estimated vehicle volume during any 15-minute period is 44 vehicles (from 5:15-5:30 PM); the greatest estimated vehicle volume during any 30-minute period is 77 vehicles (from 5:15-5:45 PM). This is less than the peak vehicle volume of 109 vehicles
that was not to be exceeded by Tehiyah and is also less than the TDMP vehicle volume goal of 87 vehicles.

**Table 4: Estimated Vehicle Volumes in the PM Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrival/Departure Time</th>
<th>Full Day PK/TK/K</th>
<th>Half Day Preschool</th>
<th>Full Day Preschool</th>
<th>Full Day Toddler</th>
<th>Afterschool Program</th>
<th>Total Estimated Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:30-11:45 AM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 AM-12:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15-2:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-2:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45-3:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:15 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15-4:30 PM</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-4:45 PM</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45-5:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-5:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15-5:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30-5:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45-6:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-6:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15-6:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Little Tree Montessori, Fehr & Peers.
Figure 2: Estimated Vehicle Volumes in the PM Period

![Graph showing vehicle volumes](image)

Source: Little Tree Montessori, Fehr & Peers.

## Site Access, Circulation, and Parking

Little Tree would maintain the traffic circulation pattern used by Tehiyah and continue to follow the parking prohibitions on Carquinez and Tassajara Avenues north of Barrett Avenue. It is likely that all parking, pick-up, and drop-off can be accommodated in the on-site parking lot, although Fehr & Peers recommends that parking utilization be re-evaluated when the school reaches 75 percent of its enrollment in order to more accurately assess parking needs. (Please see the Recommendations section for further details.)

## Site Access and Circulation

Little Tree proposes to use the existing gated pedestrian entrance located near the corner of Tassajara and Barrett Avenues as an emergency exit only and would consolidate all entries and exits through a new gate adjacent to the on-site parking lot on the north side of the property. Pedestrian access from Carquinez or Tassajara Avenues would be provided through the parking lot to the interior entry gate. The need for a second pedestrian gate near the corner of Tassajara and Barrett Avenues should be reevaluated once the school reaches 75 percent enrollment and once data is collected on the number of students who walk to or from the school site with parents or caregivers.
The circulation patterns used when Tehiyah occupied the site would be maintained by Little Tree: all vehicles would enter the parking lot via Carquinez Avenue and would exit via Tassajara Avenue. Pavement legends and signage would be used in the parking lot to guide drivers and assist them in following the correct route. Between the parking lot and the campus, a 5'-0" tall wrought iron fence would be installed for safety and security purposes. In the parking lot, a clearly marked pedestrian pathway (with both pavement markings and signage) would be provided along with new landscaping islands to beautify and provide shade to the parking stalls. Additionally, bollard lights would be added throughout the parking lot to increase visibility and safety during the evening hours. **Figure 3** shows the proposed site plan, including the proposed changes to the existing on-site parking lot.

### Off-Site Pedestrian Safety Signage

Chapter 10 of the Caltrans Traffic Manual specifies standards and guidelines for school area pedestrian safety for grades kindergarten through 12th. Because Little Tree is operating a school for preschool children, these standards and guidelines do not necessarily apply. Fehr & Peers has reviewed the existing pedestrian safety signage around the site as well as the recommendations for school pedestrian safety signage made in the 1992 Tehiyah Day School Traffic Study (see [Appendix B](#)). At this time, it does not appear to be necessary to make any modifications to the existing signage given that few, if any, children will be walking to the site by themselves (as might be the case with a typical elementary, middle, or high school). We recommend reevaluating the need for changed or additional signage once school enrollment reaches 75 percent of its capacity and once data is collected on the number of students who walk to or from the school site by themselves.

### Loading Zone

Little Tree will maintain the existing loading zone (currently designated by a yellow curb) located adjacent to the school site on southbound Tassajara Ave just north of the intersection with Barrett Avenue. Little Tree will add appropriate signage identifying the area as a loading zone during school operating hours (e.g, loading only 8AM to 5PM Monday through Friday).
Parking

For the safety and security of the younger children which Little Tree serves in its preschool programs, parents or caregivers would be required to park in the on-site lot and walk preschool children into the school for both drop-off and pick-up. (The exception would be any families who might live close enough to walk their children to and from the site. They would also enter the school via the pedestrian gate adjacent to the parking lot.) Dropping off or picking up preschool children and signing in and out takes between 10 and 15 minutes, on average.

Little Tree is proposing to increase the number of on-site parking spaces by 11 spaces, from 49 to 60. This would include three spaces for those with disabled person parking placards. Based on estimated vehicle volumes, up to 40 parking spaces may be utilized during the peak morning drop-off period from 9:15-9:30 AM. Depending on staff arrival and departure times, on-site parking may be adequate to accommodate both staff parking needs and student drop-off in the morning. In the afternoons and early evenings, up to 44 vehicles may need to park on-site during the peak period from 5:15-5:30 PM. However, the school would have fewer staff on site at that time, and additional parking spaces would be available for student pick-up.

For older children in the afterschool program, it would not be necessary for families or caregivers to park and escort children in or out. Consequently, if it is the case that parking space is limited during particular times of the afternoon or early evening, we recommend that Little Tree provide a designated drive through pick-up area in the parking lot for children in the afterschool program, and that staff members provide supervision and assistance to children and drivers to ensure safety.

If additional parking capacity were to be needed, on-street parking would also be available on Barrett Avenue between Tassajara and Carquinez Avenues and adjacent to Tassajara Park. We recommend that staff be directed to park in these locations if additional on-site parking capacity is needed for drop-off and pick-up activity. To ensure that no school-related parking occurs on the portions of Tassajara or Carquinez Avenues adjacent to the school site, families and staff should be informed in writing of parking policies, and staff should regularly check to ensure that parking policies are being followed.

Recommendations

Because the peak period vehicle volumes generated by Little Tree are estimated to be less than the vehicle volume cap of 109 vehicles that was mandated for Tehiyah and are also less than the TDMP
goal of achieving a peak period vehicle volume of no more than 87 vehicles, neither a traffic impact analysis nor any off-site transportation improvements are recommended. Furthermore, we do not recommend that Little Tree implement any transportation demand management measures at this time beyond staggering start and end times due to the lower vehicle volumes estimated for Little Tree (in comparison to the maximum vehicle volume thresholds established for Tehiyah).

It is important to note that our conclusions are based on the projected program schedules and enrollment, and that actual traffic patterns could vary once the school opens. Consequently, we have included a recommendation that Little Tree collect and analyze parking and traffic data once enrollment reaches 75 percent, or approximately 186 students enrolled in preschool programs and 84 students enrolled in the afterschool program.

**Recommendation 1: Data Collection and Evaluation**

The purpose of this recommendation is to verify the vehicle volume and parking demand estimates reported in this memorandum and to identify any necessary changes to pedestrian access, circulation, parking, and signage. Once enrollment reaches 75 percent, or approximately 186 students enrolled in preschool programs and 84 students enrolled in the afterschool program, driveway counts should be collected at the on-site parking lot entry and exit for two weekdays. Counts should also include any pedestrians entering and exiting the school site.

In addition, observations of on-site parking utilization and dwell times during AM and PM periods should be made, as well as observation and analysis of overall traffic operations on-site. Information on off-street parking utilization should also be collected. A survey should be administered to families to determine how they travel to and from school and average vehicle occupancy for those who arrive by car or van.

Data collection and analysis should be conducted by an independent, third party transportation or traffic engineering consultant approved by the City, and the results and analysis, along with any recommended modifications, should be reported to the City’s Planning Division.

---

4 Conducting this evaluation at 75 percent enrollment will enable Little Tree to make any necessary changes and adjustments to traffic circulation, site access, and parking before full enrollment is achieved.
Recommendation 2: Provide Information about Traffic and Parking Restrictions and Requirements to Families of Students and Staff

Little Tree should provide families of students and staff with a transportation compliance form that they must read and acknowledge, similar to the one used by Tehiyah (see Appendix C). The form should clearly explain pick-up and drop-off procedures, site circulation and access, and neighborhood parking restrictions. This form should be reviewed and approved by the City’s Planning Division before the school opens.
Appendix A

Tehiyah Day School Transportation Demand Management Program
Transportation Demand Management Program for
Tehiyah Day School

2603 Tassajara Avenue, El Cerrito
Prepared October 15, 1996

This document presents a Transportation Demand Management Program for Tehiyah Day School, consistent with the Initial Study and Condition Item T-2 of Tehiyah Day School’s Use Permit issued by the City of El Cerrito, effective April 15, 1996. This program incorporates Tehiyah’s Annual Traffic Monitoring Program, consistent with Condition Item T-1e of the Permit.

Goals:

The goals of the Program are to ensure that:

A. traffic volumes do not increase over that in the base year (1995/96), as required by Tehiyah’s Use Permit;
B. traffic volumes decrease overtime to a level that is 80% of that in the base year (1995/96). The 80% figure goes beyond the requirements of Tehiyah’s Use Permit and represents Tehiyah’s efforts to satisfy concerns of neighborhood residents; and
C. demand for off-street parking does not exceed that experienced in the base year (1995/96).

Terminology:

- **Traffic Volume** is measured by the number of vehicles carrying students to and from Tehiyah during any single peak period. This number excludes staff and faculty vehicles.
- **Base Year Traffic Volume**, or 109 vehicles, is that peak traffic volume reported by the Initial Study of Tehiyah’s Master Plan.
- **Base Year Parking Volume** is 50 on-street parked vehicles, during either the AM or PM peak period, as reported in the Initial Study.
Performance Standards:

A. Traffic Volumes:

For this year (1996/97) and forward, the Transportation Demand Management Program (TDMP) will ensure that traffic volumes do not exceed 109 vehicles, the base year traffic volume. (See T-2, p.7 of the Permit for the original estimate). The TDMP proposes to reduce 1995/96 traffic volumes of 109 vehicles to 87 (80%) by the year 2000. This reduction will be phased in by reducing traffic volumes by approximately 25% percent (or 5 to 6 vehicles) per year, over each of the next four years.

B. Parking:

The Program will ensure that on-street parking does not exceed the base year (1995/96) of approximately 50 vehicles, during either AM or PM peak periods.

TDM Program Elements

1. Reduction in Traffic Volumes:

Year 1 (1996/97):

In accordance with the goals of the program, Tehiyah plans to reduce traffic volume to 104 vehicles by May, 1997, and maintain a 50-vehicle maximum, on-street parking by utilizing the following methods:

Though systematic evidence has yet to be collated, anecdotal reports suggest that current levels of traffic volume are at or below last year's levels. Enrollment has decreased in the school overall, and especially in our kindergarten classes. In our experiences, parents of younger children are more likely to drive children to school than those of older parents.

A. Traffic Monitoring Program (See below) will monitor the results of the traffic reduction program during both the AM and PM peak periods in order to assess current levels of traffic. The Traffic Monitoring Program will provide a snapshot of carpool usage and traffic levels by December, 1996 and a composite year-long picture by May, 1997.
B. Year 1 Programs:

- Tehiyah has initiated a Carpool Program, sending letters to families and lists of other families in their neighborhoods. This program will be continued through the year and intensified and redirected as necessary.

- If traffic or parking levels exceed the goal levels by the end of the 1996 calendar year, then the car pool program will be intensified during the spring term. Notices encouraging parents to sign up for car pools will be placed on a bulletin board outside the Tehiyah Office. Parents carpooling with less than two children as assessed by the traffic survey will be called and encouraged to pair with other parents who are seeking carpool opportunities. Results will be evaluated again in the spring to assess whether the goal of reducing traffic volume to 104 vehicles has been met.

C. Future Planning:
In the Spring of 1997, the traffic committee will evaluate the enrollment projections for the 1997/98 school year and the current carpool program successes to project whether the Year 2 goals are attainable through the carpool program. If necessary, the traffic committee will suggest mechanisms to increase ridership on Tehiyah's existing bus and to improve ridership on the existing AC Transit service. These mechanisms would take effect in the Fall of 1997. However, it is our expectation that the existing carpool and bus programs will allow us to meet both the Year 1 and Year 2 goals.

Year 2 (1997/98)

The TDM Program will implement a design to reduce traffic volume by an additional 25% to 98 vehicles as well as to maintain 50 vehicle maximum, on-street parking by May, 1998.

A. The Traffic Monitoring Program will provide a snapshot of carpool usage and traffic levels by December, 1997 and a composite year-long measure by May, 1997.

B. Year 2 Programs:
- The Carpool Program will continue, implementing whatever changes were adopted the previous spring. Again, this program will be continued through the year and intensified and redirected as necessary.

- If traffic or parking levels exceed the Year 2 goal levels by the end of the 1997 calendar year, then the car pool and bus programs will be reevaluated and possibly redirected during the spring term.
Traffic will be monitored again in the spring to assess whether the goal of reducing traffic volume to 98 vehicles has succeeded. Again, we expect to meet the Year 1 and Year 2 goals through an improved carpool program and possibly by increasing ridership on our existing bus, without adding a second school bus.

C. Future Planning:
In the Fall of 1997, the traffic committee will evaluate the enrollment projections for the 1998/99 school year and the current carpool program successes, to project whether the Year 3 goals are attainable through the carpool program and existing bus program. At this point, we expect additional traffic reductions may require increased bus service and possibly significant bus subsidies. The traffic committee will explore mechanisms to increase ridership on Tehiyah’s existing bus and the possibility of adding additional contract bus service, either through AC Transit or an independent firm.

If the committee’s recommendation requires increased expenditures for bus transit, then it will make its recommendation to the Board of Directors by December, 1997, for implementation in the fall of 1998.1

Year 3 (1998/1999)

Similar steps will be taken in Year 3 as in Year 2, in order to reduce traffic volume an additional 25% to 93 vehicles by May, 1999. The program will include a similar schedule of

A. Traffic Monitoring, with two snapshots of performance,
B. Year 3 Programs, including carpooling and whatever efforts were specified in the previous year, and
C. Future Planning, in the fall of 1998, to be implemented in the fall of 1999.

Year 4 (1999/2000)

Similar steps will be taken in Year 4 as in Year 3, in order to reduce traffic volume an additional 25% to 87 vehicles by May, 2000. The program will include a similar schedule of

A. Traffic Monitoring, with two snapshots of performance,
B. Year 4 Programs, including carpooling and whatever efforts were specified in the previous year, and

---

1 Tehiyah adopts a preliminary budget in January to take effect in the following school year. Thus the committee needs to make its recommendation practically a year prior to needing additional bus service.
C. *Future Planning,* in the Fall of 1999, to be implemented in the Fall of 2000.

If at this time -- or at any time during this program -- it appears that traffic targets cannot be met, then additional steps will be considered that are consistent with the recommendations of the Initial Study. These include evaluation and implementation of efforts to establish the school curriculum in staggered shifts and to schedule school arrivals by grade so as to reduce travel volume. Planning for these efforts will take place during the Fall of each year to be implemented in the Fall of the coming school year.

2. **Reduction in Parking Demand:**

Current anecdotal assessments indicate that parking demand on Tassajara north of Barrett, a major concern of neighbors prior to the granting of the use permit, has already been reduced because of the opening of the gate at Tassajara and Barrett and the closing of the entranceway to the school on Tassajara. If true, monitoring will need to be continued to assess the ongoing parking demand which changes as a function of enrollment at the school.

The TDM Program expects that on-street parking demand will decrease as traffic volumes decrease but will increase as enrollment and staff parking demand increase.

Tehiyah plans to maintain on-street parking demand at no more than 50 vehicles by:

a. continuing the Monitoring program to assess parent parking demand in the fall and spring of each academic year.

b. gathering annual data on increased parking demand of staff and determine the number of increased parking spaces used by staff.

If parking demand stabilizes at 45 vehicles or more, then the traffic committee will take the following actions:

- Use the Monitoring Program to evaluate who parks and when, to determine the source of parking demand (carpools, parents of younger kids, after school program users, etc.) and to identify appropriate options for reducing on-street parking demand.
- evaluate several options to reduce parking demand which may include some combination of drive through, temporary on-site parking during peak periods, and education programs of designated parent groups based on the results of the survey by the Monitoring Program.
3. Management and Schedule

The Tehiyah Monitoring Program and the Tehiyah Transportation Demand Management Program will be continued by the Tehiyah Board of Directors, with responsibilities for:

- ensuring that a Monitoring Committee develops and implements a monitoring schedule that annually assesses traffic volume, parking demand, and mode of transport.
- ensuring that a Traffic Committee prepares annual reports to be submitted to the City of El Cerrito on or about October 15 in each of the four targeted years of the Transportation Demand Management Program.

Annual Monitoring Program

The Annual Monitoring Program (AMP) is designed to meet the following requirements:

- Implementation of an annual traffic monitoring program as specified in Condition T-1e of the TDS Use Permit.
- Implementation of a transportation demand management program (TDM) as described in Conditions T-2b and T-2c of the Use Permit.

The Annual Monitoring Program shall include the following components:

- A regular traffic monitoring program.
- Periodic surveys of Tehiyah students.

Traffic Monitoring Program

The traffic count program will make periodic measurements of the following, during both the AM and PM peak periods:

- The number of vehicles exiting the Tehiyah parking lot.
- The number of vehicles parking on Tassajara south of Barrett.
- The number of vehicles parking on Tassajara north of Barrett.
- The number of vehicles parking on Barrett between Tassajara and Carquinez, and east (uphill) of Tassajara.

A sample data form is shown in Exhibit A. Data will be taken for a 1 hour period ending 15 minutes after the beginning of school or 15 minutes prior to the end of school. Over the course of the year, each count will be taken a total of three times in the AM and three times in the PM -- including one Wednesday (which has an early dismissal time that may influence traffic patterns), and two other days. The counts will be throughout the school year, so that by the end of the year there will be a
complete composite of traffic activity generated by the school. This composite count will be the basis for assessing progress toward traffic reduction goals.

_Tehiyah Student Survey_

The second component of the plan will be a twice-a-year survey of student access modes. The survey will be administered in the classroom once in the fall and once in the spring. Students will be asked how they are getting to and from school on the day of they survey, the number of other students coming in their vehicle, and whether the they came with a Tehiyah employee. In the upper grades, the survey will be self-administered, while in the lower grades teachers will administer the survey. A copy of the survey instrument is shown in Exhibit 2. Results will be compiled to calculate student mode splits and vehicle trips per student. In addition, the information will be used to more effectively target the TDM program.

_Reporting_

An annual report will be provided to the El Cerrito City Planning Division every year. It will be incorporated into the Transportation Demand Management Program Annual Report. This report will summarize:

- The counts of peak period parking activity, in the aggregate, by day of week, and by season of year.
- Trends in activity over the previous several years.
- Summaries of student mode split and vehicle trips per student, by age group, and by season.
- Trends in student mode split over the previous several years.

On the basis of the above, the report will assess goal attainment of the TDM program, and, where appropriate, identify modifications to that program that may be considered by the Traffic Committee to improve the program’s performance.

The report will also discuss and propose remedies for observed safety problems and violations of Tehiyah traffic policies.

Lastly, the report will consider the monitoring program itself, suggesting possible modifications of the monitoring program that will make it more efficient and effective.
TEHIYAH TRAFFIC COUNT PROGRAM

Location of Count:

☐ Tehiyah parking lot exit.
☐ Tassajara north of t Barrett.
☐ Tassajara south of Barrett.
☐ Barrett between Tassajara and Carquinez.

Date of Count: ____________________________

Time of Count:

☐ AM Peak (7:45-8:45 AM).
☐ PM Peak (3:15-4:15 PM except Wednesdays).
☐ Wednesday PM Peak (1:15-2:15 PM).

Name of Counter: _______________________

Please record data for 15 minute intervals—see example on first row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Cars Parked at Beginning of Period</th>
<th>Cars Parking or Exiting During Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:45</td>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note any unsafe or hazardous conditions observed.

Note any violations of TDS traffic policies (include car license plate # and any other identification).

I certify that the above data are true and correct, to the best of my knowledge.

Signed ____________________________ Dated ________________
TEHIYAH STUDENT TRANSPORTATION SURVEY

As a condition of approving the expansion of Tehiyah Day School, the city of El Cerrito requires that we monitor vehicle traffic generated by the school. To help us do this, please answer the following questions about your trip to and from school today.

Your Name: __________________________
Your Class: __________________________

How did you get to school today?

☐ Car
☐ Tehiyah school bus
☐ AC Transit bus
☐ Walk
☐ Bicycle
☐ Other

IF YOU CAME BY CAR:

How many other Tehiyah students came in the same car?

☐ None
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ More than 4 (How many? ___)

Did you come with a Tehiyah teacher or other employee?

☐ Yes
☐ No

How will you leave school today?

☐ Car
☐ Tehiyah school bus
☐ AC Transit bus
☐ Walk
☐ Bicycle
☐ Other

IF YOU WILL LEAVE BY CAR:

How many other Tehiyah students will leave in the same car?

☐ None
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4
☐ More than 4 (How many? ___)

Will you leave with a Tehiyah teacher or other employee?

☐ Yes
☐ No
Appendix B

1992 Tehiyah Day School Traffic Study
April 3, 1992

Mr. Mark Caughey, AICP
City Planner
City of El Cerrito
10890 San Pablo Avenue
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Subject: Tehiyah Day School Traffic Study

Dear Mr. Caughey:

This letter presents the results of DKS Associates’ traffic study for the proposed Tehiyah Day School expansion. The proposed expansion increases the number of students from its current level of just over 200 to 400 students.

The approach to the study consisted of collecting information concerning existing conditions and, based on the existing conditions, determining the future auto traffic. An inventory of school area traffic control devices was conducted for Tehiyah Day School. Caltrans requirements for school area traffic control devices and adult crossing guards were reviewed. Based on the inventory of the existing traffic control devices, review of Caltrans guidelines and future school traffic, recommendations were made for new traffic control devices.

Background

Tehiyah Day School is located on the north side of Barrett Avenue between Tassajara Avenue and Carquinez Avenue in El Cerrito. During the 1991-1992 school year, the school has an enrollment of approximately 208 students. The students are from Berkeley, Oakland, Albany, El Cerrito, Richmond, and a few other communities from the north with the majority from Berkeley and Oakland. Students are dropped off by parents, take AC Transit Route 7, or ride the school bus. Five students are dropped off in the morning by car and walk home from school.¹

Mr. Mark Caughey, AICP
April 3, 1992
Page 2

The existing classroom buildings are located on the southern part of the site. The proposed additional buildings to accommodate increased enrollment would be located between a recently constructed parking lot on the north end of the site and the existing buildings.

On March 9, 1992, the Day School began to provide traffic access on the north side of the site for passenger pick-up and drop-off. Vehicle traffic flows from Carquinez Avenue into a recently constructed parking lot and exits on Tassajara Avenue. Figure 1 shows the new parking lot location.

The school day starts at 8:30 A.M. on weekday mornings. Some students arrive before the school day to attend morning prayer services which begin at 8:00 A.M. The school days ends at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday and at 2:30 P.M. on Wednesday for grades 1 through 8. The kindergarten school day ends at 1:30 P.M. The day school provides day care and approximately 20 kindergarten students stay past 1:30 P.M. and remain at day care. The school also provides the day care service past the end of the school day so that some students are picked up between 4:00 P.M. and 5:30 P.M.

Existing Traffic Patterns

DKS staff observed arrival and departure patterns and conducted traffic surveys on March 18, March 24 and March 25, 1992. The surveys consisted of counting the number of vehicles dropping off or picking up students, counting the number of students arriving or departing by automobile or bus and noting the turnover of automobiles parking for school purposes.

Students are dropped off and picked up in the new parking lot area and on Tassajara Avenue. Although the school administration has notified the parents to use the new access on the north end of the site, some parents continue to drop off and pick up students at the entrance on Tassajara Avenue. Some parents continue to use Tassajara Avenue because the existing classroom buildings are located close to this entrance.

Many of the parents after dropping off or before picking up the students park the vehicles to do school business, e.g., pay the tuition. Some parents park on the west side of Tassajara Avenue north of Barrett Avenue, on Barrett Avenue in front of the school on both the north and south sides of the street, and on Tassajara Avenue south of Barrett Avenue. In all cases observed, the parents who parked on Barrett Avenue or on Tassajara Avenue south of Barrett walked with the children into the school or picked up the students in the school and walked with the students to the automobile.

The school staff have noted that they strictly enforce their internal rules against double parking, U-turns and other driver conduct which is disruptive to the neighborhood. From our observations over several days, no driver attempted conduct which would cause conflict with pedestrians or other vehicles.
Table 1 summarizes the number of automobiles and students involved in arriving to and departing from school by automobile obtained from our survey. The average occupancy in Table 1 is the number of students per vehicle. The average occupancy ranges from 1.81 to 2.48.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Survey</th>
<th>Autos</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Average(^2) Occupancy</th>
<th>Autos</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Average(^2) Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/18/92</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/92</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Traffic surveys conducted during the morning and afternoon of Wednesday, March 18, 1992, the afternoon of Tuesday, March 24, 1992, and the morning of Wednesday, March 25, 1992.

2 The average occupancy is the average number of students per vehicle. The occupancy does not include the driver.

The school currently provides private bus service from Oakland and Berkeley with a 42-passenger school bus. The school has recognized an increased demand for this service and has plans to provide service with a 66-passenger school bus by the 1992-1993 school year. The school bus uses the new access on the northern part of the site to drop-off students in the morning. In the afternoon, the school bus waits on Tassajara Avenue at Barrett Avenue to pick-up the students.

Approximately 30 or more students use AC Transit. AC Transit Route 7 traveling eastbound has a stop on Barrett Avenue across from the school at Carquinez Avenue. AC Transit Route 7 traveling westbound has a stop on Barrett Avenue in front of the south side of the school at the corner of Carquinez Avenue. The majority of the students travel from Berkeley and Oakland on AC Transit and therefore use the bus stop on the north side of Barrett in the morning and use the bus stop on the south side of Barrett in the afternoon.

Table 2 presents the travel modes observed in the field. As noted earlier, five students arrive at school by auto and walk home. In the morning, the peak arrival period is between 8:00 A.M. and 8:40 A.M. Some students arrive earlier for prayer services held at 8:00 A.M. In the afternoon, the peak departure period is between 3:25 P.M. and 3:50 P.M. when the majority of the students leave at the end of the school day. Other students leave later due to
participating in extracurricular school activities or remaining at school for day care services. Also, the kindergarten students not remaining in day care leave at 1:30 P.M.

| Table 2 |
|---|---|
| **Existing Student Travel Modes** | **Tehiyah Day School** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>--- Arrival ---</th>
<th>--- Departure ---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The counts for arrival were taken between 8:00 A.M. and 8:40 A.M. when the majority of the students arrive at school.
2. The counts for departure were taken between 3:25 P.M. and 3:50 P.M. when the majority of the students leave school.
3. From counts conducted on the afternoon of Tuesday, March 24, 1992 and the morning of Wednesday, March 25, 1992.

The majority of the students carpool to school. The number of students using AC Transit are approximately the same in the morning as in the afternoon. Since there is a demand for the school bus, if an opening is available for the morning or afternoon, the seat is usually filled.

**School Area Traffic Devices**

School area traffic control devices are located on Barrett Avenue, Tassajara Avenue and Carquinez Avenue. The traffic control signs are warning signs for motorists to be aware of school age pedestrians and are illustrated as Sign A and Sign B in Figure 1. Yellow-painted crosswalks are located at the intersections of Tassajara Avenue/Barrett Avenue and Carquinez Avenue/Barrett Avenue. The yellow-painted crosswalks along Barrett Avenue indicate that the major "suggested route to school" for school pedestrians is along this roadway. Figure 1 attached shows the location of the existing signage and crosswalks.
Future Traffic Circulation

The analysis assumed a 400-student enrollment at Tehiyah Day School which is approximately a doubling of student enrollment. First, we determined the future travel modes of students based on these assumptions:

1. The school bus service increase is assumed to be from one to two school buses -- one 66-passenger bus and one 42-passenger bus. For the future projection, it is assumed that 108 students would use the school bus service.

2. The increase in enrollment will come from the same areas that they serve today as these are well established Jewish communities.²

3. The percentage of students arriving or departing during the peak periods will remain the same in the future. In the future, about 75 percent of the students arrive during the morning peak period and about 65 percent depart during the afternoon peak period. Table 3 presents the projected travel mode assuming a 400-student enrollment.

| Table 3 |
| ---Future Student Mode Split¹ |
| Tehiyah Day School |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>---Arrival²---</th>
<th></th>
<th>---Departure³---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Assumes enrollment of 400 students at the day school.
² Arrival peak period of 8:00 A.M. to 8:40 A.M.
³ Departure peak period of one-half hour from the time school ends for the day.

² Based on discussions with Linda Riff, Tehiyah Day School, on March 3, 1992.
The key concern is the number of vehicles picking up students. In the morning, the turnover time is very short. Parents drive in the new north access and drop off students or drop-off on Tassajara Avenue. School staff is currently asking parents not to use Tassajara Avenue. In the afternoon, some parents park and wait for students. Therefore, this peak period is more crucial in the analysis of the traffic flow.

The projected number of vehicles arriving in the afternoon peak period is calculated by dividing the future number of students departing by carpool by the average occupancy. For the worst-case, the analysis assumed 1.81, the lower of the two occupancies determined in the survey and listed in Table 1. Thus, the projected number of vehicles arriving in the afternoon peak period is 53 vehicles, i.e. 96 students divided by 1.81 students per vehicle.

From observations in the field, at any one time during the afternoon peak, about one-half of the total number of vehicles were at the school at the same time. Therefore, for our analysis, it was expected that about one-half of the vehicles in the future, or 27 vehicles, would be at the school at the same time to pick up students.

This number of vehicles can be accommodated at the new access location (parking lot) on the north side of the site, on the west side of Tassajara Avenue, and on Barrett Avenue. The school staff should continue efforts in establishing the new access as the location for picking up students; this will be accomplished more easily in the future since proposed school buildings will be located closer to the parking lot. The perception today is that the school is located closer at the Tassajara entrance because the existing buildings are near the Tassajara entrance and not the north access.

**Warrants**

**Adult Crossing Guards.** Section 10-07 of the Caltrans Traffic Manual presents a discussion on the use of adult crossing guards. Adult crossing guards are not traffic control devices, but rather a supplemental method for providing elementary school pedestrians assistance and guidance in crossing public highways located along the "suggested route to school." Adult crossing guards should not direct traffic in the usual police regulatory manner, but should pick opportune times to create a safe gap in the traffic stream for pedestrians. Adult crossing guards may be considered when one of the following conditions exists:

- special problems exist which make it necessary to assist elementary school pedestrians in crossing the street, such as at an unusually complicated intersection with frequent turning movements and vehicular speeds above the posted speed limit; or

- a change in the school crossing location is imminent but prevailing conditions require school crossing supervision for a limited time and it is infeasible to install another form of control for a temporary period.
The Caltrans warrants for adult crossing guards at uncontrolled crossing such as those in the area of Tehiyah Day School are specified for the following conditions:

"at uncontrolled crossings" where there are not any alternative controlled crossings within 600 feet; and

a. in urban areas, an adult crossing guard may be warranted where the vehicular traffic volume exceeds 350 vehicles per hour (vph) and the pedestrian volume exceeds 40 pedestrians either going to or returning from school during each of any two hours.

b. in rural areas, the above values are 300 vph and 30 daily pedestrian crossings."

The traffic and pedestrian volumes on Barrett Avenue or Tassajara Avenue do not warrant an adult crossing guard for the day school.

**Pedestrian Crosswalks.** In general, there are two schools of thought pertaining to the use of pedestrian crosswalks:

- if a crosswalk is painted, then the motorist will be cognizant of a crossing pedestrian, and proceed with extra caution, thereby reducing the likelihood of a conflict between the motorist and the pedestrian

- if a crosswalk is painted, the pedestrian may be more likely to walk into a potential conflict with a motorist by expecting that the motorist will yield the right-of-way

It is obvious that both arguments have good intentions that are aimed toward improving the safety of pedestrians. The City of San Diego conducted a study in the mid 1960s in an effort to determine the merits of painted crosswalks as compared to unpainted crosswalks.\(^3\) The City collected data at 400 intersections, each having one painted and one unpainted crosswalk across the major street, for five years (1963 to 1967). Based on their data, the City concluded that "in terms of the number of pedestrian using the crosswalks, approximately twice as many pedestrian accidents occur in marked crosswalks as in unmarked crosswalks... the poor accident record of marked crosswalks is not due to the crosswalk being 'marked' as much as it is a reflection on the pedestrian's attitude and lack of caution when using the marked crosswalks." The Caltrans *Traffic Manual* points out that emphasis should be "placed on the use of marked crosswalks as a pedestrian channelization device rather than as a safety device."

School crosswalks should be used to channel pedestrian traffic along the "suggested route to school." The Caltrans *Traffic Manual* points out that at all intersections located along the

---

"suggested route to school," yellow painted or marked school crosswalks should be installed if the following conditions exist:

- potential conflict exists between motorists and school age pedestrians,
- school age pedestrians are permitted to cross between intersections, or
- school age pedestrians could not otherwise recognize the proper place to cross

Since some students cross Barrett Avenue and Tassajara Avenue to or from a vehicle parked on the east side of Tassajara south of Barrett, a crosswalk should be painted across Tassajara Avenue south of Barrett. The crosswalk is to guide the students across Tassajara and Barrett to the school. Crosswalk lines should be solid lines no less than 12 inches in width and should mark both edges of the crosswalk. The crosswalk should not be less than six feet in width. In order to discourage diagonal walking between crosswalks, both edge lines of the crosswalk should extend the full width of pavement. Diagonal or longitudinal lines may be used to mark the area of the crosswalk when added emphasis of the crosswalk is required. These lines should be 12 to 24 inches in width and be spaced 12 to 24 inches apart. Figure 1 shows the location of the existing and recommended crosswalks. The use of school crosswalks is also outlined by the State of California in Section 21368 of the California Vehicle Code (see attachment).

Recommendations

The following are recommendations concerning the Tehiyah Day School area traffic control should the proposed expansion to 400 students occur:

- **School area traffic control signs** should be located on Tassajara Avenue south of Barrett Avenue and on Carquinez Avenue just north of the school site as noted in Figure 1. The existing sign on Tassajara Avenue south of Barrett Avenue should be removed. The proposed signage on Tassajara Avenue provides forewarning of a school crossing. On Carquinez Avenue, the proposed sign warns motorists of a school area before reaching the new access at the north end parking lot.

- **Pedestrian crosswalks** should be painted on Tassajara Avenue south of Barrett Avenue as shown in Figure 1. This marked crosswalk is a channelization device rather than a safety device, e.g., the crosswalk should be used to channel pedestrian traffic along the "suggested route to school."

- **Loading zone curb painting** for the school bus loading on Tassajara Avenue should be extended. The existing curb on the west side is painted yellow for approximately 50 feet from Barrett Avenue to the north. The curb should be painted yellow for 100 feet starting from the crosswalk and going to the north along Tassajara Avenue as shown in Figure 1. The school should provide some signage noting that this area is for "buses only" from 2:00 P.M. to 4:00 P.M. Other commercial vehicles could use the area at other times of the day.
• School administration should continue their enforcement measures to encourage motorists to use the parking lot for dropping off and picking up students and their internal rules against double parking, U-turns and other driver conduct which would cause conflict with pedestrians or other vehicles.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to call me at (510) 763-2061.

Sincerely,

DKS ASSOCIATES
A California Corporation

Carolyn Gonot Wieczorek

Carolyn Gonot Wieczorek, P.E.
Project Manager
NOTES:

1. Install Sign A
2. Install Sign B
3. Remove Sign A
4. Paint Yellow Crosswalk
5. Paint Curb Yellow 100 Feet
6. Install Sign B

LEGEND:
- Existing Sign
- Proposed Sign
- Existing Crosswalk
- Proposed Crosswalk
- A/C AC Transit Bus Stop

Figure 1
PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS
Tehiyah Day School
Appendix C

Tehiyah Transportation Compliance Form
TEHIYAH TRANSPORTATION COMPLIANCE FORM

This agreement is required by the City of El Cerrito as a condition of Tehiyah’s use permit. Each family and employee must initial this agreement in all provided spaces and return it before school begins.

Child(ren)’s/Employee’s Name(s):

Please list all drivers (parent, guardian, siblings, au pair, sitter, etc.) going to and from Tehiyah, and their vehicle information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Make/Model/Color of Vehicle</th>
<th>License Plate #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic generated by the school impacts the surrounding neighborhood. Our use permit requires that we follow a stringent set of traffic rules to alleviate that impact. Tehiyah Day School enforces the following rules, which apply to every employee, parent, guardian, and/or designated driver (e.g. childcare provider) that drives to the school.

Parking Choices

- Parents and visitors are encouraged to park in the school parking lot. Employees are required to park in the school parking lot unless space is unavailable.
- You may park anywhere on Barrett between Tassajara and Carquinez (except in the bus zones, crosswalks, or red zones).
- You may park anywhere on Barrett east of the school (uphill).
- You may park on the west side of Tassajara north of the school (alongside the park).

Please initial that you have read and understood these rules ___

Parking Restrictions

- You may not park anywhere on Tassajara or Carquinez north of Barrett at any time (along-side the school).
- Do not park in the school driveway/emergency entrance on Tassajara near Barrett.
- Do not stop or park with the rear of your car projecting into traffic lanes.
- Do not double park.

Please initial that you have read and understood these rules ___

Other Restrictions

- Do not use any driveways – those of the school or its neighbors – to turn around, back up, or facilitate a three-point or U turn.
- Do not make a three-point or U turn at either the intersection of Barrett and Tassajara, or Barrett and Carquinez. U turns are not permitted on any street within a two-block radius of Tehiyah at any time.

Please initial that you have read and understood these rules ___

Turn Over ➤
**Drop off and Pickup**

- Children can only be dropped off or picked up in the school parking lot. Do not drop your child off on Barrett, Carquinez, or Tassajara Avenues under any circumstances.
- If you park on the street, you must walk your child to the school grounds. Under no circumstances are parents to double park on any street or allow their children to cross any street without supervision.
- Traffic flow in and out of the school parking lot is a one-way system as follows:
  - Enter only from Carquinez. Pull forward as far as possible to prevent waiting cars from backing up onto Carquinez.
  - When dropping off in the snorkel lane: Enter the gate, pull as far forward as possible, and unload your children as quickly as possible in the designated zone. Follow all the posted signs and instructions given by staff.
  - When picking up: If your children have not yet arrived at the pick-up area, pull forward and follow directions of staff. Do not leave your car when parked in the pick-up lane. If staff instructs you that the gates will be closed, pull out of the pick-up lane and park in an available space in the parking lot.
  - Exit the lot only from Tassajara Avenue – right turn only out of the lot.
  - Never drive northbound on Tassajara north of Barrett.

**Please initial that you have read and understood these rules _____**

**Infractions**

- **First Infraction:** Parent, guardian, or Tehiyah employee will receive a written warning and a second copy of the Tehiyah Traffic Agreement which must be signed and returned to the Tehiyah office within seven days.
- **Second Infraction:** Parent or guardian will receive a $25 fine, which will be billed by the business office. Tehiyah employees will be subject to administrative action.
- **Third Infraction:** Parent or guardian will receive a $50 fine, which will be billed by the business office.
- **Fourth Infraction:** Children will be required to take either the Tehiyah bus or public transportation to and from school.

**Please initial that you have read and understood these rules _____**

**Please complete all requested information below.**

I/we the undersigned, parent(s) or guardian(s) of ____________________________ enrolled at Tehiyah Day School, and/or Tehiyah employee, have read this section in its entirety and will abide by the traffic regulations and procedures. Any designated driver of my/our children will be informed of, and will also abide by, this agreement. I/we acknowledge that if any driver of our children or any Tehiyah employee violates the rules in this agreement, I/we shall be subject to the enforcement terms stated above.

Parent/Guardian/Employee Signature: _______________________________________

For school use only Accepted by: ______________________ Date: ____________________
05 February 2019

Tree Inventory & Preservation Report
Little Tree Montessori School
2603 Tassara Avenue
El Cerrito CA

Prepared by:
INSIDEOUT DESIGN
6000 Harwood Avenue
Oakland, CA 94618
510.655.7674
www.aboutinsideout.com
Tree Inventory at the Little Tree Montessori school campus, 2603 Tassajara Ave, El Cerrito, California

Dear Janice,

We have prepared the following report evaluating the health of each tree within the vicinity of the proposed site improvements, the potential impacts that may be placed on each tree, preservation or removal recommendations, and recommended tree protection measures. Our work included the following:

1. Trees with diameters equal to, or greater than, 4” numerically tagged on site.
2. Identification of each tree species.
3. Identification of ‘Significant Trees’, measuring a minimum of 12” in diameter 4½ feet above grade.
4. Approximate tree location (trees were not included in civil survey).
5. Documentation of approximate dripline for each tree, in plan.
6. Notation of structural deficiencies (decay, cavities, disease, dieback, etc.)
7. Preparation of a Tree Inventory Map.
8. General Tree Protection Guidelines

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to document the existing trees and assess the structural integrity and general health of each species. Trees recommended for removal are based on either structural deficiencies, potential hazards, or trees planted too closely to one another.

SITE SUMMARY

The site is located at 2603 Tassajara Avenue in the eastern hills of El Cerrito. The existing campus is situated between Tassajara Avenue and Carquinez Avenue, bordered by Barrett Avenue to the south, and existing residences to the north. The entire site is developed, with classrooms being concentrated in the center and southern portions of the site, while the vehicular circulation and a parking lot are to the north. This northern portion of the property is where current
vehicular ingress and egress are located at Carquinez Avenue and Tassajara Avenue, respectively, and will be remaining as such, with updates to capacity and route of student drop-off.

The proposed site improvements are in the northern half of the campus. Trees have been tagged within 30’ of any proposed site disturbances. Existing trees include: Pittosporum (*Pittosporum crassifolium* & one *P. eugenioides*), Cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster spp.*), volunteer plums and cherries (*Prunus spp.*), a grove of manzanita (*Arctostaphylos manzanita ‘Dr. Hurd’*), a grove of Brazilian cherry (*Eugenia uniform*), student-planted August Lady peaches (*Prunus persica ‘August Lady’*) and nectarines (*Prunus persica*), olives (*Olea europaea*), an Italian buckthorn (*Rhamnus alaternus*), and a yucca (*Yucca sp.*).

A great quantity of trees and species flank the school and act as a buffer between the campus and the bordering avenues. While the buffer provides screening, it is recommended that some trees in decline and with low retention values either be thinned out and/or replaced. English ivy has also invaded many of the trees and should be cut back to promote the health of the trees so that the natural architecture of certain specimens may be exposed. This applies most particularly the grove of thriving manzanita. The three olives in planters in the playground could be replaced with a more suitable shade tree.

All trees greater than 4 inches in diameter have been identified and numbered 101–165. Trees are listed in numerical order on the tree table below.

Per conversations with the project architect, no new grading is proposed except at the northeast corner of property where 2 new parking stalls are proposed. This will require the removal of one tree. This is the only tree on-site impacted due to the proposed site improvements, all other recommended tree removals are either based on trees in severe decline or where removal(s) may benefit adjacent trees. This latter concern particularly applies to the grove of trees between the campus and Carquinez Avenue. A number of trees are growing too close to one another and have subsequently become ‘crowded’, allowing for little light and competing for available nutrients. Some of recommended tree removals in this zone have been identified as “To Be Determined”. It is suggested that the project arborist, the project team and stakeholders walk this zone to determine which trees should remain. It is understood that the school would like to retain as many trees as possible.

If a proposed Grading Plan is eventually developed, this report may need to be updated to determine if additional trees may be adversely impacted.
TREE INVENTORY & ASSESSMENT

A site visit was conducted on January 23, 2019.

Each tree was evaluated on a scale from 1-5 based on the following criteria:

- **Structure (S) & Health (H) (1-5)**
  - 1 = poorest rating
  - 5 = best rating

- **Retention Value (RV) (1-5)**
  - 1 = dead
  - 2 = Poor condition: extreme problems, or tree in severe decline (removal usually recommended based on poor health and potential hazard)
  - 3 = Fair condition: minor problems that can be usually remedied through basic arboriculture procedures, i.e. pruning, fertilization; (tree retention optional)
  - 4 = Good condition: no apparent problems (tree preservation recommended)
  - 5 = Tree exhibits balanced structure, vigor and exceptional health (tree preservation strongly encouraged)

While trees that receive a rating from 3-5 are deemed as worthy to preserve, it does not preclude them from being removed. The parameters of the site conditions, construction layout, cost of development, and other unforeseen factors must all be considered in the preservation of any particular tree.

Diameters (DIA) were measured at 54” above grade with a diameter tape.
# Tree Inventory and Observations for 2603 Tassajara Avenue

## Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIA</th>
<th>Diameter (in inches) of trunk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>Retention Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Trees of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Tree Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree #</th>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>DIA (inches)</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>RV</th>
<th>OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>SAVE/ REMOVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Toyon</td>
<td>7, 6, 3,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5&quot; leader bifurcates into two with included bark; some limbs intertwined and interfering with growth; moderate deadwood. Prune deadwood and intertwined limbs.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5, 4, 9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Italian Buckthorn</td>
<td>4.5, 3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5&quot; leader, codominant leaders at root corn with included bark; provided screening from Tassajara; potential thrips infestation. Crowded by adjacent trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>3, 4.5, 4,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3&quot; limbs; covered in ivy; minor/moderate deadwood; part of a grove. Prune deadwood and remove ivy.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>3, 2, 2, 1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Crowded; limited light; ivy throughout canopy, but not covered; part of a grove. Prune deadwood and remove ivy.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>3, 3.5, 3,</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1&quot; leader interfering with 107; minor deadwood; ivy at base and into lower canopy; part of a grove. Prune deadwood and remove ivy down to root crown.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>2.5, 3.5,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minor/modead deadwood; ivy at base and into lower canopy; part of a grove. Prune deadwood and remove ivy.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>2.5, 3,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sparse leaf development and moderate deadwood; codominant branch union at 5' above grade; included bark; tree stake and cable embedded into bark. Removal recommended and replacement with more suitable species for the shady location.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5, 3, 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Sparse leaf development and moderate deadwood; codominant branch union at 5' above grade; included bark; tree stake and cable embedded into bark.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Sparse leaf development and lean to west; codominant branch union at 4' above grade; broken leader. Removal recommended and replacement with more suitable species for the shady location.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Sparse leaf development and lean to west; codominant branch union at 4' above grade; broken leader. Removal recommended and replacement with more suitable species for the shady location.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Pittosporum c.</td>
<td>3, 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Codominant branch union 12&quot; above grade; sparse canopy; crowded; provides buffer from Carquinez.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree #</td>
<td>SPECIES</td>
<td>DIA</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>RV</td>
<td>OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SAVE/ REMOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>4, 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leaders growing from stump; provides buffer from Carquinez.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Pittosporum c.</td>
<td>3, 2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crowded; provides buffer from Carquinez.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>7, 5.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5&quot; dead leader; provides buffer from Carquinez. Prune 5.5&quot; leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crowded; cavity in central leader with signs of minor decay; provides buffer from Carquinez.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Cotoneaster</td>
<td>3, 3, 2, 3, 1 (x9)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two 3&quot; leaders and some of the 1&quot; leaders are intertwined; crowded; provides buffer from Carquinez.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>4.5, 4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Majority of growth are suckers from stump; two 3.5&quot; leaders are dead; provides buffer from Carquinez. Consider removal to benefit adjacent trees.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>3.5, 3.5, 4.5, 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Previous prunings have compartmentalized; provides buffer from Carquinez.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Codominant branch union 4.5&quot; above grade; moderate/significant deadwood; ivy at base; significant insect damage to leaf; provides buffer from Carquinez. Prune deadwood and remove ivy at base.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Pittosporum c.</td>
<td>3, 4, 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Canopy leans to west; crowded; ivy at base growing into canopy; provides buffer from Carquinez. If preserved, remove ivy at base.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>2.5, 8, 7, 6, 8, 6.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate/significant branch dieback; intertwined leaders; pockets of decay on 8&quot; leader; ivy at base growing into canopy; provides buffer from Carquinez. Fungal infection.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Cotoneaster</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Multiple 1&quot; leaders; grows horizontally to west; significant dieback; crowded; ivy at base; provides buffer from Carquinez. Consider removal to benefit adjacent trees.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>4, 1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grows to west; crowded; insect damage to leaf; ivy at base; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy; consider treating infection.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>4, 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Codominant branch union at 3' above grade, insect damage to leaf; crowded; ivy at base coming up central leader; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy; consider treating infection.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Yucca</td>
<td>3, 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Significant dead fronds in lower canopy; crowded; ivy overtaking; provides buffer from Carquinez. Consider removal to benefit adjacent trees.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>9, 8, 2 (x8)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8&quot; leader is dead, 9&quot; leader is in decline; majority of leaf production from 2&quot; suckers; ivy at root crown up to 4'; provides buffer from Carquinez. Consider removal to benefit adjacent trees.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ivy at root crown; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree #</td>
<td>SPECIES</td>
<td>DIA</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>RV</td>
<td>OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SAVE/ REMOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45° lean to west; ivy at root crown; provides buffer from Carquinez. Minor to moderate fungal infection. Remove ivy; consider treating infection.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Pittosporum c.</td>
<td>3, 2.5, 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor branch union 18” above grade with included bark¹; provides buffer from Carquinez.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>3.5, 2.5, 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poor branch union at grade; ivy at root crown coming up to leaders at 2’; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Pittosporum c.</td>
<td>2.5, 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lower branch union between two leaders; 2.5” leader is missing bark and showing signs of decay; ivy at root crown; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>3.5, 2.5, 3, 7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Poor branch union at base; leaders graft into each other; previous pruning shows decay; insect damage to leaf; provides buffer from Carquinez. Consider removal to benefit adjacent trees.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Pittosporum c.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Previous pruning shows decay; ivy at root crown up 6’ to central leader; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Severely in decline and nearly dead; provides buffer from Carquinez. Consider removal to benefit adjacent trees.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>7, 5, 4.5, 2.2, 2.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Multiple suckered leaders growing out of base; ivy at base; provides significant buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Pittosporum eugenioides</td>
<td>9, 6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Poor branch union at 4’ above grade and codominant; previous prunings have not compartmentalized; 6” cavity at union with decay; 6” leader topped; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>3.5, 4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ivy at root crown travelling up leaders to 6’; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>6, 6, 6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Codominant branch union at 18” above grade with included bark¹; moderate deadwood; previous prunings have not compartmentalized; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ivy at root crown; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>4, 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ivy at root crown; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leaning west; crowded; minor/moderate deadwood; ivy at root crown travelling up central leader to 4’; provides buffer from Carquinez. Prune deadwood; remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Pittosporum c.</td>
<td>3, 3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crowded; ivy at root crown; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Pittosporum c.</td>
<td>5, 4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crowded; ivy at root crown; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree #</td>
<td>SPECIES</td>
<td>DIA</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>RV</td>
<td>OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SAVE/ REMOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grows 45° to west; crowded from 143; ivy at root crown; provides buffer from Carquinez. Remove ivy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bulbous base, minor leaf damage.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Prunus sp.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Codominant leaders; decay noted at base; significant fungal infection. Consider removal to benefit adjacent trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Eugenia sp.</td>
<td>6.5, 2.5, 4, 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intertwining limbs, multiple poor branch unions with included bark; narrow crotch branch unions throughout canopy; decay at previous pruning; ivy at root crown; crowded; substantial buffer. Prune intertwining limbs; remove ivy.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Eugenia sp.</td>
<td>4.5, 5.5, 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Codominant branch union with included bark between 5.5° &amp; 4°; narrow crotch branch unions throughout canopy; decay noted at base between branch unions and at previous pruning; ivy at root crown; crowded; substantial buffer. Consider removal to benefit adjacent trees.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Eugenia sp.</td>
<td>5.5, 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Narrow crotch branch unions throughout canopy; ivy at root crown; crowded; substantial buffer. Prune/remove ivy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Eugenia sp.</td>
<td>3.5, 5, 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Narrow crotch branch unions throughout canopy; ivy growing up into canopy; crowded; substantial buffer. Prune/remove ivy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Eugenia sp.</td>
<td>5, 3.5, 3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Narrow crotch branch unions throughout canopy; ivy growing at root crown; crowded; substantial buffer. Prune/remove ivy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Eugenia sp.</td>
<td>4, 2, 2.5, 5.5, 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intertwining limbs interfering with growth; narrow crotch branch unions throughout canopy; decay noted at previous pruning; ivy growing up into canopy; crowded; substantial buffer. Prune/remove ivy.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>August Lady peach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Planted by students; alongside parking lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August Lady peach</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Given the educational history of the tree planting, efforts should be made to preserve tree.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Nectarine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>August Lady peach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Nectarine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>August Lady peach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Nectarine</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree #</td>
<td>SPECIES</td>
<td>DIA</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>RV</td>
<td>OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SAVE/ REMOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>August Lady peach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Planted by students; alongside parking lot. Proposed addition of 2 parking stalls requires removal.</td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Cotoneaster</td>
<td>5, 5, 3.5, 3.5, 3.5, 3, 3.5, 2, 3.5, 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minor/moderate deadwood; ivy throughout dripline. Remove ivy &amp; properly prune branches that were previous lopped.</td>
<td>Save</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Cotoneaster</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not accessible. Untagged and fenced off between gym and Tassajara Ave.</td>
<td>Save</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* * * * *</td>
<td>Save</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* * * *</td>
<td>Save</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* * * *</td>
<td>Save</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Included bark: bark that becomes embedded in crotch between branch and trunk or between codominant stems or leaders, causing weak structure. Such conditions may increase the likelihood of failure.
General Tree Protection and Preservation Guidelines

The objective of the tree protection and preservation guidelines is to provide the necessary information to ensure the continued health of existing trees within the proximity of construction and grading activities. Trees selected for preservation should be structurally sound and healthy so that they may survive any adverse impacts due to construction activity. Tree removal recommendations are based on conflicts with the proposed buildable areas, noted deformities, their potential failures, and trees that present a hazard.

As the project progresses, the following Tree Protection procedures must be exercised:

1.0 Tree Documentation

1.1 Indicate removal or preservation of all existing trees on an appropriately sized plan. Trees shall be identified and numbered as tagged on site. Dripline locations for each tree to remain should be shown on all relevant plans (as shown on the Tree Inventory Plan). See attached.

2.0 Tree Protection

2.1 The majority of the sensitive root structure of a tree is located within the top 6 to 12 inches of soil. This renders them vulnerable to soil compaction, often due to construction activity, limiting available oxygen and leading to stress and potential demise. This upper region of a tree is known as the critical root zone.

2.2 In an effort to protect the critical root zone, Tree Protective Fencing shall be erected. This temporary fencing will designate the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ). The fencing is a critical component to the preservation of existing trees.

2.3 Tree Protective Fencing (see Attachment 1) should ideally be placed at the dripline of the tree to be protected, or beyond. The following Tree Protective Fence criteria shall be employed:

2.3.1 All protective fencing shall be located under the direction of the project arborist. The fencing is to remain in place until the end of construction activity.

2.3.2 We recommend the fence be aligned with any proposed retaining walls or structural walls at the minimum distance which allows for the necessary excavation for wall installation (see Item 5.0).

2.3.3 Protective fencing shall be continuous and be comprised of chainlink fabric mounted to steel posts driven firmly into ground (not mounted into concrete bases and set at grade). The spacing of the posts shall not exceed 10 feet in distance.

2.3.4 Protective fencing shall be clearly indicated with a laminated sign reading 'DO NOT ENTER'. The sign shall also indicate that the project arborist is
the only designated individual who may open, move or modify the location of the protective fencing.

2.3.5 No excavated fill, chemicals, debris, equipment, or any other materials shall be dumped or stored within the TPZ.

2.3.6 Fencing should be a 6-foot high chain link type, secured by metal posts, and driven a minimum of 24” into the ground.

2.3.7 A minimum 3” layer of mulch shall be applied to all areas within the Tree Protection Zone for trees located outside the creek embankment. The mulch will help alleviate soil compaction and moderate temperatures. Keep a 6” clear mulch-free zone around the base of the tree (do not place mulch against root crown).

2.3.8 The use of hydrated lime or quick lime shall not be permitted within the vicinity of any existing trees.

3.0 Grading

3.1 The project arborist shall be on-site for all disturbances of grades within the dripline of existing trees to remain.

3.2 The existing grade shall be maintained within the Tree Protection Zone. Any changes in grade (cut or fill) shall be minimized, unless otherwise noted within the tree table, and if undertaken shall be supervised by the project arborist.

3.3 Root pruning shall be determined on an individual basis for each tree.

3.4 Supplemental water must be readily available during excavation activities if done during the summer months. Occasional spraying of the foliage with water to wash off dust may also be required.

3.5 If any cuts are made within the dripline of trees, roots shall be cut cleanly back to the excavated cut and covered with burlap or straw matting. This material shall be kept damp until the finished grade has been established.

4.0 Pruning

4.1 Trees to be pruned for clearance shall be done prior to construction activities to avoid damage.

4.2 All pruning shall be conducted by the project arborist and done in accordance to ISA procedures by certified tree workers or under the supervision of the project arborist.

5.0 Retaining Walls and Architectural Foundations
5.1 Existing plans show no proposed walls or foundations within the dripline of existing trees.

6.0 Project Coordination

6.1 Prior to the commencement of construction activities, the general contractor shall meet with the project arborist to review Tree Protection Measures procedures mentioned within this report.

6.2 Beyond on-site inspection of grading operations occurring within the Tree Protection Zone, the project arborist shall make bi-weekly inspections of the site during the site improvements to monitor trees and ensure Tree Protection Measures are in place.

Conclusion and Continuing Maintenance

We believe that if the proper Tree Protection Measures and guidelines are addressed, the trees on the subject property shall continue to thrive or remain stable. As noted, mitigation measures shall ensue if any trees are significantly impacted. Regardless, site improvements will impact the existing trees. To what extent, time will tell as signs of decline show months and even years later. Vigilant monitoring is the most effective course of action to ensure continued health and failure prevention.

Assumptions and Limitations

As previously noted, documented existing tree locations are approximate and were not part of the original survey. Contractor shall alert the architect & project arborist in the event that the shown tree locations are misrepresented prior to any site disturbances that would otherwise occur within the dripline of an existing tree.

InsideOut Design has no interest, either personal or monetary, on the outcome of the proposed subdivision. All observations and recommendations made within this review are objective and to the best of the author’s ability. The findings in this report are dependent on the condition of the trees evaluated at the time of the site inspections. This assessment was limited to the visual examination of the trees listed within the report with no dissection, excavation, probing or coring. There is no guarantee, warranty, expressed or implied, that problems, deficiencies or failure may occur in the future. To live near trees, one must accept some degree of risk.
Please contact us with any questions you may have or if additional information is warranted.

Sincerely,
INSIDEOUT DESIGN, INC

Pennell Phillips
ISA Certified Arborist, WE-6608A
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TREE INVENTORY PLAN

Little Tree Montessori

2603 Tassajara Avenue  El Cerrito Ca
1. Existing tree to remain.
2. Dripline.
3. Steel post, 10'-0" O.C. max.
4. 6'-0" chainlink fencing.
5. Extend fencing 50% beyond dripline of tree where possible.

Note: Fencing shall be located as indicated by stakes/posts set in field by project arborist.
978 Arlington Boulevard

DETAILS

Application Number: PL18-0084

Applicant: Joseph Timar Jr.

Location: 978 Arlington Boulevard

APN: 505-321-010

Zoning: RS-10 (Single Family Residential)

General Plan: Very Low Density Residential

Request: Planning Commission consideration of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a fence taller than 6 feet in the rear and side yard (19.06.030.U.1, ECMC).

CEQA: This project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines, Class 3: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed project includes replacement of a fence in the rear and side yard with a redwood fence ranging in height from 8 feet to 9.5 feet. The proposed fence includes one-foot tall lattice as well as vertical posts at the top of the fence. The Zoning Ordinance allows for fences to exceed six feet in height, up to ten feet, with a Conditional Use Permit. As discussed in detail in this report, the project is expected to be harmonious and compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability or appropriate development of abutting properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

Based on the evidence contained in this report, staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The subject property at 978 Arlington Boulevard is located in the hills of El Cerrito. A single-family house with an attached studio workshop, and a detached accessory dwelling unit are located on the approximately 0.58-acre parcel. The lot is up-sloping away from Arlington Boulevard. The surrounding neighborhood consists of single-family houses, typically with wooden fences separating each property.

Vicinity Map

Site Photos

From Front of Property

Northeast Corner of Property
Adjacent Designations and Land Uses

**North:** Single Family Residential (RS-10) Zoning and Very Low Density Residential General Plan designation. Single family dwelling.

**East:** Single Family Residential (RS-10) Zoning and Very Low Density Residential General Plan designation. Single family dwelling.

**South:** Single Family Residential (RS-10) Zoning and Very Low Density Residential General Plan designation. Single family dwelling.

**West:** Single Family Residential (RS-10) Zoning and Very Low Density Residential General Plan designation. Single family dwelling.

Analysis

**Project Description**

The applicant is requesting approval for an existing redwood fence in the rear and side yard of the property, ranging from 8 feet to 9.5 feet tall (see Attachment 2). The proposed fence includes one-foot tall lattice as well as vertical posts at the top of the fence. As shown in Attachment 2, the new fence spans roughly 29 feet on the western side property line, the entire 125-foot-wide rear property line, and 88 feet on the eastern side property line.

The new fence was constructed in April 2018. The City’s Code Enforcement Officer observed the fence in May 2018 and recorded that it likely exceeded the height limit and provided notice to the property owners to obtain proper approval. In June 2018, the property owners submitted an application for a Conditional Use Permit to allow a fence taller than 6 feet.

Due to the location of the proposed fencing along the side and rear property lines of the project site and due to the location of existing buildings, trees, and landscaping, only a small segment of the proposed fencing would be visible from the street and sidewalk on Arlington Boulevard and on Arbor Drive. Surrounding fences in the area are also constructed of wood. The new fence was constructed for privacy purposes as well as to reduce the noise from dogs on adjacent properties. The project applicant indicated that tenants have vacated the accessory dwelling unit on their property twice, in 2003 and in 2006, due to constant dog barking and that they have minimized their use of their backyard due to the dog barking. The project applicant provided letters from the Contra Costa County Animal Services Department from 2008 indicating that the project applicant submitted noise complaints to the department regarding animal noise.
Upon conducting a site inspection, the new fence does not appear to substantially affect views from any adjacent property. For the few properties that are located upslope in relation to the subject property, and are north and east of the subject property, the buildings are located at substantially higher elevations and/or existing large trees screen the new fence, such that views from these properties do not appear to be substantially affected by the new fence.

Fence Height Requirements

Table 19.06-G of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance allows fences outside front yard and street side yard setback areas to exceed 6 feet in height, allowing up to 10 feet with a Conditional Use Permit. All segments of the proposed fence are located outside of the required front yard setback. The proposed fencing would range in height between 8 feet and 9.5 feet along the side and rear property lines. If the fence posts are not considered, then the fence ranges in height from 7 feet to 8.75 feet.

Public Notice and Comment

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times and mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site on or before February 27, 2019. Staff did not receive written or verbal comments for this project.

Environmental Review

This project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines, Class 3: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures.

Compliance with the General Plan

The Conditional Use Permit to allow an exception to the maximum fence height is consistent with the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan:

**CD1.1: Neighborhood Character.** Preserve and enhance the character of existing residential neighborhoods by limiting encroachment of new buildings and activities that are out of scale and character with the surrounding uses.

As designed, only a small portion of the proposed fence would be visible from the street or sidewalk. The design of redwood fencing is consistent with the numerous wood fences on surrounding properties.

Required Findings

In order to approve the Conditional Use Permit to allow an exception to the maximum fence height, the Planning Commission must make the following findings, contained in 19.34.040 of the El Cerrito Zoning Ordinance:

1. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed development will be harmonious and compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability or appropriate development of abutting properties and the surrounding neighborhood.

Due to the location of the proposed fencing along the side and rear property lines of the project site and due to the location of existing buildings, trees, and landscaping, only a small segment of the proposed fencing would be visible from the street and sidewalk on Arlington Boulevard and on Arbor Drive. The design of redwood fencing is consistent with the numerous wood fences on
surrounding properties. The proposed fencing would not substantially impact the views of any surrounding property owners. The houses located to the north and east of the project site are located uphill of the project site.

2. The location and design of the proposal will provide a convenient and functional living, working, shopping, or civic environment that will be an attractive amenity for the City.

   The proposed fence represents an aesthetic upgrade to the previous fence. The older fence still existing on portions of the property is weathered and leaning in different directions. The new fence provides a simple and attractive design that follows the sloping topography. The new fence also increases the privacy of the property and reduces noise from dogs on neighboring properties.

3. The proposal is consistent with the purpose of the district where it is located and conforms in all significant respects with the El Cerrito General Plan and with any other applicable plan adopted by the City Council.

   The Conditional Use Permit will legalize an existing new fence that is up to 9.5 feet tall in the rear and side yard, with regards to the City’s Zoning Ordinance. This is a permitted improvement with a Conditional Use Permit, per Table 19.06-G in Section 19.06.030 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code. The proposed fencing is consistent with policy CD1.1: Neighborhood Character of the El Cerrito General Plan.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a fence taller than 6 feet.

Proposed Motion

1. Move adoption of Planning Commission Resolution PC19-03 approving a Conditional Use Permit to allow a fence taller than 6 feet at 978 Arlington Boulevard.

Appeal Period

Within ten (10) calendar days after the date of the decision, the Planning Commission action may be appealed to the City Council.

Attachments

1. Draft resolution
2. Project Submittal, dated 6/22/18
3. Fence Sections
Planning Commission Resolution PC19-03

APPLICATION NO. PL18-0084

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A FENCE TALLER THAN 6 FEET IN THE REAR AND SIDE YARD AT 978 ARLINGTON BOULEVARD

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Very Low Density Residential;

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is RS-10 (Single Family Residential);

WHEREAS, the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines, Class 3: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures;

WHEREAS, the site is located at 978 Arlington Boulevard;

WHEREAS, the Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 505-321-010;

WHEREAS, on June 22, 2018 the applicant submitted an application for a conditional use permit to allow for a fence taller than six feet in the rear and side yard;

WHEREAS, on March 20, 2019, the Planning Commission, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review does find and determine the following:

1. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed development will be harmonious and compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability or appropriate development of abutting properties and the surrounding neighborhood. Due to the location of the proposed fencing at the rear of the property and the existence of numerous large trees, landscaping, and buildings, only a small segment of the proposed fencing is visible from Arlington Boulevard. The redwood fencing is consistent with wood fencing in the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed fencing would not substantially impact the views of any surrounding property owners.

2. The location and design of the proposal will provide a convenient and functional living, working, shopping, or civic environment that will be an attractive amenity for the City. The proposed fence represents an aesthetic upgrade to the previous fence. The older fence still existing on portions of the property is weathered and leaning in different directions. The new fence provides a simple and attractive design that follows the sloping topography. The new fence also increases the privacy of the property and reduces noise from dogs on neighboring properties.

3. The proposal is consistent with the purpose of the district where it is located and conforms in all significant respects with the El Cerrito General Plan and with any other applicable plan adopted by the City Council. The Conditional Use Permit will legalize an existing new fence that is up to 9.5 feet tall in the rear and side yard, with regards to the City’s Zoning Ordinance. This is a permitted improvement with a Conditional Use Permit, per Table 19.06-G in Section 19.06.030 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code. The proposed fencing is consistent with policy CD1.1: Neighborhood Character of the El Cerrito General Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito
Planning Commission hereby approves Application No. PL18-0084, subject to the following conditions:

**Planning Division:**

1. The project will be constructed substantially in conformance with the plans presented to the Planning Commission on March 20, 2019. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator. All improvements shall be installed in accordance with these approvals. Improvements shall be maintained as approved.

2. If applicant constructs buildings or makes improvements in accordance with these approvals, but fails to comply with any of the Conditions of Approval or limitations set forth in these Conditions of Approval and does not cure any such failure within a reasonable time after notice from the City of El Cerrito, then such failure shall be cause for non-issuance of a certificate of occupancy, revocation or modification of these approvals or any other remedies available to the City.

3. These Conditions of Approval shall apply to any successor in interest in the property and Applicant shall be responsible for assuring that the successor in interest is informed of the terms and conditions of this approval.

4. If not used, this approval shall expire two years from the date of this action.

5. The project shall require issuance of a building permit prior to installation.

**Stege Sanitary District:**

6. Property owner shall take care not to puncture or damage the sewer lines with posts where it intersects the easement. Structural fenceposts shall never be located on the sewer easement at any location.

7. The property owner shall not construct a fence within 5 feet of a manhole and in no way shall they make it impossible or difficult for it to be opened and maintained.

---

**CERTIFICATION**

I certify that this resolution was adopted by the El Cerrito Planning Commission at a regular meeting held on March 20, 2019, upon motion of Commissioner __________, second by Commissioner __________:  

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:  
ABSENT:  

Sean Moss, AICP  
Acting Planning Manager
PROJECT SUMMARY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A FENCE

AT 978 ARLINGTON BLVD.

The project is for the replacement of a rear yard fence at 978 Arlington Blvd. (Parcel Number: 505321010), which is in the RS-10 zone. We replaced an old fence with a new wood fence constructed of con heart redwood, with a “board-on-board” vertical design. The work began April 20, 2018 and was completed April 25, 2018.

The fence design includes a one-foot “privacy” lattice on top. To account for elevation changes, a kickboard is included which varies in height along each horizontal section of fencing. As detailed on the attached parcel map, we replaced 125 ft. of fencing along our rear property, as well as 29 ft. on the adjacent property (8608 Don Carol) and 20 ft. on 8619 Arbor Dr. and 68 ft. along 8609 Arbor Dr. We provided copies of a 2001 property survey we had conducted shortly after purchasing the property, made by Moran Engineering, to the contractors prior to constructing the fence. At the time the survey was made, the surveyor set 5/8” rebar with yellow plastic caps to clearly mark the boundary of the property. The fence is located entirely on our side of the property line(s).

We believe the installed fence conforms to the criteria detailed in Municipal Code 19.34.040, for the following reasons:

1. The location of the fence, it’s overall design and construction are compatible with similar fences in the neighborhood. The fence, being in the rear of our property, is not visible at all from any adjacent public roads in our neighborhood; namely Arlington Blvd., Don Carol and Arbor Drive. Our three adjacent neighbors all have existing boundary fences of one form or another. In addition, most of the fence is not visible to our neighbors, either because they have their own fence or there are trees in the area that obstruct a clear view of the new fence.

2. The new replacement fence in its design and construction provides a functional and private area for each of our adjacent neighbors. It either adds to or enhances the privacy of our respective lots. Several neighbors have dogs which can readily be startled when we are gardening in our backyard area. Since the construction, we have noticed that we hear less barking form our neighbor’s dogs.

3. The construction is consistent with other residential properties in the district and, we believe, conforms with the applicable parts, if any, of the El Cerrito general plan. The fence enhances the general aesthetics of our neighbor’s adjacent properties. In the past, an unsightly chain link fence separated our property from that of 8631 Don Carol. Several years ago, our neighbor, at 8631 Don Carol, erected a similar and duplicate wooden fence across approximately 75% of the rear property line, rather than participating and sharing with us in the construction of our fence. When we undertook our work, we removed the chain link fence, and erected the new fence, which is much more aesthetically pleasing.
Details of the construction can be found in the attached supporting documents, sketches, and photographs.

**Document 1** – this is a copy of the land survey we had Moran Engineering Inc. conduct on our property, detailing the location of the property boundaries with 5/8” rebar with yellow caps.

**Figure 1** – A rough sketch of the property, outlining where we had replaced our old fence with the new redwood construction. Of the three sections, four neighbors have adjacent properties. Each of the neighbors are, according to the highlighted section...

- **Section A** – 8608 Don Carol
- **Section B** – 8631 Arbor Dr.
- **Section C** – 8619 Arbor Dr.
- **Section D** – 8609 Arbor Dr.

**Photo 1 (below)**– A photo of the fence from Section A – adjacent to 8608 Don Carol. Note that this fence is not on the property line; the neighbors on 8608 Don Carol have their own fence. I have also included an 8-ft. section of 2”x4” with 1 ft. delineations as a guide for general height of the fence.
Included below is an old photo of the in the same general location as Photo 2 above. This shows the old chain-link fence that was located on our property which separated 978 Arlington from our backyard neighbors at 8631 Don Carol. As clearly seen, the area was a general eye-sore with yard waste and debris piled up against our chain-link fence. Also, clearly visible is the neighbor’s dog...
Photos 3a & 3b (below) – This is a photo of the fence from Section B, 8631 Arbor, which shows the height and approximate location of their fence, which is behind the fence of photo 2, above. Note that the height of both fences is similar in height. Also, the addition of our new fence does not necessarily obstruct any preexisting view they may have had.

Photos 4a & 4b (below) – This is the corner between 8631 Arbor and 8619 Arbor, Sections B and C. Note that behind the fence adjacent to 8619 Arbor, there is approximately a 4.5 ft retaining wall.
**Photo 5 (below)** – details Section D fencing which is adjacent to 8609 Arbor.

**Document 2** – this is a rough sketch of the entire property, detailing the sections of fencing that was newly constructed.

To help better visualize the project at hand, we would like to invite the planning commission members to visit the site at their convenience. I’m certain that after viewing the enhancements that we made with the construction of our fence, that the planning commission will approve our Conditional Use Permit.

Sincerely,

Joseph & Mary Timar

978 Arlington Blvd.,

El Cerrito, CA
PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT
March 20, 2019

922 CLARK PLACE TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP

DETAILS

Application Number: PL17-0109

Applicant: Kazuo Negishi

Location: 922 Clark Place

APN: 505-301-033

Zoning: RS-5

General Plan: Low Density Residential

Request: Planning Commission consideration of a Tentative Parcel Map requiring an exception to Title 18 of the City's Municipal Code (ECMC) for minor subdivisions because one of the proposed lots does not have frontage on a public street. The location of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map is 922 Clark Place. The existing parcel is 25,633 square feet. Proposed Parcel A is developed with a single-family house, a detached accessory dwelling unit, and a detached garage, and is to be 16,570 square feet. Proposed Parcel B is vacant and is to be 9,063 square feet.

CEQA: This project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to Section 15315 of the CEQA Guidelines, Class 15: Minor Land Divisions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The requested entitlements for consideration by the Planning Commission are a Tentative Parcel Map for a two-lot minor subdivision and an exception to Title 18 of the El Cerrito Municipal Code (ECMC) for minor subdivisions because one of the proposed lots does not have frontage on a public street. The location of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map is 922 Clark Place. The existing parcel is 25,633 square feet. Proposed Parcel A is developed with a single-family house, a detached accessory dwelling unit, and a detached garage, and is to be 16,570 square feet. Proposed Parcel B is vacant and is to be 9,063 square feet.

Staff has reviewed the proposal, and the proposed parcels meet the development setbacks (lot dimensions and square footage) for the RS-5 Single Family Residential zoning district. The Tentative Parcel Map also complies with requirements in Section 18.32.050 ECMC for minor subdivisions proposing a lot without frontage on a public street. The installation of a new fire hydrant will be required prior to any development occurring on the proposed Parcel B.

Based on the information in this report, which supports the required findings, staff recommends approval of the project.
Background

Site Location and Layout

The project site is located at the northeast corner of where Clark Place dead ends. The parcel is 25,633 square feet with a shape that is mostly rectangular and that slopes upward toward the northeast. The existing residence has access from Clark Place, which dead ends at the project site. There is an existing access easement and driveway located on the project site that currently serve 912 Clark Place and 914 Clark Place. The site has the Low Density Residential General Plan designation and the RS-5, Single Family Residential zoning designation.

Vicinity Map

Existing/Previous Land Use

The project site is developed with a single-family residence, a detached garage, a detached accessory dwelling unit, and an attached extension to the residence with a breezeway. There are a cluster of trees on the eastern and southern portions of proposed Parcel B, some of which would be removed for the construction of a new residence on this proposed lot.
Site Photos

Existing Garage, Accessory Dwelling Unit and Driveway

Existing Single-Family Residence

Proposed Vacant Parcel

Adjacent Land Uses


South: Single family residential uses (General Plan: Low Density Residential. Zoning: RS-5).

Analysis

Project Description

The requested entitlements for consideration by the Planning Commission are a Tentative Parcel Map for a two-lot minor subdivision and an exception to Title 18 of the City’s Municipal Code for minor subdivisions because one of the proposed lots does not have frontage on a public street. Proposed Parcel A, which would contain the existing structures, would be 16,570 square feet. Proposed Parcel B is vacant and would be 9,063 square feet. As part of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map, improvements are proposed for the existing driveway on the project site that serves 912 and 914 Clark Place. This driveway will be improved to 16 feet wide and will comply with Fire Code requirements including the ability to carry the load of a fire truck, and the driveway will serve proposed Parcel B as well. The applicant will also be required to install a fire hydrant in the vicinity where Clark Place dead ends, prior to building permit approval of any future proposed development of proposed Parcel B.

The subject property is located in the RS-5 (Single Family Residential) zoning district, which allows single family residential dwelling units as a permitted use in this district. The proposed Parcel Map meets the requirements of Chapter 18 (Subdivision Ordinance) and Chapter 19 (Zoning Ordinance) of the El Cerrito Municipal Code, except that proposed Parcel B does not have frontage on a public street. Section 18.24.169 ECMC provides that lots without frontage on a street will not be permitted. Chapter 18.12 ECMC regulates tentative maps and Chapter 18.32, ECMC regulates subdivision maps which require an exception to the Subdivision Ordinance. Section 18.32.050 specifically includes requirements for minor subdivisions in which frontage on a public street is not provided for all parcels.

The existing single family residence and the existing detached garage on proposed Parcel A are existing nonconforming structures. The single family residence was constructed in 1924 and is located approximately six feet from the rear property line (the northern property line). The current Zoning Ordinance requires a rear setback of 15 feet in RS-5 zoning districts, and this requirement was likely enacted after the house was originally built. The detached garage does not comply with minimum front setback requirement of 20 feet, as it is approximately 15 feet from the private road/access easement. However, this detached garage received approval of Application No. 2145 for a Variance for front yard setback from the El Cerrito Planning Commission on December 20, 1967. However, the covered attachment on the western side of the garage that encroaches into the neighboring property was installed without a permit and will be required to be removed, as described in the Draft Resolution (Attachment 1).

The proposed Tentative Parcel Map does not affect the nonconforming nature of the residence or of the detached garage. If improvements are proposed to either of these structures in the future, they will need to be reviewed appropriately by the City.

Authority of the Planning Commission

The Tentative Parcel Map proposes parcels that do not have frontage on a public street, and thus the application requires an exception to the Subdivision Ordinance (Title 18 ECMC). Chapter 18.32 ECMC regulates subdivision maps which require an exception to the Subdivision Ordinance. Section 18.32.010 requires that the Planning Commission conduct a hearing and provide a recommendation to the City Council on the basis of the findings described below.
General Plan Compliance

The project is consistent with and will implement the following policies of the El Cerrito General Plan:

**LU1.1, Predominate Single Family Use.** Ensure that the existing single family neighborhoods remain predominantly single-family use, but including accessory units, by prohibiting incompatible uses.

The zoning for this lot is RS-5, Single Family Residential, which allows single family homes as a permitted use. Proposed Parcel A is developed with a single family residence, an attached addition to the residence, an accessory dwelling unit, and a detached garage. It is expected that proposed Parcel B will be developed with a single family home. Therefore, the proposed use adheres to the purpose of LU1.1, and will not create a situation where incompatible uses will be created.

**LU1.5: Suitable Housing.** Promote suitably located housing and services for all age groups within the city.

The project will create one new lot for development of a single family residential home that is surrounded by existing single family homes.

**CD1.1, Neighborhood Character.** Preserve and enhance the character of existing residential neighborhoods by limiting encroachment of new buildings and activities that are out of scale and character with the surrounding uses.

The proposed two-lot subdivision would allow the creation of a single family house on proposed Parcel B. Proposed Parcel A is developed with a single family residence, an attached addition to the residence, an accessory dwelling unit, and a detached garage. The future single family residence can be two-stories tall, which is in keeping with other existing single family homes in the immediate area of the neighborhood. Any new two-story structure requires review under the Residential Architectural Design (RAD) process.

Public Notice and Comment

The required public notice for the project was published in the East Bay Times, mailed to owners of property within 300 feet of the project site on February 27, 2019. No comments were received as of the publication of this staff report.

Environmental Review

The project is Categorically Exempt under the Section 15315 – Class 15, Minor Land Divisions, of the California Environmental Quality Act. This section consists of the division of property in urbanized areas zoned for residential, commercial, or industrial use into four or fewer parcels when the division is in conformance with the General Plan and zoning and all services and access to the proposed parcels to local standards are available. In addition, the parcel was not involved in a division of a larger parcel within the previous 2 years and the average slope of the parcel is not greater than 20 percent. The proposed tentative parcel map complies with all of these requirements.
Required Findings

The Planning Commission must make the following findings as outlined in Sections 18.32.010 and 18.12.030 ECMC in order to recommend City Council approval of the Tentative Parcel Map:

1) That there are special circumstances or conditions affecting said property.

   The existing parcel is located at the northeast corner of where Clark Place dead ends. It is not feasible nor desirable to require a public street be constructed such that both proposed parcels will have frontage entirely along a public street. The proposed Tentative Parcel Map includes improving an existing driveway within an existing easement to meet the standards described in Section 19.32.050 ECMC.

2) That the exception is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right of the petitioner.

   The exception will allow the applicant to subdivide an existing 25,633 square foot parcel into two parcels of 16,570 square feet and 9,063 square feet. These proposed parcel sizes are consistent with the surrounding properties, and would allow the applicant to develop the proposed vacant parcel in a manner similar to surrounding properties.

3) That the granting of the exception will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property in the vicinity of which said property is situated.

   As described in the two findings above, the proposed Tentative Parcel Map includes a driveway that complies with City requirements (particularly Section 19.32.050 ECMC) in a manner that continues to serve 912 and 914 Clark Place. In addition, the proposed parcel sizes are consistent with the surrounding properties. Development on the proposed vacant parcel will be required to conform with all development standards of the RS-5 zoning district and will not negatively impact other properties.

4) When vehicular access for two or less dwelling sites is provided by way of a private access road, such road shall be of a minimum width of 16 feet of pavement.

   The proposed new driveway is 16 feet wide and will be surfaced with asphalt, concrete, or other approved surface capable of supporting the imposed load of fire apparatus weighing at least 75,000 pounds.

5) Design for private access roads shall be subject to approval of the city engineer. The city engineer shall require curb and gutter and drainage facilities as may in his or her opinion be needed. A cul-de-sac, with a paved radius of twenty-five feet, or an approved Y-turnaround shall be required to permit forward driving in both directions on private roads.

   The City Engineer and the Fire Department reviewed and approved the proposed private access road. A cul-de-sac or a Y-turnaround were determined by the Fire Department and the City Engineer to not be necessary for this Tentative Parcel Map given that proposed Parcel B is sufficiently close to Clark Place for fire truck access and given that 912 and 914 Clark Place
currently have driveways allowing sufficient turn-around space and that proposed Parcel B will be required to provide sufficient driveway space to allow turn-around space as well.

6) Area minimum and frontage minimum for sites fronting on a public street shall be as required by the zoning ordinance. For each site not fronting on a public street in the R-1 zone, the minimum area shall be six thousand square feet; in the R-1-B-1 zone, eight thousand square feet; and in the R-1-B-2 zone, ten thousand square feet. Private roads shall not be included in the building site area computations. Setbacks shall be as required in the zoning ordinance, and no part of the private road may be within the setback area.

These zoning designations existed until 2008, when the current Zoning Ordinance was adopted. These designations have been changed by the current Zoning Ordinance. The references in the Subdivision Ordinance were not updated accordingly. The project site was designated as R-1 on the previous Zoning Map. Both of the proposed Parcel A and the proposed Parcel B do not have the required frontage on a public street and both proposed parcels comply with the minimum six thousand square feet in area requirement. Excluding the area of the private road, proposed Parcel A is 14,421 square feet and proposed Parcel B is 7,511 square feet.

Per Table 19.06-B within Section 19.06.030 of the Municipal Code the minimum lot width at the front setback line shall be at least 50 feet. This dimension is approximately 108 feet and 72 feet for proposed Parcels A and B, respectively.

7) All large and deep lot subdivisions shall conform to the general pattern of the neighborhood.

Parcels in the immediately surrounding area predominantly range in size from 6,000 square feet to 9,000 square feet, and the proposed Parcels A and B are similar in size to these surrounding parcels.

8) Since the above procedure involves exceptions to the subdivision ordinance, additional variances relating to yard requirements shall not be granted.

The applicant does not propose any additional variances relating to yard requirements beyond the exception to the subdivision ordinance described above.

9) The proposed lots are in conformity with the requirements of Chapter 18; the proposed parcels comply with the necessary size and shape; and the lots will have the proper and sufficient access to a public street.

The proposed Tentative Parcel Map is in conformity with Chapter 18 excluding the exception described above for frontage on a public street. The proposed parcels also comply with the minimum 5,000 square feet in area and minimum 50 feet lot width for interior lots in the RS-5 zoning district per Table 19.06-B in Section 19.06.030 ECMC, in addition to the minimum area requirements described in Finding 6 above.

Staff Recommendation

Based on the information contained in this report, staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend City Council approval of Planning Application No. PL17-0109, as conditioned by the draft resolution in Attachment 1.
Proposed Motion
Move adoption of Planning Commission Resolution PC19-04 that recommends City Council approval of a Tentative Parcel Map for a two-lot subdivision and an exception to Title 18 of the City’s Municipal Code for a minor subdivision proposing a lot without frontage on a public street at 922 Clark Place with Assessor’s Parcel Number 505-301-033

Attachments
1. Draft Resolution
2. Tentative Parcel Map
3. Erosion Control and Grading Plan
Planning Commission Resolution No. 19-04

APPLICATION NO.  PL17-0109

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF EL CERRITO PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDING CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF A TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP FOR A TWO-LOT SUBDIVISION AND AN EXCEPTION TO TITLE 18 OF THE CITY’S MUNICIPAL CODE FOR A MINOR SUBDIVISION PROPOSING A LOT WITHOUT FRONTAGE ON A PUBLIC STREET AT 922 CLARK PLACE WITH ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER 505-301-033

WHEREAS, the existing address of the site is 922 Clark Place; and

WHEREAS, the existing Assessor’s Parcel Number of the site is 505-301-033; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use classification of the site is Low Density Residential; and

WHEREAS, the zoning district of the site is RS-5 (Single Family Residential); and

WHEREAS, on August 2, 2017, the applicant submitted an application for a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide a parcel of 25,633 square feet into two parcels. Proposed Parcel “A” would be 16,570 square feet and is developed with a single-family house, an attached addition to the residence, a detached accessory dwelling unit, and a detached garage; proposed parcel “B” would be 9,063 square feet and is vacant;

WHEREAS, the project is Categorically Exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15315: Class 15, Minor Land Divisions; and

WHEREAS, approval of the Tentative Parcel Map is governed by Sections 66444 – 66450 of the State of California Government Code (Subdivision Map Act) and Title 18 Divisions of Land of the El Cerrito Municipal Code; and

WHEREAS, on March 20, 2019, the Planning Commission of El Cerrito, after due consideration of all evidence and reports offered for review, does find and determine the following pursuant to Sections 18.32.010 and 18.12.030, ECMC:

1) That there are special circumstances or conditions affecting said property.

The existing parcel is located at the northeast corner of where Clark Place dead ends. It is not feasible nor desirable to require a public street be constructed such that both proposed parcels will have frontage entirely along a public street. The proposed Tentative Parcel Map includes improving an existing driveway within an existing easement to meet the standards described in Section 19.32.050 ECMC.

2) That the exception is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right of the petitioner.
The exception will allow the applicant to subdivide an existing 25,633 square foot parcel into two parcels of 16,570 square feet and 9,063 square feet. These proposed parcel sizes are consistent with the surrounding properties, and would allow the applicant to develop the proposed vacant parcel in a manner similar to surrounding properties.

3) That the granting of the exception will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property in the vicinity of which said property is situated.

As described in the two findings above, the proposed Tentative Parcel Map includes a driveway that complies with City requirements (particularly Section 19.32.050 ECMC) in a manner that continues to serve 912 and 914 Clark Place. In addition, the proposed parcel sizes are consistent with the surrounding properties. Development on the proposed vacant parcel will be required to conform with all development standards of the RS-5 zoning district, and will not negatively impact other properties.

4) When vehicular access for two or less dwelling sites is provided by way of a private access road, such road shall be of a minimum width of 16 feet of pavement.

The proposed new driveway is 16 feet wide and will be surfaced with asphalt, concrete, or other approved surface capable of supporting the imposed load of fire apparatus weighing at least 75,000 pounds.

5) Design for private access roads shall be subject to approval of the city engineer. The city engineer shall require curb and gutter and drainage facilities as may in his or her opinion be needed. A cul-de-sac, with a paved radius of twenty-five feet, or an approved Y-turnaround shall be required to permit forward driving in both directions on private roads.

The City Engineer and the Fire Department reviewed and approved the proposed private access road. A cul-de-sac or a Y-turnaround were determined by the Fire Department and the City Engineer to not be necessary for this Tentative Parcel Map given that proposed Parcel B is sufficiently close to Clark Place for fire truck access and given that 912 and 914 Clark Place currently have driveways allowing sufficient turn-around space and that proposed Parcel B will be required to provide sufficient driveway space to allow turn-around space as well.

6) Area minimum and frontage minimum for sites fronting on a public street shall be as required by the zoning ordinance. For each site not fronting on a public street in the R-1 zone, the minimum area shall be six thousand square feet; in the R-1-B-1 zone, eight thousand square feet; and in the R-1-B-2 zone, ten thousand square feet. Private roads shall not be included in the building site area computations. Setbacks shall be as required in the zoning ordinance, and no part of the private road may be within the setback area.

These zoning designations existed as until 2008, when the current Zoning Ordinance was adopted. These designations have been changed by the current Zoning Ordinance. The references in the Subdivision Ordinance were not updated accordingly. The project site was designated as R-1 on the previous Zoning Map. Both of the proposed Parcel A and the proposed Parcel B do not have the required frontage on a public street and both proposed parcels comply with the minimum six
thousand square feet in area requirement. Excluding the area of the private road, proposed Parcel A is 14,421 square feet and proposed Parcel B is 7,511 square feet.

Per Table 19.06-B within Section 19.06.030 of the Municipal Code the minimum lot width at the front setback line shall be at least 50 feet. This dimension is approximately 108 feet and 72 feet for proposed Parcels A and B, respectively.

7) All large and deep lot subdivisions shall conform to the general pattern of the neighborhood.

Parcels in the immediately surrounding area predominantly range in size from 6,000 square feet to 9,000 square feet, and the proposed Parcels A and B are similar in size to these surrounding parcels.

8) Since the above procedure involves exceptions to the subdivision ordinance, additional variances relating to yard requirements shall not be granted.

The applicant does not propose any additional variances relating to yard requirements beyond the exception to the subdivision ordinance described above.

9) The proposed lots are in conformity with the requirements of Chapter 18; the proposed parcels comply with the necessary size and shape; and the lots will have the proper and sufficient access to a public street.

The proposed Tentative Parcel Map is in conformity with Chapter 18 excluding the exception described above for frontage on a public street. The proposed parcels also comply with the minimum 5,000 square feet in area and minimum 50 feet lot width for interior lots in the RS-5 zoning district per Table 19.06-B in Section 19.06.030 ECMC, in addition to the minimum area requirements described in Finding 6 above.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that after careful consideration of maps, facts, exhibits, correspondence, and testimony, and other evidence submitted in this matter, and, in consideration of the findings, the El Cerrito Planning Commission recommends City Council approval of Application No. PL17-0109, subject to the following conditions:

Planning Division:

1. The project shall be developed and maintained substantially in compliance with the Tentative Parcel Map dated March 15, 2019 except as amended by subsequent conditions of this Resolution. Minor changes may be approved by the Zoning Administrator.

2. The scope of this approval shall be limited to a Tentative Parcel Map for a two-lot minor subdivision.

3. If not recorded, the approval of this Tentative Parcel Map shall expire two years from the date of approval.

4. When new residences are constructed, they will be subject to the zoning regulations in place at the time that the building permit is submitted.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a construction staging plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator. The construction staging plan shall illustrate where the construction equipment will be staged and the location of parking for the construction employees. This construction and staging plan may also require the submission of a Temporary Use Permit.

6. Prior to recordation of the Parcel Map, the covered attachment to the garage on proposed Parcel A that encroaches into the neighboring property at APN 505-301-032 shall be removed.

Public Works Department:

The following conditions shall be required when a new building is proposed:

7. Projects that create or replace between 2,500 and 10,000 square feet of new area are required to submit a Storm Water Control Plan that meets the criteria in the most recent version of The Contra Costa Clean Water Program Stormwater C3 Guidebook. Refer to Appendix C of the following link for more information: https://www.cccleanwater.org/userfiles/kfinder/files/Stormwater_C3_Guidebook_7th_Edition_2017-05-12%281%29.pdf

8. Applicant shall provide a detailed civil plan for the frontage and driveway.

9. If any trees are removed, they must be replaced with three new trees, and must be from the City Master Tree List and approved by the City Arborist before installation. Tree species, location, spacing, tree well size, and planting details, are to be approved by the City Arborist before installation.

10. Any new street trees are required to have irrigation and an establishment period of 3 years prior to acceptance by the City.

11. Applicant shall provide detailed drainage plan including rain leaders, roof slopes, downspouts, drainage piping information, slopes, cleanouts. All drainage is encouraged to stay onsite, draining away from foundations, and discharged a distance more than 10-FT from property lines, and shall not cause a nuisance to neighboring properties. Show how storm water runoff from the proposed driveway will be collected and treated.

12. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, applicant shall submit an estimate of grading and earthwork to be completed for the project. Any earthwork and/or grading operations in excess of 50 cubic yards will require the applicant to submit a detailed grading plan, obtain a Grading & Transportation Permit and pay all associated fees.

13. Before the start of ANY work in the public right-of-way, including any street tree, sidewalk and driveway work, applicant must obtain a Public Works Encroachment Permit and pay all associated fees.

14. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, include an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for construction.
Fire Department:

15. **Building Construction**
   A. Building construction shall meet current California Building, Fire, and Residential Codes and the El Cerrito Fire Code.

   B. Door from the dwelling to an attached garage shall be self-closing, self-latching, 1 3/8 inch solid core, 1 3/8 inch steel or 20 minute rated door.

   C. All electrical breakers shall be labeled.

16. **Fire Apparatus Access**
   A. With the exception of the width which shall not be less than 16 feet wide fire apparatus access from the street to the structure shall meet the requirements of Appendix D of the 2016 California Fire Code.

   B. Buildings or portions of buildings hereafter constructed shall be accessible to Fire Department apparatus by way of an approved fire apparatus access road with an asphalt, concrete or other approved driving surface capable of supporting the imposed load of fire apparatus weighing at least 75,000 pounds (34 050 kg).

   C. Per previous discussions, one fire hydrant shall be installed at the North end of Clark Place prior to any building permit approval for proposed Parcel B.

17. **Carbon Monoxide Detectors**
   A. Carbon monoxide alarm shall be installed outside of and adjacent to sleeping areas where fuel-burning appliances are installed; and in dwelling units that have attached garages.

   B. Carbon Monoxide detectors shall be installed in accordance with NFPA 720.

   C. Carbon Monoxide alarms shall be 120 v Powered with battery backup and be interconnected with the smoke detectors.

18. **Smoke Detection**
   A. Smoke detection shall be installed in each bedroom, in hallways adjacent to bedrooms, and one detector per floor level (top and bottom of stairs).

   B. Smoke detectors shall be 120v powered with battery backup.

   C. Smoke detectors shall be interconnected.

19. **Automatic Fire Sprinklers**
   A. NFPA 13D Automatic Fire Sprinklers are required throughout.

   B. Plans shall be submitted for review and approval under separate cover.
20. **Premises Identification**
   A. Approved numbers or address shall be provided in such a position to be plainly visible and legible from the street fronting the property.
   
   B. Address shall be either internally or externally illuminated.

21. **Emergency Egress**
   A. Every sleeping room shall have at least one operable window or door approved for emergency escape or rescue.
   
   B. Escape or rescue windows shall be installed in accordance with California Residential Code R310.2.1 & R310.2.2.

22. **Wildland-Urban Interface**
   A. Area is located within designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) and is subject to the requirements of the Wildland-Urban Interface. Building construction shall meet all applicable codes and requirements including those in CRC Section R337.
   
   B. El Cerrito Vegetation Management Standards shall be strictly enforced.
   
   C. State Law and City Ordinance require that all roofing within the VHFHSZ be Class B or better in new construction.
   
   D. Spark arresters with a maximum of ½” openings in the mesh are required over the outlet of chimney shall be installed.

**Solid Waste:**

23. Solid waste, recycling, and green waste carts shall be brought to the curb of Clark Place for service.

**Building Division:**

24. Prior to building permit approval, a geotechnical report shall be provided for peer review and shall be used by a structural engineer in the design of the foundation system.
CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY that this resolution was adopted by the El Cerrito Planning Commission at a regular meeting held on March 20, 2019 upon motion of Commissioner _____, second by Commissioner ______:

AYES: 
NOES: 
ABSTAIN: 
ABSENT: 

__________________________________________
Sean Moss, AICP
Acting Planning Manager
GENERAL STORMWATER NOTES

1. 12 INCH OVERLAP. RULES, REGULATIONS, ORDINANCES, OR STATUTES. WATER SHALL BE APPLIED AS REQUIRED. DUST CONTROL MEASURES TO BE TAKEN TO PREVENT EXCESSIVE STORM WATER RUNOFF OR CARRYING BY STORM DRAWS OR TO WATERCOURSES AS A RESULT OF CONDITIONS CREATED BY GRADING OPERATIONS.

2. SEDIMENTATION CONTROL MEASURES TO BE TAKEN DURING WET SEASONS UNTIL PERMANENT SEAMS SHALL BE TAPED OR WEIGHTED DOWN THEIR ENTIRE LENGTH AND THERE SHALL BE AT LEAST A 2:1 CENTERLINE SLOPE. ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES.

3. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

4. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

5. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

6. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

7. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

8. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

9. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

10. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

11. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

12. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

13. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

14. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

15. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

16. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

17. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

18. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

19. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.

20. DURING THE RAINY SEASON WITHOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL BMP'S TO PREVENT DRAINAGE INTO PERMCAP SOURCES, DURING WET SEASONS, ADDITIONAL MEASURES MAY BE REQUIRED IF DETERMINED BY THE CONTRACTOR, THE CITY, THE COUNTY, OR THE ENGINEER AS DRAINING CONDITIONS OCCUR. GRADING SHOULDN'T TAKE PLACE.