



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Date: 9/28/2026
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Location: Zoom.us/join – ID# 846 9472 6242 and
Belle Haven Community Campus
100 Terminal Ave., Menlo Park, CA 94025

Members of the public can listen to the meeting and participate using the following methods.

How to participate in the meeting

- Access the live meeting, in-person, at the Belle Haven Community Campus
- Access the meeting real-time online at:
zoom.us/join – Meeting ID# 846 9472 6242
- Access the meeting real-time via telephone (listen only mode) at:
(669) 900-6833
Regular Meeting ID # 846 9472 6242
Press *9 to raise hand to speak
- Submit a written comment online up to 1-hour before the meeting start time:
planning.commission@menlopark.gov*
Please include the agenda item number related to your comment.

*Written comments are accepted up to 1 hour before the meeting start time. Written messages are provided to the Planning Commission at the appropriate time in their meeting.

Subject to change: The format of this meeting may be altered or the meeting may be canceled. You may check on the status of the meeting by visiting the city website menlopark.gov. The instructions for logging on to the webinar and/or the access code is subject to change. If you have difficulty accessing the webinar, please check the latest online edition of the posted agenda for updated information (menlopark.gov/agendas).

Regular Meeting

- A. Call To Order**
- B. Roll Call**
- C. Reports and Announcements**
- D. Public Comment**

Under “Public Comment,” the public may address the Commission on any subject not listed on the agenda. Each speaker may address the Commission once under public comment for a limit of three minutes. You are not required to provide your name or City of residence, but it is helpful. The

Commission cannot act on items not listed on the agenda and, therefore, the Commission cannot respond to non-agenda issues brought up under Public Comment other than to provide general information.

E. Consent Calendar

- E1. Approval of minutes from the September 14, 2026, Planning Commission meeting ([Attachment](#))

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Use Permit/Shu Wu/411 Chester St.:
Consider and adopt a resolution to approve a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and detached carport and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width and area in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district and determine this action is categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15303's Class 3 exemption for new construction or conversion of small structures. The project includes an attached ADU (accessory dwelling unit), which is a permitted use and not subject to discretionary review. ([Staff report #26-042-PC](#))
- F2. Use Permit/Babak Homayouni/253 Yale Road.:
Consider and adopt a resolution to approve a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and detached garage and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district, and determine this action is categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15303's Class 3 exemption for new construction or conversion of small structures. The project includes an attached ADU (accessory dwelling unit), which is a permitted use and not subject to discretionary review. ([Staff report #26-043-PC](#))

H. Informational Items

- H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule – The upcoming Planning Commission meetings are listed here, for reference. No action will be taken on the meeting schedule, although individual Commissioners may notify staff of planned absences.
- Regular Meeting: October 5, 2026
 - Regular Meeting: October 19, 2026

I. Adjournment

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

At every special meeting of the Planning Commission, members of the public have the right to directly address

the Planning Commission on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by the chair, either before or during consideration of the item. For appeal hearings, appellant and applicant shall each have 10 minutes for presentations.

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

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

Agendas are posted in accordance with Cal. Gov. Code §54954.2(a) or §54956. Members of the public can view electronic agendas and staff reports by accessing the city website at menlopark.gov/agendas and can receive email notifications of agenda postings by subscribing at menlopark.gov/subscribe. Agendas and staff reports may also be obtained by contacting City Clerk at 650-330-6620. (Posted: 9/23/2026)



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Date: 9/14/2026
Time: 7:00 p.m.
Location: Zoom.us/join – ID# 846 9472 6242 and
City Council Chambers
751 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. Call To Order

Chair Silverstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Ross Silverstein (Chair), Katie Behroozi (Vice Chair, remote, exited at 9:35 p.m.), Andrew Ehrich, Katie Ferrick, Nancy Larocca Hedley, Jennifer Schindler, Misha Silin

Staff: Matthew Ball, Assistant Planner; Matthew Pruter, Associate Planner; Corinna Sandmeier, Principal Planner

C. Reports and Announcements

Principal Planner Sandmeier stated that the City Council will consider a resolution to make the Coleman Avenue pilot project permanent during their September 15 meeting.

D. Public Comment

Chair Silverstein opened public comment and closed it as no one requested to speak.

E. Consent Calendar

E1. Approval of minutes from the August 24, 2026 Planning Commission meeting (Attachment)

E2. Architectural Control/Ana Maria Villa/1100 Sharon Park Dr., Unit 20:
Consider and adopt a resolution approving an architectural control permit to construct a wooden pergola, approximately nine-foot, four-inches in height, over an existing private roof deck for a residential condominium unit located in the R-3-A(X) (Garden Apartment Residential, Conditional Development Permit) zoning district. Determine this action is categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15303's Class 3 exemption for new construction or conversion of small structures. (Staff report #26-039-PC)

Chair Silverstein opened public comment and closed it as no one requested to speak.

ACTION: To approve the Consent Calendar as presented; passes 7-0.

F. Public Hearing

- F1. Architectural Control, Major Subdivision, Below Market Rate Housing Agreement/800 Oak Grove Owner, LLC/800 Oak Grove Ave.:
Consider and adopt two resolutions related to a project at 800 Oak Grove Ave. in the SP-ECR/D (El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan) zoning district to 1) approve an architectural control permit to demolish an existing surface-level parking lot, construct a new six-story, approximately 72-foot-tall multifamily residential building with 15 units, and convert and expand an existing two-story bank building into a two-story non-medical office building with a roof deck; approve a below market rate (BMR) housing agreement for the proposed project to ensure that one unit is designated as affordable to very low-income households and that the project applicant pays a BMR in-lieu fee to satisfy the remaining inclusionary housing requirement; and determine that this action is exempt from CEQA under the provisions of Assembly Bill (AB) 130; and 2) recommend to City Council approval of a tentative subdivision map to subdivide the project site into 15 condominium residential units and one commercial unit. The ground floor of the new residential building would contain parking for the new units and the adjacent existing commercial building on the site, and the five stories above the parking area would contain the residential units. In addition to the one BMR unit (approximately 6.7 percent of the total number of units), the remaining fractional below market rate (BMR) unit value would be provided via an in-lieu fee payment. The proposed change of use and expansion of the existing non-residential building also requires a BMR commercial linkage in-lieu fee. The application is being submitted subject to the State Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915 and relevant amendments), which permits concessions and waivers to the City's Zoning Ordinance requirements. The applicant is requesting concessions and waivers, as specified in the application materials. The proposed project also includes the removal of three heritage-size coast live oak trees. ([Staff report #26-040-PC](#))

Associate Planner Matt Pruter and the applicant team presented the project.

Commissioners asked staff and the city attorney clarifying questions about state density bonus law.

Chair Silverstein opened the public hearing.

Public comments:

- Brian Schmidt (Menlo Spark) expressed support for an all-electric project and for the developer to include native plants in their landscaping.
- Anna Chase expressed concerns about the amount of parking provided and the proposed valet parking system.
- John McKenna voiced his support for the project and echoed an earlier commenter's sentiments regarding electrification of the building.

Chair Silverstein closed the public comment period.

The Commissioners' discussion focused on the project's timeline and whether it was significantly reduced by excluding the CEQA process pursuant to AB 130. Commissioners also asked why the developer chose to provide for-sale units and discussed the rationale for the proposed unit sizes and count.

Commissioners discussed the utilities serving the building and how each component would be powered, as well as the reasons for the requested waivers and concessions.

Commissioners also discussed the office portion's roof deck and proposed amenities, as well as the infill nature of the project and the benefits of AB 130.

ACTION: Motion and second (Silverstein/Ehrich) to adopt a resolution approving the item as submitted; Passes 7-0.

G. Study Session

- G1. Study Session/Mark Murray for Lane Partners/Parkline Phase 2 Masterplan Revisions: Request for a study session for revisions to the previously approved Parkline masterplan development project located at 201, 301 and 333 Ravenswood Ave. and 555 and 565 Middlefield Rd. The proposed revisions would increase the number of housing units from 800 to 1,082 units, consolidate the office/research and development (R&D) footprint, reduce the non-residential square footage to approximately 902,000 square feet of office/ R&D uses and add approximately 40,000-square-feet of retail uses, increase the office/R&D building heights, modify the design standards and guidelines, and redesign the site layout. The proposed revised project also includes modifications to the below market rate (BMR) guidelines to locate all for-sale BMR units in the attached townhome component, the definition of gross floor area as applied to the project, and number and type of emergency diesel back-up generators. The proposed revised project would require revisions to the approved conditional development permit (CDP), BMR housing agreement, vesting tentative map, and heritage tree removal permits. Review of the project will include analysis of the revised project's potential impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to determine if the revised project is consistent with the findings of the certified EIR for the approved project. Separate architectural control permits would also be required for the building design and site improvements. ([Staff report #26-041-PC](#))

Principal planner Sandmeier and the applicant team presented the project.

Commissioners asked clarifying questions of the applicant and staff.

Chair Silverstein opened the public hearing.

Public comments:

- Peter Lezak (McCandless office buildings) expressed support for the overall project but expressed concerns about potential traffic and congestion, and concerns about access to the project via Seminary Drive.

- Irakili Nadareishvili voiced concerns regarding the potential impact that Parkline and other proposed projects nearby may have on Menlo Park's schools and City services.
- Ana Melikishvili expressed concerns regarding the potential impact that a project of this scale would have on Menlo Park.
- Gail Gorton expressed concerns regarding increased traffic and expressed support for a buffer zone between the proposed single-family homes and the existing Burgess Classics homes.
- Sue Connelly expressed support for a buffer zone between the proposed project and the Burgess Classics neighborhood, for keeping Burgess Drive closed, and for ongoing collaboration between the developer and the neighborhood.
- Mollie Naber, vice president of housing development strategy at Midpeninsula Housing, expressed her gratitude for being chosen as the developer for the project's affordable housing component.
- Brian Schmidt expressed support for the efforts to make the project 100% electric and suggested several ideas to decrease the project's environmental impact.
- Josephine Gaillard voiced support for the project but echoed earlier comments regarding traffic impacts. She also indicated that she would like City staff to communicate what efforts will be made to alleviate traffic.
- Maria Yip, a resident of the Burgess Classics neighborhood, echoed earlier comments in support of a buffer.
- Susan Stinson, a resident of the Burgess Classics neighborhood, expressed frustration with the revised project design and voiced support for a buffer.
- Sally Cole asked the developer to consider adding more bike and pedestrian infrastructure.
- Peter expressed concern regarding the number of large development projects proposed in District 3.
- John McKenna expressed his support for the project and asked that the proposed athletic field use natural grass instead of artificial turf.
- Steven Peng echoed concerns regarding the increased number of housing units and traffic impacts.

Chair Silverstein closed the public comment period.

Commissioners discussed the reasons for the project revision, including community feedback requesting less commercial space and additional residential uses. Discussion focused on changes from the original proposal, including screening between the project and adjacent single-family homes in the Burgess Classics neighborhood.

Commissioners asked about potential City incentives that could support additional affordable housing. They also discussed potential synergies between Parkline and redevelopment of the former USGS site.

Commissioners expressed general support for the revised project and appreciation for relocating the open space area to create a more inviting space for the community.

Commissioners commented that the increased unit count may not be enough to address the City's housing needs. Commissioners also discussed potential traffic and congestion impacts.

Commissioners voiced support for a safer bicycle and pedestrian connection along Ravenswood Avenue in addition to the proposed paseo through the site. Commissioners asked staff about sequencing of the environmental review and whether the maximum parking ratio would change for any portion of the project. Commissioners also requested future public outreach about potential traffic reduction efforts.

Chair Silverstein conducted straw polls (unofficial votes) on various study session items to summarize feedback to the applicant. Commissioner Behroozi was absent during the straw polls but all other Commissioners were present. The following items were supported by a majority of Commissioners present:

- Balconies being solar ready, meaning the correct plug ins would be available on balconies for residents to plug in photovoltaic equipment.
- Not using artificial turf for all public open spaces, including the recreation area to be dedicated to the City.
- An adequate buffer, which could include open space or other means such as hedges, that would persist between Parkline and Burgess Classics.
- A protected bike lane along Ravenswood Avenue in addition to the proposed bike/pedestrian path along Ravenswood Avenue.
- Decoupling the construction of the detached single-family units from the construction of the townhomes, meaning the BMR units for the single-family homes would likely be constructed after the single-family homes, during the construction of the townhomes.
- The applicant's proposed modifications to the BMR Guidelines.
- Requiring the applicant to develop a plan to move away from the use of diesel back-up generators.
- Asking the City Council to direct staff to develop a comprehensive traffic management plan for the Middlefield Road corridor and communicating the plan to the public.

A majority of the Commissioners did not support limiting the height of the two-story single-family homes abutting Burgess Classics to 28 feet, and no Commissioners supported a requirement to enable a virtual power plant, which would require batteries within residences.

H. Informational Items

- H1. Future Planning Commission Meeting Schedule – The upcoming Planning Commission meetings are listed here, for reference. No action will be taken on the meeting schedule, although individual Commissioners may notify staff of planned absences.

Principal Planner Sandmeier announced that the September 28 Planning Commission meeting will be held at the Belle Haven Community Campus.

- Regular Meeting: September 28, 2026
- Regular Meeting: October 5, 2026

I. Adjournment

Chair Silverstein adjourned the meeting at 11:18 p.m.

Staff Liaison: Corinna Sandmeier, Principal Planner

Recording Secretary: Matthew Ball



STAFF REPORT

Planning Commission

Meeting Date:

9/28/2026

Staff Report Number:

26-042-PC

Public Hearing:

Consider and adopt a resolution to approve a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and detached carport and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width and area in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district, at 411 Chester St. The project includes an attached ADU (accessory dwelling unit), which is a permitted use and not subject to discretionary review. Determine this action is categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15303's Class 3 exemption for new construction or conversion of small structures.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a resolution to approve a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and detached carport and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width and area in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district. The proposal would include an attached ADU (accessory dwelling unit), which is a permitted use that is not subject to discretionary review. The draft resolution, including the recommended actions and conditions of approval, is included as Attachment A.

Policy Issues

Each use permit is considered individually. The Planning Commission should consider whether the required use permit findings can be made for the proposed project.

Background

Site Location

The subject property is located at 411 Chester St. Using Chester Street in the east-west orientation, the subject property is located on the south side of Chester Street between Willow Road and Arnold Way. A location map is included as Attachment B.

The property is zoned R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential District). The property is bordered by properties in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential District) on all sides. Across the street on the north side of Chester Street the properties closest to Willow Road are zoned C-MU (Neighborhood Mixed

Use District) while all other properties are zoned R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential District).

Analysis

Project Description

The subject property is currently occupied by a single-story, single-family residence, detached carport, and two small storage sheds. The existing single-story residence was built in 1953 and is 1,148 square feet. The existing carport is 404 square feet, and the existing storage sheds are 135 square feet.

The lot is substandard with regard to minimum lot width and minimum lot area. The lot has a width of 50 feet where 65 feet is required and an area of 6,500 square feet where 7,000 square feet is required. A use permit is required to construct a two-story home on a substandard lot.

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing single-story, single-family residence, detached carport, and storage sheds and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with four bedrooms, 2.5 bathrooms and an attached two-car garage, which provides the two compliant parking spaces for the new residence. The new residence would have an attached 468.53-square-foot ADU, which would exceed the floor area limit (FAL) by 468.53 square feet. The attached ADU would be located on the first floor of the new two-story residence in the front left corner. The proposed ADU and FAL exceedance are permitted and not subject to discretionary review.

The proposed two-story single-family home would conform with all applicable zoning ordinance regulations.

Design and Materials

The proposed two-story, single-family residence would be a modern residential style. Proposed exterior materials include smooth stucco, accent stone tile, metal roofing, and metal-framed windows and doors. Proposed exterior colors would be neutral residential tones, including off-white and gray finishes with natural wood accents. A perspective rendering of the proposed residence can be found on Sheet A0.03 of the plan set, included as Exhibit A to Attachment A.

All second-floor windows would have a minimum sill height of three feet, six inches, and all first-floor windows would have a minimum sill height of three feet. There would be a sliding glass door that opens to a six-inch-high landing at the rear of the house. The side and rear property lines of the site would have a five-foot-high wood fence. The portion of the fence within the 20-foot front setback would be limited to four feet in height. The driveway and landscaped areas would be in approximately the same location as on the existing site; however, the proposed two-story residence has a greater width than the existing one-story residence. Therefore, the area of the site that currently consists of the two storage sheds and landscaped area bordering the property at 415 Chester St. would be replaced with area covered by the new two-story residence.

The streetscape along the south side of Chester Street between Willow Road and Arnold Way consists of single-family residences. The neighboring property to the west at 415 Chester St. is a one-story single-family residence. The neighboring property to the east at 407 Chester St. is also a one-story single-family residence. The streetscape along the north side of Chester Street between Willow Road and Arnold Way

consists of one commercial building with multiple tenants at the intersection of Willow Road and Chester Street and single-family residences. The single-family residences along the north side of Chester Street between Willow Road and Arnold Way are one-story. The proposed two-story single-family residence at 411 Chester St. is surrounded by one-story single-family residences but has proposed a maximum height more than two feet less than the maximum height allowed in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential District), complies with the daylight plane requirements, and does not propose any permitted daylight plane intrusions. These factors have the potential to mitigate impacts of the proposed two-story development on the surrounding residences.

Trees and Landscaping

The applicant submitted an arborist report (Attachment A, Exhibit C), detailing the species, size, and conditions of on-site and nearby trees. A total of three trees were assessed, including two heritage trees (trees #1 and 2 in the table below). There are two on-site heritage trees proposed for removal (tree #1, a 17.5-inch Glossy privet and tree #2, a 20-inch Coast redwood). The mitigation plan for the heritage tree removal is the planting of two 24-inch box male ginkgo trees in the rear yard along the rear fence, one 24-inch box Hedge maple street tree in the front yard between the existing water meter and proposed front walkway, and the payment of a \$3,290 in-lieu fee. The City Arborist has reviewed and approved the heritage tree removal permit based on development, pending Planning Commission approval of the project and the in-lieu fee has been paid.

To protect the heritage trees and non-heritage trees on and off site, the arborist report outlines requirements for tree protection fencing during construction as well as necessary pre- and post-construction measures. All recommended tree protection measures identified in the arborist report would be implemented and ensured as part of condition 1h.

The tree protection plan provided with the arborist report shows existing landscaping areas with small trees to remain. There are three plum trees in the front yard that would be retained, protected by temporary fencing, and continue to soften the streetscape.

Table 1: Tree summary and disposition						
ID #	Species	Trunk Diameter	Condition	Status	Removal or Retention	Location
1	Glossy privet	17.5	Fair	Heritage	Remove	On-site
2	Coast redwood	20	Good-Fair	Heritage	Remove	On-site
3	Plum	7	Very Poor	Non-heritage	Remove	On-site

Correspondence

The applicant indicates they conducted neighborhood outreach. The project description letter details outreach to neighboring properties and responses from 412 Chester St. and 415 Chester St. Staff received email correspondence from a nearby resident expressing concerns with traffic and street conditions, access to sunlight and shadow impacts, neighborhood compatibility, and privacy impacts. This email correspondence is included as Attachment C.

As noted in the staff report, the proposed residence has a maximum height more than two feet less than the maximum height allowed in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential District), complies with the daylight plane requirements, and does not propose any permitted daylight plane intrusions. All second-floor windows would have a sill height of at least three feet, six inches. The proposed residence also complies with off-street parking requirements through the provision of an attached two-car garage, which provides two compliant parking spaces.

Conclusion

Staff believes the scale, materials, and style of the proposed residence are generally compatible with the overall neighborhood. The area immediately surrounding the project site along Chester Street between Willow Road and Arnold Way consists of one commercial building and single-family residences. Although the neighboring properties are one-story residences, the height of the proposed structure, compliance with the daylight plane requirements of the zoning ordinance, and the minimum sill height of second-floor windows could mitigate potential impacts of the proposed development. The proposal would meet all Zoning Ordinance requirements. Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the proposed project.

Impact on City Resources

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

Environmental Review

The project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New construction or conversion of small structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Public Notice

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

Appeal Period

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

Attachments

A. Draft Planning Commission Resolution approving the Use Permit

Exhibits to Attachment A

- A. Project plans
- B. Project description letter
- C. Arborist report
- D. Conditions of approval

Staff Report #: 26-042-PC

- B. Location map
- C. Correspondence
- D. Data table

Report prepared by:
Brian Toy, Associate Planner

Report reviewed by:
Corinna Sandmeier, Principal Planner

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2026-0XX

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MENLO PARK APPROVING A USE PERMIT REQUEST TO DEMOLISH AN EXISTING SINGLE-STORY, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND DETACHED CARPORT AND CONSTRUCT A NEW TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A SUBSTANDARD LOT WITH REGARD TO LOT WIDTH AND LOT AREA, IN THE R-1-U ZONING DISTRICT, AT 411 CHESTER STREET.

WHEREAS, the City of Menlo Park ("City") received an application requesting a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and detached carport and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width and lot area, in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential) zoning district, (collectively, the "Project") from Shu Wu ("Applicant") and Shu-Wei Hsu ("Owner"), located at 411 Chester Street (APN 062-205-090 ("Property")). The Project use permit is depicted in and subject to the development plans and project description letter, which are attached hereto as Exhibit A and Exhibit B, respectively, and incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, the Property is located in the Single-Family Urban Residential (R-1-U) zoning district, which supports single-family residential uses; and

WHEREAS, the Property is substandard with regard to minimum lot width and lot area, in the R-1-U zoning district; and

WHEREAS, two-story residences are allowed to be constructed on a substandard lot, subject to the granting of a use permit; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Project complies with all objective standards of the R-1-U district; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Project was reviewed by the Engineering Division and found to be in compliance with City standards; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant submitted an arborist report, attached hereto as Exhibit C, prepared by Michelia Arboriculture, LLC, which was reviewed by the City Arborist and found to be in compliance with the Heritage Tree Ordinance, and proposes mitigation measures to adequately protect heritage trees in the vicinity of the project; and

WHEREAS, the Project requires discretionary actions by the City as summarized above, and therefore the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA," Public Resources Code Section §21000 et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code of Regulations, Title 14, §15000 et seq.) require analysis and a determination regarding the Project's environmental impacts; and

WHEREAS, the City is the lead agency, as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, and is therefore responsible for the preparation, consideration, certification, and approval of environmental documents for the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Project is categorically exempt from environmental review under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New construction or conversion of small structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, all required public notices and public hearings were duly given and held according to law; and

WHEREAS, at a duly and properly noticed public hearing held on September 28, 2026, the Planning Commission fully reviewed, considered, and evaluated the whole of the record including all public and written comments, pertinent information, documents and plans, prior to taking action regarding the Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE MENLO PARK PLANNING COMMISSION HEREBY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Recitals. The Planning Commission has considered the full record before it, which may include but is not limited to such things as the staff report, public testimony, and other materials and evidence submitted or provided, and the Planning Commission finds the foregoing recitals are true and correct, and they are hereby incorporated by reference into this Resolution.

Section 2. Conditional Use Permit Findings. The Planning Commission of the City of Menlo Park does hereby make the following Findings:

The approval of a use permit for the construction of a new two-story residence on a substandard lot is granted based on the following findings, which are made pursuant to Menlo Park Municipal Code Section 16.82.030:

1. That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use applied for will, under the circumstance of the particular case, not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort, and general welfare of the persons residing in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or injurious or detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the city because:
 - a. Consideration and due regard were given to the nature and condition of all adjacent uses and structures, and to general plans for the area in question and surrounding areas, and impact of the application hereon; in that, the proposed use permit is consistent with the R-1-U zoning district and the General Plan because two-story residences are allowed to be constructed on substandard lots subject to granting of a use permit.
 - b. The proposed residence would include the required number of off-street parking spaces because two parking spaces would be required at a minimum, and two covered parking spaces are provided in an attached garage.

- c. The proposed Project is designed to meet all the applicable codes and ordinances of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, and the Commission concludes that the Project would not be detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding community as the new residence would be located in a single-family neighborhood.

Section 4. Conditional Use Permit. The Planning Commission approves Use Permit No. PLN2026-00013, which use permit is depicted in and subject to the development plans and project description letter, which are attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as Exhibit A and Exhibit B, respectively. The Use Permit is conditioned in conformance with the conditions attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as Exhibit D.

Section 5. Environmental Review. The Planning Commission makes the following findings, based on its independent judgment after considering the Project, and having reviewed and taken into consideration all written and oral information submitted in this matter:

1. The Project is categorically exempt from environmental review under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New construction or conversion of small structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines

Section 6. Severability. If any term, provision, or portion of these findings or the application of these findings to a particular situation is held by a court to be invalid, void or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of these findings, or their application to other actions related to the Project, shall continue in full force and effect unless amended or modified by the City.

I, Corinna Sandmeier, Principal Planner of the City of Menlo Park, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing Planning Commission Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted at a meeting by said Planning Commission on September 28, 2026, by the following votes:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Official Seal of said City on this ____ day of September, 2026.

PC Liaison Signature

Corinna Sandmeier
Principal Planner
City of Menlo Park

Exhibits

- A. Project plans
- B. Project description letter
- C. Arborist report
- D. Conditions of approval



411 CHESTER ST, MENLO PARK, CA 94025

Stamp Area

PROJECT NAME:
**SHU-WEI HSU'S SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT**

PROJECT LOCATION:
4111 CHESTER ST. MENLO PARK, CA 94025

[illegible]

COVER SHEET

A0.01

EASEMENTS:

EASEMENTS OF RECORD ARE BASED ON A REVIEW OF THE SUBDIVISION MAP AND A PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT BY LAWYERS TITLE COMPANY, DATED 12/18/2025. NO EASEMENTS AFFECTING THE SUBJECT PROPERTY WERE DISCLOSED BY THE SUBDIVISION MAP OR THE PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT.

ELEVATION BENCHMARK

CITY BENCHMARK 6, ELEVATION = 31.14' (NAVD 88)
A BRASS DISK SET IN TOP OF CURB, STAMPED "CITY BENCHMARK 6", AT THE INTERSECTION OF WILLOW RD AND DURHAM ST.

NOTE:

- (1) DATE OF FIELD SURVEY: MARCH, 2026.
- (2) UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, TREES SHOWN WERE MEASURED AT THE GROUND AND TRUNK DIAMETERS WERE MEASURED 4' ABOVE GROUND. DRIP LINES WERE NOT MEASURED AND DEPICTED GRAPHICALLY IN THEIR APPROXIMATE LOCATIONS ONLY.
- (3) ALL DISTANCES AND DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- (4) BUILDING OUTLINE WAS MEASURED AT BUILDING EXTERIOR FINISH WALL SURFACE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- (5) ELEVATION SHOWN ARE ON NAVD 88 ELEVATION DATUM.

ABBREVIATIONS AND LEGEND


BSBL	BUILDING SETBACK LINE
CB	CATCH BASIN
CONC	CONCRETE
EM	ELECTRIC METER
EP	EDGE OF PAVEMENT
FT	FRUIT TREE
GM	GAS METER
GND	GROUND
HCR	HANDICAP RAMP
JP	JOINT POLE
PUE	PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT
SP	SIGN POLE
SSCO	SANITARY SEWER CLEAN OUT
SFNF	SEARCH FOR NOT FOUND
TC	TOP OF CURB
TEL	TELEPHONE
UNK T	UNKNOWN TREE
WM	WATER METER
-X-X-	BOUNDARY LINE
-X-X-	EXISTING FENCE LINE
-X-X-	EXISTING BUILDING OUTLINE
()	INDICATES REFERENCE MAP NUMBER
(M)	SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
(SD)	STORM DRAIN MANHOLE
FH	FIRE HYDRANT
-SS-	SANITARY SEWER LINE
-W-	WATER LINE
-OH-	OVERHEAD ELECTRICAL LINE
-G-	GAS LINE

REFERENCE INFORMATION

- (1) 13 MAPS 19
- (2) 14 MAPS 59
- (3) 42 ILS 26

GRAPHIC SCALE

(IN FEET)
1 inch = 10 ft.



SPECIAL NOTE:

THE LOT AREA SHOWN ON THIS BOUNDARY SURVEY MAP IS CALCULATED BASED ON PRECISE FIELD MEASUREMENTS AND THE DIMENSIONS RECORDED ON OFFICIAL SURVEY RECORDS OF SURVEY MAPS. THIS AREA IS DETERMINED BY A LICENSED SURVEYOR AND REFLECTS THE MOST ACCURATE AND RELIABLE INFORMATION AVAILABLE. PLEASE BE AWARE THAT FIGURES FROM CITY/COUNTY RECORDS OR REAL ESTATE WEBSITES MAY DIFFER DUE TO VARIATIONS IN DATA SOURCES OR ESTIMATION METHODS AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AS ACCURATE AS THIS SURVEY.

Purpose of Survey and Limitations of Use:

This Topographic Survey is prepared exclusively for site planning and development purposes in connection with proposed [house addition / new residence / ADU] design and permitting. It is not intended for use in resolving property line disputes, fence encroachments, or other legal matters. Use of this map for any other purpose may require additional survey services.

Property lines shown hereon are based on record information and available field evidence and are depicted for planning and design purposes only. This map does not represent a boundary survey for the purpose of establishing property lines or setting property corner monuments unless specifically stated otherwise. Establishment of property boundaries and monumentation may require additional survey work and the filing of a Record of Survey pursuant to the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY
WITH BOUNDARY INFORMATION

LOT 7, BLOCK 12, AS SHOWN ON "MENALTO
PARK MAP NO. 2", BOOK 14 OF MAPS AT
PAGE 59, SAN MATEO COUNTY RECORDS.
APN 062-205-090

(411 CHESTER STREET)

CITY OF MENLO PARK SAN MATEO COUNTY CALIFORNIA
SCALE: 1"=10' MARCH, 2026



Zhen Wang
ZHEN WANG



03/21/2026
DATE

ZHEN'S LAND SURVEYING CORP.
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA
TEL: (415)802-9945 | INFO@ZHENSLANDSURVEYING.COM

A0.12



(E) FLOOR PLAN
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

— 01

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

Stamp Area



SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO
PROJECT@EASYHOUSE.AI

FIELD VERIFICATION & RESPONSIBILITY NOTICE

BEFORE STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE OWNER, GENERAL CONTRACTOR, AND ALL RELEVANT TRADES SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS ON SITE. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SITE CONDITIONS AND THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY REPORTED TO SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO FOR REVIEW AND CORRECTION.

FIELD VERIFICATION / NOTICE OF DISCREPANCIES:
CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS
AND DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO
COMMENCING WORK. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN
ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS AND THE CONTRACT
DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE DESIGN TEAM
IN WRITING AND SHALL BE RESOLVED BEFORE
PROCEEDING. CONTRACTOR PROCEEDS AT ITS OWN RISK
FOR ANY WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT SUCH
NOTICE AND APPROVED DIRECTION.

ENGINEER OF RECORD:
SHU WU



PROJECT NAME:
**SHU-WEI HSU'S SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT**

PROJECT LOCATION:
411 CHESTER ST, MENLO PARK, CA 94025

STATUS / ACTION
DRAWN BY: EV YQ

DRAWN BY: SY, XQ

[illegible]

(E) FLOOR PLAN


A1.03



Stamp Area

(E) ROOF PLAN

A1.04



LEGEND

(E) RESIDENCE TO BE DEMOLISHED

DESIGN CONSULTANT:



SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO
PROJECT@EASTHOUSE.AI

FIELD VERIFICATION & RESPONSIBILITY NOTICE

BEFORE STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE OWNER, BEFORE CONSTRUCTION, AND ALL SUBMITTANT TRACES SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SITE AND DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SITE CONDITIONS AND THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY REPORTED TO SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO FOR REVIEW AND CORRECTIONS.

FIELD VERIFICATION / NOTICE OF DISCREPANCIES: CONSTRUCTION SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND CONDITIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. IF ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE FIELD CONDITIONS AND THE FIELD DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE DESIGN TEAM IN WRITING AND SHALL BE RESOLVED BEFORE PROCEEDING. CONSTRUCTION SHALL PROCEED AT ITS OWN RISK FOR ANY WORK PROCEEDING WITHOUT SUCH NOTICE AND APPROVED WORK.

ENGINEER OF RECORD:



PROJECT NAME:
SHU-WEI HSU'S SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT

PROJECT LOCATION:
4111 CHESTER ST. MENLO PARK, CA 94025

STATUS / ACTION DRAWN BY: SY, XQ

DATE	ACTION ITEM
04/06/2026	1ST PLNG SUBMITTAL
05/29/2026	2ND PLNG SUBMITTAL
06/29/2026	3RD PLNG SUBMITTAL
07/29/2026	4TH PLNG SUBMITTAL

DEMOLITION PLAN

A1.05

DEMOLITION PLAN

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

01

Stamp Area



EXISTING REAR YARD



EXISTING FRONT YARD



EXISTING SIDEYARD



EXISTING SIDE YARD



EXISTING REAR YARD



EXISTING FRONT YARD

DESIGN CONSULTANT:



SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO
PROJECT@EASTHOUSE.AI

FIELD VERIFICATION & RESPONSIBILITY NOTICE

BEFORE STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE OWNER, ARCHITECT, CONTRACTOR, AND ALL RELEVANT TRADES SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SITE. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SITE CONDITIONS AND THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY REPORTED TO SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO FOR REVIEW AND CORRECTIONS.

FIELD VERIFICATION / NOTICE OF DISCREPANCIES: CONSTRUCTION SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND CONDITIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. IF ANY DISCREPANCIES ARE FOUND, THE FIELD VERIFICATION AND NOTICE OF DISCREPANCIES SHALL BE REPORTED TO THIS DESIGN TEAM IN WRITING AND SHALL BE REVIEWED IMMEDIATELY. THE DESIGN CONSULTANT SHALL PROVIDE A FIELD VERIFICATION REPORT AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DISCREPANCIES WITHOUT DELAY.

ENGINEER OF RECORD:



PROJECT NAME:
**SHU-WEI HSU'S SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT**

PROJECT LOCATION:
4111 CHESTER ST. MENLO PARK, CA 94025

STATUS / ACTION



DRAWN BY: SY, XQ

DATE	ACTION ITEM
04/06/2026	1ST PLNG SUBMITTAL
05/29/2026	2ND PLNG SUBMITTAL
06/29/2026	3RD PLNG SUBMITTAL
07/29/2026	4TH PLNG SUBMITTAL

(E) ELEVATIONS
PHOTOGRAPHS

A1.06


Stamp Area



2ND FL. SQUARE-FOOTAGE CALCULATION PLAN

SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

02



G.F. SQUARE-FOOTAGE CALCULATION PLAN

SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

01

FLOOR AREA LIMIT CALCULATION

AREA	DIMENSIONS	ACTUAL SQFT
A	25'x18'9"	467.48
B	15'x18'9"	280.29
C1	25'3"x16'2"	408.97
C2	11'6"x4'9"	54.83
D-GARAGE	20'6"x20'6"	425.20
E1	15'6"x14'7"	226.37
E2	11'4"x7'2"	81.45
E3	3'3"x1'9"	5.76
E4	15'3"x5'5"	82.25
E5	15'6"x4'4"	66.93
F	15'3"x11'8"	178.15
G	13'2"x11'4"	148.84
H	12'10"x11'10"	145.36
J	11'6"x5'8"	64.63
K	8'3"x6'1"	49.32
L	16'x7'	114.07

1ST FLOOR AREA: A+B+C1+C2+D=1,636.77 SQFT
2ND FLOOR AREA: E1+E2+E3+E4+E5+F+G+H+J+K+L=1,163.13 SQFT
ADU: 468.53 SQFT

TOTAL FLOOR AREA: 2,799.90 SQFT
FLOOR AREA LIMIT: 2,800 SQFT

BUILDING COVERAGE CALCULATION

AREA	DIMENSIONS	ACTUAL SQFT
ADU	31'8"x14'9"	468.53
M-PORCH	4'x4'	16.00

1ST FLOOR (A+B+C1+C2+D): 1,636.77 SQFT

TOTAL BUILDING COVERAGE (A+B+C1+C2+D+M+ADU): 2,121.30 SQFT

MAX. ALLOWED = 2,275 (6,500 X 35%)

NOTE:

ACTUAL SF: THE ACTUAL SQUARE FOOTAGE IS BASED ON THE COMPUTING CALCULATION OF THE ACTUAL SHAPE OF THE SPACE. IT IS NOT DIRECTLY COMPUTED BY THE LARGEST LENGTH AND WIDTH OF THE SPACE NOTED ON THE DIMENSIONS.

DESIGN CONSULTANT:



SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO

PROJECT@EASTHOUSE.AI

FIELD VERIFICATION & RESPONSIBILITY NOTICE

BEFORE STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE OWNER, DESIGN CONSULTANT, AND ALL NEARBY TRADERS SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE FIELD VERIFICATION AND THE DESIGN DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE DESIGN TEAM IN WRITING AND SHALL BE RESOLVED BEFORE CONSTRUCTION. THE DESIGN TEAM SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DESIGN DISCREPANCIES WITHOUT CAUSE.

FIELD VERIFICATION / NOTICE OF DISCREPANCIES: THE DESIGN CONSULTANT SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE FIELD VERIFICATION AND THE DESIGN DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE DESIGN TEAM IN WRITING AND SHALL BE RESOLVED BEFORE CONSTRUCTION. THE DESIGN TEAM SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DESIGN DISCREPANCIES WITHOUT CAUSE.

ENGINEER OF RECORD:

SHU WU



PROJECT NAME:
SHU-WEI HSU'S SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT

PROJECT LOCATION:
411 CHESTER ST. MENLO PARK, CA 94025

STATUS / ACTION

DRAWN BY: SY, XQ

DATE	ACTION ITEM
04/06/2026	1ST PLNG SUBMITTAL
05/29/2026	2ND PLNG SUBMITTAL
06/29/2026	3RD PLNG SUBMITTAL
07/29/2026	4TH PLNG SUBMITTAL





(N) FLOOR AREA &
BUILDING
COVERAGE

A1.08

Stamp Area

[illegible]

A1.09



DESIGN CONSULTANT:

FIELD VERIFICATION & RESPONSIBILITY NOTICE

BEFORE STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE OWNER, GENERAL CONTRACTOR, AND ALL RELEVANT TRADES SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS ON SITE. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SITE CONDITIONS AND THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY REPORTED TO SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO FOR REVIEW AND CORRECTION.

FIELD VERIFICATION / NOTICE OF DISCREPANCIES:
CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS
AND DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO
COMMENCING WORK. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN
ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS AND THE CONTRACT
DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE DESIGN TEAM
IN WRITING AND SHALL BE RESOLVED BEFORE
PROCEEDING. CONTRACTOR PROCEEDS AT ITS OWN RISK
FOR ANY WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT SUCH
NOTICE AND APPROVED DISCREPANCY.

ENGINEER OF RECORD:
SHU WU

PROJECT NAME:
**SHU-WEI HSU'S SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT**

PROJECT LOCATION:
411 CHESTER ST, MENLO PARK, CA 94025



STATUS / ACTION
DRAWN BY: SY, XQ

DATE	ACTION ITEM
04/06/2026	1ST PLNG SUBMITTAL
05/29/2026	2ND PLNG SUBMITTAL
06/29/2026	3RD PLNG SUBMITTAL
07/29/2026	4TH PLNG SUBMITTAL

3D VIEWS

A1.10

Stamp Area



DESIGN CONSULTANT:



FIELD VERIFICATION & RESPONSIBILITY NOTICE

BEFORE STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE OWNER, GENERAL CONTRACTOR, AND ALL RELEVANT TRADES SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS ON SITE. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SITE CONDITIONS AND THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY REPORTED TO SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO AND RESOLVED AND CORRECTED AT ONCE.

FIELD VERIFICATION / NOTICE OF DISCREPANCIES:
CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS
AND DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO
COMMENCING WORK. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN
ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS AND THE CONTRACT
DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE DESIGN TEAM
IN WRITING AND SHALL BE RESOLVED BEFORE
PROCEEDING. CONTRACTOR PROCEEDS AT ITS OWN RISK
FOR ANY WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT SUCH
NOTICE AND APPROVED DIRECTION.

ENGINEER OF RECORD:
SHU WU





STATUS / ACTION
DRAWN BY: SY, XQ

DATE	ACTION ITEM
04/06/2026	1ST PLNG SUBMITTAL
05/29/2026	2ND PLNG SUBMITTAL
06/29/2026	3RD PLNG SUBMITTAL
07/29/2026	4TH PLNG SUBMITTAL

SOLAR STUDY

A1.11

Stamp Area



G.F. CONSTRUCTION PLAN

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

01

DESIGN CONSULTANT:



SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO
PROJECT@EASTHOUSE.AI

FIELD VERIFICATION & RESPONSIBILITY NOTICE

BEFORE STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE OWNER, DESIGN CONSULTANT, AND ALL RELEVANT TRADES SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND CONDITIONS ON SITE, AND DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SITE CONDITIONS AND THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY REPORTED TO SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO FOR REVIEW AND CORRECTIONS.

FIELD VERIFICATION / NOTICE OF DISCREPANCIES: CONSTRUCTION SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND CONDITIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. IF ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE FIELD CONDITIONS AND THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THIS DESIGN TEAM IN WRITING AND SHALL BE RESOLVED BEFORE PROCEEDING. CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DISCREPANCIES WITHOUT CLAIM FROM THE DESIGN TEAM AND APPROVED SCHEDULING.

ENGINEER OF RECORD:

SHU WU



PROJECT NAME:
**SHU-WEI HSU'S SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT**


PROJECT LOCATION:
4111 CHESTER ST. MENLO PARK, CA 94025

STATUS / ACTION
DRAWN BY: SY, XQ

DATE	ACTION ITEM
04/06/2026	1ST PLNG SUBMITTAL
05/29/2026	2ND PLNG SUBMITTAL
06/29/2026	3RD PLNG SUBMITTAL
07/29/2026	4TH PLNG SUBMITTAL

GROUND FL.
CONSTRUCTION
PLAN
A2.01

Stamp Area





N

SECTION PLAN

SCALE: $1/4" = 1'-0"$


Stamp Area







01

A2.03



NOTE: FOR REFERENCE ONLY, RESIDENCE TO BE DEMOLISHED

A3.00



ELEVATION KEY NOTES

1. PORTLAND CEMENT PLASTER SMOOTH FINISH OR SIMILAR
2. WINDOW AS SCHEDULED
3. DOOR AS SCHEDULED

DESIGN CONSULTANT:



FIELD VERIFICATION & RESPONSIBILITY NOTICE

BEFORE STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE OWNER, GENERAL CONTRACTOR, AND ALL RELEVANT TRADES SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS ON SITE. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SITE CONDITIONS AND THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY REPORTED TO SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO FOR REVIEW AND COORDINATION.

FIELD VERIFICATION / NOTICE OF DISCREPANCIES:
CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS
AND DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO
COMMENCING WORK. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN
ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS AND THE CONTRACT
DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE DESIGN TEAM
IN WRITING AND SHALL BE RESOLVED BEFORE
PROCEEDING. CONTRACTOR PROCEEDS AT ITS OWN RISK
FOR ANY WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT SUCH
NOTICE AND APPROVED DIRECTION.

ENGINEER OF RECORD:
SHU WU



PROJECT NAME:
**SHU-WEI HSU'S SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT**

PROJECT LOCATION:
411 CHESTER ST, MENLO PARK, CA 94025

STATUS / ACTION


DRAWN BY: SY, XQ

DATE	ACTION ITEM
04/06/2026	1ST PLNG SUBMITTAL
05/29/2026	2ND PLNG SUBMITTAL
06/29/2026	3RD PLNG SUBMITTAL
07/29/2026	4TH PLNG SUBMITTAL


ELEVATIONS

A3.01

Stamp Area



SOUTH ELEVATION 02
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



WEST ELEVATION 01
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

ELEVATION KEY NOTES

1. PORTLAND CEMENT PLASTER SMOOTH FINISH OR SIMILAR
2. WINDOW AS SCHEDULED
3. DOOR AS SCHEDULED



FIELD VERIFICATION & RESPONSIBILITY NOTICE

BEFORE STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE OWNER, GENERAL CONTRACTOR, AND ALL SUBMITTAL TRACERS SHALL VERIFY ALL FIELD VERIFICATION AND DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE FIELD VERIFICATION AND THE DRAWING DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE DESIGN TEAM IN WRITING, AND SHALL BE RESOLVED BEFORE PROCEEDING. CONSTRUCTION SHALL PROCEED AT THE RISK OF THE OWNER AND CONTRACTOR.



PROJECT NAME:
SHU-WEI HSU'S SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT


PROJECT LOCATION:
4111 CHESTER ST. MENLO PARK, CA 94025

STATUS / ACTION	
DATE	ACTION ITEM
04/06/2026	1ST PLNG SUBMITTAL
05/29/2026	2ND PLNG SUBMITTAL
06/29/2026	3RD PLNG SUBMITTAL
07/29/2026	4TH PLNG SUBMITTAL

ELEVATIONS

A3.02

Stamp Area



A3.04

MARK	LOCATION	QT.	FIRE RATING (MINUTES)	SIZE			DOOR		FRAME			Hardware	U Value	SHGC	COMMENTS
				WIDTH	HEIGHT	THK	DOOR MATERIAL	DOOR FINISH	FRAME MATERIAL	FRAME FINISH					
01	ENTRANCE	1	NR	4' - 0"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	HOLLOW METAL	FACTORY FINISH	HOLLOW METAL	FACTORY FINISH					
02	TYP. BEDROOM, BATHROOM	7	NR	2' - 8"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH					
03	ADJ. BEDROOM	1	NR	2' - 6"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH					
04	GARAGE	1	20	2' - 6"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	HOLLOW METAL	FACTORY FINISH	HOLLOW METAL	FACTORY FINISH					
05	ADU	1	45	2' - 6"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	HOLLOW METAL	FACTORY FINISH	HOLLOW METAL	FACTORY FINISH					
06	LIVING	1	NR	12' - 0"	8' - 0"	0' - 0 1/4"	GLASS	FACTORY FINISH	HOLLOW METAL	FACTORY FINISH				1/4" THK. TEMP. GLASS	
07	GARAGE	1	NR	16' - 0"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	HOLLOW METAL	FACTORY FINISH	HOLLOW METAL	FACTORY FINISH					
08	CLOSET	5	NR	6' - 0"	8' - 0"	0' - 0 1/4"	GLASS	FACTORY FINISH	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH					
09	ADJ. MASTER BATHROOM	3	NR	2' - 8"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH				1/4" THK. TEMP. GLASS	
10	PORCH	1	NR	2' - 2"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH					
11	ADU	1	NR	2' - 8"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	GLASS	FACTORY FINISH	HOLLOW METAL	FACTORY FINISH					
12	ADU	1	45	2' - 6"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH					
13	GARAGE TO SIDE YARD	1	NR	2' - 6"	8' - 0"	0' - 1 3/4"	GLASS	FACTORY FINISH	WOOD	FACTORY FINISH				LOCKABLE FROM BOTH SIDES	

REMARKS

1. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY WITH OWNER/ARCH. ALL DOOR SIZES, MATERIALS, FINISHES AND LOCATIONS PRIOR TO ORDERING.

2. PROVIDE WEATHER STRIPPING FOR ALL EXTERIOR DOORS TYP.

3. EXIT DOORS SHALL BE OPERABLE FROM INSIDE WITHOUT USE OF A KEY OR ANY SPECIAL KNOWLEDGE OR EFFORT.

4. SIZE OF THE STORAGE UNDER THE STAIRCASE VERIFY IN FIELD.

5. EXTERIOR DOOR ASSEMBLIES SHALL BE APPROVED NONCOMBUSTIBLE MATERIAL.

MARK	WINDOW LOCATION	QT.	WINDOW SIZE				UV COATING	U Values URL	SHGC VALUE	COMMENTS
			Width	Height	Head Height	Sill Height				
01	DINING, JADU, KITCHEN	3	8'-0"	5'-0"	8'-0"	3'-0"	UV COATING	0.3	0.23	
02	BEDROOM	4	6'-0"	4'-6"	8'-0"	3'-6"	UV COATING	0.3	0.23	
03	MASTER BATH, ADU	2	4'-0"	4'-6"	8'-0"	3'-6"	UV COATING	0.3	0.23	1/4" THK. TEMP. GLASS
04	BEDROOM, BATHROOM	2	3'-0"	4'-6"	8'-0"	3'-6"	UV COATING	0.3	0.23	1/4" THK. TEMP. GLASS
05	BEDROOM	11	2'-0"	4'-6"	8'-0"	3'-6"	UV COATING	0.3	0.23	
06	STAIR	1	4'-0"	4'-6"	8'-0"	3'-6"	UV COATING	0.3	0.23	
07	BATHROOM	2	5'-0"	2'-0"	6'-0"	6'-0"	UV COATING	0.3	0.23	1/4" THK. TEMP. GLASS
08	MASTER BATH	2	4'-0"	2'-0"	8'-0"	6'-0"	UV COATING	0.3	0.23	1/4" THK. TEMP. GLASS

REMARKS

1. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY WITH OWNER/ARCH. ALL WINDOW SIZES, MATERIALS, FINISHES AND LOCATIONS PRIOR TO ORDERING.

2. ALL OPERABLE WINDOWS TO HAVE SCREENS(TYP.) COLOR SELECTED BY OWNER/ARCH. U.N.O.

3. FOR WINDOW TYPES AND LITES REFER TO EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS.

4. ALL GLAZING TO BE LOW-E DOUBLE GLAZING.

Figure 1 shows eight different door types (01 to 08) with their dimensions. The dimensions are as follows:

Door Type	Width	Height (from FF)
01	8'-0"	3'-0"
02	6'-0"	4'-6"
03	4'-0"	4'-6"
04	3'-0"	4'-6"
05	2'-0"	4'-6"
06	4'-0"	4'-6"
07	5'-0"	2'-0"
08	4'-0"	2'-0"



PROJECT@EASYHOUSE.AI

BEFORE STARTING CONSTRUCTION, THE OWNER, GENERAL CONTRACTOR, AND ALL RELEVANT TRADES SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS ON SITE. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SITE CONDITIONS AND THESE DRAWINGS SHALL BE IMMEDIATELY REPORTED TO SANDHILLS DESIGN STUDIO FOR REVIEW AND COORDINATION.

FIELD VERIFICATION / NOTICE OF DISCREPANCIES:
CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS
AND DIMENSIONS IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO
COMMENCING WORK. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN
ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS AND THE CONTRACT
DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE DESIGN TEAM
IN WRITING AND SHALL BE RESOLVED BEFORE
PROCEEDING. CONTRACTOR PROCEEDS AT ITS OWN RISK
FOR ANY WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT SUCH
NOTICE AND APPROVED DIRECTION.



PROJECT NAME:
**SHU-WEI HSU'S SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT**

PROJECT LOCATION:
411 CHESTER ST, MENLO PARK, CA 94025

DATE	ACTION ITEM
04/06/2026	1ST PLNG SUBMITTAL
05/29/2026	2ND PLNG SUBMITTAL
06/29/2026	3RD PLNG SUBMITTAL
07/29/2026	4TH PLNG SUBMITTAL

A4.01

Stamp Area

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address: 411 Chester St, Menlo Park, CA 94025
APN: 062-205-090

Purpose of the Proposal

The purpose of this proposal is to construct a new steel-framed single-family residence with an attached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) on the subject property. The project is intended to improve the site with a new residential development that is consistent with the existing residential zoning and neighborhood context.

Scope of Work

The project consists of the demolition/removal of the existing residence and existing site improvements, followed by the construction of a new two-story single-family residence with an attached ADU and related site improvements.

The scope of work includes site preparation, foundation construction, steel structural framing, exterior wall and roof construction, windows and doors, interior build-out, utility connections, drainage improvements, paving/hardscape, landscaping, and other related work required for completion of the project.

Architectural Style, Materials, Colors, and Construction Methods

The proposed residence is designed in a modern residential style. Exterior materials are proposed to include smooth stucco, accent stone tile, metal roofing, and metal-framed windows and doors.

Exterior colors will consist of neutral residential tones, including off-white and gray finishes with natural wood accents, to maintain compatibility with the surrounding residential neighborhood.

The residence will be constructed using a steel framing system over a concrete foundation, with conventional exterior cladding and roofing materials suitable for residential construction.

Basis for Site Layout

The site layout is based on the lot configuration, applicable setbacks and development standards, site access, utility connections, drainage considerations, and the functional arrangement of the residence and attached ADU.

The ADU is incorporated into the main residence and designed as part of the overall residential layout.

Existing and Proposed Uses

The existing use of the property is residential.

The proposed use will remain residential and will consist of one single-family residence with one attached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The ADU is intended to provide living space for an elderly family member of the property owner and is not intended to function as a separate apartment development.

NEIGHBORHOOD OUTREACH LETTER & RESPONSE FORM #1

Project Address: 411 Chester St, Menlo Park, CA 94025

APN: 062-205-090

Neighboring Property Address: _____

Date of Outreach: _____

Method of Outreach:

- ☐ **Hand-delivered Letter**
- ☐ **Mailed Letter**
- ☐ **Email**
- ☐ **In-person Discussion**
- ☐ **Other:** _____

Dear Neighbor,

We are providing this letter to share information regarding the proposed residential project at 411 Chester St, Menlo Park, CA 94025, and to give nearby neighbors an opportunity to provide comments before the project continues through the City of Menlo Park planning review process.

The project proposes removal of the existing residence and construction of a new two-story single-family residence with an attached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The ADU is incorporated into the main residence and is intended to provide living space for an elderly family member of the property owner. It is not intended as a separate apartment development and is not expected to create additional neighborhood parking pressure.

The proposed residence will use a modern residential design with neutral exterior materials and colors, including smooth stucco, accent stone tile, metal roofing, metal-framed windows and doors, and off-white / gray tones with natural wood accents.

Please review the attached project materials and provide any comments, concerns, or support. Any feedback received will be documented as part of the City's review process.

Project Materials Provided

- ☐ Site Plan
- ☐ Floor Plans
- ☐ Exterior Elevations
- ☐ Exterior Renderings
- ☐ Project Summary
- ☐ Other: _____

Neighbor Response

- ☐ I support the proposed project / have no objection.
- ☐ I have comments or concerns regarding the proposed project.
- ☐ I acknowledge receipt of the outreach letter and project materials, but do not wish to provide comments at this time.

Neighbor Comments

Neighbor Acknowledgment

Printed Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Email / Phone, optional: _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Address: 411 Chester St, Menlo Park, CA 94025
APN: 062-205-090

Purpose of the Proposal

The purpose of this proposal is to construct a new steel-framed single-family residence with an attached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) on the subject property. The project is intended to improve the site with a new residential development that is consistent with the existing residential zoning and neighborhood context.

Scope of Work

The project consists of the demolition/removal of the existing residence and existing site improvements, followed by the construction of a new two-story single-family residence with an attached ADU and related site improvements.

The scope of work includes site preparation, foundation construction, steel structural framing, exterior wall and roof construction, windows and doors, interior build-out, utility connections, drainage improvements, paving/hardscape, landscaping, and other related work required for completion of the project.

Architectural Style, Materials, Colors, and Construction Methods

The proposed residence is designed in a modern residential style. Exterior materials are proposed to include smooth stucco, accent stone tile, metal roofing, and metal-framed windows and doors.

Exterior colors will consist of neutral residential tones, including off-white and gray finishes with natural wood accents, to maintain compatibility with the surrounding residential neighborhood.

The residence will be constructed using a steel framing system over a concrete foundation, with conventional exterior cladding and roofing materials suitable for residential construction.

Basis for Site Layout

The site layout is based on the lot configuration, applicable setbacks and development standards, site access, utility connections, drainage considerations, and the functional arrangement of the residence and attached ADU.

The JADU is incorporated into the main residence and designed as part of the overall residential layout.

Existing and Proposed Uses

The existing use of the property is residential.

The proposed use will remain residential and will consist of one single-family residence with one attached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The ADU is intended to provide living space for an elderly family member of the property owner and is not intended to function as a separate apartment development.

NEIGHBORHOOD OUTREACH LETTER & RESPONSE FORM #1

Project Address: 411 Chester St, Menlo Park, CA 94025

APN: 062-205-090

Neighboring Property Address: 412 Chester St, Menlo Park, CA 94025

Date of Outreach: 5/7/2026 12:03:00

Method of Outreach:
☒ Hand-delivered Letter
☒ Mailed Letter

☐ Email

☐ In-person Discussion

☐ Other: _____

Dear Neighbor,

We are providing this letter to share information regarding the proposed residential project at 411 Chester St, Menlo Park, CA 94025, and to give nearby neighbors an opportunity to provide comments before the project continues through the City of Menlo Park planning review process.

The project proposes removal of the existing residence and construction of a new two-story single-family residence with an attached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The ADU is incorporated into the main residence and is intended to provide living space for an elderly family member of the property owner. It is not intended as a separate apartment development and is not expected to create additional neighborhood parking pressure.

The proposed residence will use a modern residential design with neutral exterior materials and colors, including smooth stucco, accent stone tile, metal roofing, metal-framed windows and doors, and off-white / gray tones with natural wood accents.

Please review the attached project materials and provide any comments, concerns, or support. Any feedback received will be documented as part of the City's review process.

Project Materials Provided

- ☐ Site Plan
- ☐ Floor Plans
- ☐ Exterior Elevations
- ☐ Exterior Renderings
- ☐ Project Summary
- ☐ Other: _____

← not sure why I would be asked what I would be providing.

Neighbor Response

- ☒ I support the proposed project / have no objection.
- ☐ I have comments or concerns regarding the proposed project.
- ☐ I acknowledge receipt of the outreach letter and project materials, but do not wish to provide comments at this time.

Neighbor Comments

I do hope this won't be a hyper-modern dwelling, those tend to stand out, but I hope it brings its new inhabitants joy and long life. Welcome to the neighborhood.

Neighbor Acknowledgment

Printed Name: Robert Sugrath

Signature: R. Sugrath

Date: 26 5 17

Email / Phone, optional: 650.346.6396

I am Joss Geiduschek, your neighbor at 415 Chester. Thank you for coming by and introducing yourself and your sister Ocean to my wife, Amy Harris, and for the lovely teas!

The Project Description that you delivered by hand has also been received in the mail. We will sign and return it to the mailbox at 411 Chester Street.

We will check off the box that says that we have comments or concerns regarding the proposed project. Specifically,

1. Trees

We would like to understand the plan for the large trees near our shared property line. You should be aware that your redwood tree used to have a second trunk, but in March, 2023, that second trunk fell on our house after heavy rains followed by strong winds. We worked with the previous owner of your house who paid to get the tree lifted off of our house and for the cleanup. We would like to learn what your arborist says about the remaining redwood tree.

2. The fence

After the tree fell on our house, the tenant at 411 Chester and I partially propped up the damaged fence, but it was still falling over into our yard and towards our house along most of its length. Recently, Amy and I paid to have the fence fortified in a few places just to stabilize it until we could work with the new owners of 411 Chester. When you're ready, we would like to collaborate with you to have the fence repaired and/or rebuilt.

Also, comments and questions that will **not** go in the record:

1. Soil testing

We have an ADU project of our own under review with the city. This ADU will be built on the southwest corner of our property (the back corner furthest from your property) replacing our old garage. We are being required to obtain a soils report for this project. I'm hoping to economize by using your soils engineer and leveraging what they learned from testing your property. I know you mentioned this to Amy, and now I am asking to find out more about your experience and the cost of your testing, if you don't mind sharing that information.

2. Project drawings

Are you able to send us a copy or pdf of your construction drawings? Before you came over to introduce yourselves, I had reached out to the city to get drawings of your project; I was interested in the location of your windows and how our access to sunlight might change. The city would not send me a copy, but I was allowed to view the drawings at the building department, and saw that you are building a very nice house! However, I found a discrepancy: on one page, it shows that your house will be 13 feet away from our house; on the detailed plan views it shows you will build to the 5-foot setback, which is about 8 feet from the side of our house. I will assume you are building to the 5-foot setback since the plan views offer the greatest detail.

I look forward to meeting you personally.

A38

Best,

Hi Joss,

I checked with our architect and it seems like the soil engineer who worked on our property is traveling in asia.

He is with this company Geo Trinity Consultants and I found the contact info here

<http://www.geotrinity.com/contact-us.html>

Please feel free to reach out to them.

Best Regards,

Wayne (Shu-Wei) Hsu

On Mon, May 18, 2026 at 10:36 PM joss geiduschek <joss@sbccglobal.net> wrote:

Hi Wayne,

Could you please forward the contact info for your soil inspection provider? I think getting this report may be on critical path for processing our permit application.

Many thanks,

Joss (and Amy)

On May 14, 2026, at 6:21 PM, joss geiduschek <joss@sbccglobal.net> wrote:

Hi Wayne,

Thank you for the detailed reply and the offer to forward the helpful information. Regarding the fence, we are in no particular hurry, so can coordinate with your construction schedule.

Best,

Joss and Amy

On May 14, 2026, at 4:23 PM, Shu-Wei Hsu

<waynehsu1982@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Joss and Amy,

Thanks so much for the kind note and for sharing your questions and concerns. Please see the responses below:

Redwood tree: We're currently planning to remove the redwood, but we're waiting on our City-approved arborist's report next week before finalizing. We'll share the report and any recommendations once we receive it. Sorry to hear about the 2023 incident — appreciate you flagging it.

Fence: Thanks for stabilizing it in the meantime — really appreciate it. We're planning to install a new fence centered on the shared property line. Would that work for you? Happy to walk the line together and coordinate on timing and design once construction is closer.

Soil testing: Happy to share — I'll send our engineer's contact info and the cost separately. Worth asking them for a neighbor discount.

Drawings: We'll send you the updated PDF set once it's finalized — it'll include the solar shadow studies and the revised building heights. Thanks also for flagging the 13' vs 5' question. The 5' is our ground-floor side setback, and the 13' reflects the second floor, which steps back further from the property line. We'll make sure this reads more clearly in the updated drawings.

Thank you!

May 27, 2026

SandHills Design Studio & Easy House Construction

Project@easyhouse.ai

Dear SandHills & Easy House,

This arborist report addresses the new home at 411 Chester St, Menlo Park. For this report, I used the following references:

- City of Menlo Park: Heritage Trees Ordinance (Chapter 13.24), Street Trees Ordinance (Chapter 13.20), Heritage Tree Ordinance Administrative Guidelines (companion document to the Ordinance), Heritage Tree Removal Permit Application, Arborist Report Requirements [for] Large Projects (2022, with email clarification from City Arborist on January 30, 2024)
- Email from City Arborist with additional report requirements on September 19, 2023 (re: admittance to approved consulting arborist list)
- Site plan by SandHills Design Studio (April 6, 2026)
- Site visit / tree inventory on May 14, 2026

Heritage Tree Definition

- Non-oak trees with trunk diameter $\geq 15"$ (circumference $\geq 47.1"$) at 54" above grade.
- Oak trees (*Quercus* sp.) native to California with a trunk diameter $\geq 10"$ (circumference $\geq 31.4"$) at 54" above grade: Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), Scrub oak (*Quercus berberidifolia*), Canyon live oak (*Quercus chrysolepis*), Blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), Leather oak (*Quercus dumosa*), Englemann oak (*Quercus engelmannii*), Oregon white oak (*Quercus garryana*), Black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*), Valley oak (*Quercus lobata*), Shreve oak (*Quercus parvula* var. *shrevei*), Oracle oak (*Quercus x morehus*), Island oak (*Quercus tomentella*), Interior live oak (*Quercus wislizenii*)
- A tree or group of trees of significance that is specially designated by City Council (as of 2020, there were none per the Administrative Guidelines)
- Exemption: If the tree is under 12' tall, it is not a heritage tree.
- Multi-trunked trees are measured below the union. If the union is at or below grade, each trunk is considered a separate tree

Site & Project Summary

The subject property is a single-family residential parcel located at the northeast end of Menlo Park, near the border of East Palo Alto. The site is south of the Willow Rd & Hwy 101 intersection. The 6500 sq. ft. site has a 1000 sq. ft. house, two sheds and a carport. The property has not been maintained for some time, based on the condition of the home and landscape.

The proposed project will demolish the existing home to construct a new two-story home with a garage that sits closer to the front of the property, leaving the rear half for use as patio and landscape area. The proposed 2,788 sq. ft. home includes a 500 sq. ft. attached junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU).

I included three trees in my assessment, two of which are heritage trees on the west side of the property near the shared fence. The last tree is a declining plum in the front yard. The heritage trees are proposed for removal, due to the proximity of the new house and potential damage to the neighbor's house. The plum will be removed based on its condition (Figure 1).

Since the trees will be removed, tree protection recommendations have not been provided for this project. The client may opt to protect smaller trees with temporary fencing, which is marked on the accompanying "Tree Protection Plan".



Figure 1. A declining plum in the front yard will be removed because of its health, even though it is technically clear of construction (tree #3, canopy heighted in dashed lines, trunk in solid line).

Tree Inventory Table

The tree inventory table includes individual tree data as required by the City of Menlo Park. The data is explained as follows:

ID #	# assigned to each tree, correlating with a metal tag affixed to their trunks. Off-site trees are not tagged if their trunks are not accessible from the property; tags may be applied to the property line fence if feasible.
Species	Common & botanical name
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height (4.5' above ground) in inches; trunk is measured with a diameter tape. For off-site or inaccessible trees, the trunk size may be visually estimated instead.
Status	Denotes whether the tree is a Street/City tree, Heritage Tree, or off-site tree
Height	Height, visually estimated
Health	Health and vigor of the tree. Ratings are broken down into: • Good: The tree is growing well with vigor appropriate for its age – canopy is full with good color. Pest or disease issues may be present but have low impact on the tree. • Fair: The tree is showing signs of stress, exhibited as sparseness of canopy, change in foliage color, and minor-moderate signs of pest or disease issues. It can recover as long as conditions naturally improve. • Poor: The tree is stressed with tip dieback; it is unable to overcome pest & disease issues. Immediate long-term intervention and care is needed to avoid decline to the point of non-recovery. • Very Poor: The tree has significant issues and has declined so far that it is unlikely to recover. • Dead: No life remains in the tree.
Structure	Architecture & defects of the tree. Ratings are broken down into: • Good: The tree has ideal trunk & branch architecture. • Fair: Branch defects, poor attachments and decay may be present, but they can be mitigated with 1-2 pruning cycles (over 3-5 years). • Poor: Defects cannot be mitigated without long term management (10+ years); support systems like cabling and bolting may be needed in conjunction with pruning to reduce risk to the property. • Very Poor: The tree has significant issues that cannot be corrected and may be a hazard to the property.
Dripline	The canopy ("dripline") radius is visually estimated in feet in each cardinal direction (north, east, south, west).
Appraised Value	An estimate of the value of each tree is obtained using the Trunk Formula Technique outlined in the 10 th Edition of the <u>Guide for Plant Appraisal</u> by the Council of Tree & Landscape Appraisers (CTLA). The cost to replace a perfect specimen of like-size is calculated, then depreciated by the subject tree's current health, structure, form, factors that are inherent to the species and property, and external factors that are out of the property manager's control. Removal of non-Heritage, privately owned trees do not require a permit or mitigation plantings, so appraised values are not calculated. They are noted with "N/A".
Notes & Impact	Proximity to the project's improvements, and the anticipated impact based on tree condition, species tolerance to disturbance, future longevity, etc.
Actions	Includes recommended actions based on impacts, including tree protection measures.

ID #	Species	DBH (in)	Status	Height	Health	Structure	Dripline (NESW, ft)	Appraised Value	Notes & Impact	Actions
1	Glossy privet (<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>)	17.5	Heritage	35'	Fair	Fair	11, 16, 15, 10	\$1,750.00	Codominant trunks at 8' above grade, canopy elevated to half of height. Dead branches throughout interior despite competition only to N, no dieback. E side of trunk has buttress roots that flatten along walkway (does not grow over), debris and vines obscuring the rest of the trunk flare. Concrete patio extends about 10' long on E side of trunk. Neighbor's house 7.5' to NW. 1' from proposed patio, 6.5' from proposed house (2 stories); in permeable paver area.	Remove.
2	Coast redwood (<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i>)	~20	Heritage	35'	Good-Fair	Good-Fair	8 NESW	\$2,740.00	Diameter estimated since trunk is flush to and pushing over fence. 2' from neighbor's house. Slightly sparse canopy. root sprouts have dying tops. Brown in upper canopy mainly from dead vine. Concrete walkway 14' to E. 3' from proposed house; in permeable paver area.	Remove.
3	Plum (<i>Prunus</i> sp.)	7		12'	Very Poor	Poor	0, 10, 0, 0	N/A	Mostly dead. Trunk leans to SE with sparse living foliage, top dieback. Clear of construction.	Remove. (due to health)

Heritage Tree Discussion

Tree #1 is a heritage tree, a glossy privet on the west side of the existing house (*Ligustrum lucidum*, Figure 2 top). This species is considered weedy, since its seeds spread and germinate easily. The existing concrete patio goes right up to its trunk, which limits root growth to the east. Often, tree roots can grow under hardscape, but in this case, the trunk and main roots grow parallel to concrete (Figure 2, bottom). This indicates that the main roots may not have developed to the east, which may be an issue in terms of tree stability. The base of the tree was covered by vines and brush, which further obscure potential root or trunk issues.

The proposed house will be 6.5' from the trunk, with excavation and scaffolding likely extending another 1'-2' towards the trunk. The tree is about 35' tall and will need to be heavily pruned on one side, since the new house is 27' tall. The house itself poses a high impact to the tree, but permeable pavers are also proposed for the backyard and side yards. Thus, the privet will be removed to build the house and to install the new pavers.



Figure 2. (top) Privet #1 on the west side of the house, with an existing patio between the house and the tree. (bottom) The trunk and main roots of the privet flatten against and grow parallel to the patio (white line), Instead of growing under the hardscape.

The other heritage tree is right next to the privet – a coast redwood along the property line (*Sequoia sempervirens*, tree #2, Figure 3). It is a young tree in good health, but its location is problematic for the neighbor. The tree is within 2' of the neighbor's house and has pushed the fence further into their property. The closer a tree is to a structure, the higher the likelihood of damage – but the mere presence of the tree does not guarantee that damage will occur. If the damage is caused by roots, some degree of root pruning may be possible to mitigate the problem. However, as this redwood approaches its full size, the trunk may also expand into their house. There is no way of addressing that problem without removing the tree. Additionally, the proposed house will be 3' from the tree, effectively trapping it between two homes. For those reasons, the redwood will also be removed.

Replacement trees

The City requested street trees as part of the project. There is space for one street tree between the existing water meter and the proposed front walkway. The client's preference is for a male ginkgo (*Ginkgo biloba*). Ginkgos are medium to large trees, so they will grow into the power lines, but they are not vigorous growers. A few rounds of directional pruning may be enough to train it to grow away from the power lines, allowing for a larger tree in this space. If the City does not permit this species, the client has a second preference for maples. Utility friendly maples include hedge maple (*Acer campestre* 'Postelence'), Vine maple (*Acer circinatum*) and Japanese maple (*Acer palmatum*).

Since the trees are proposed for removal, there are no tree protection recommendations at this time. Should you have any questions or need clarification, please reach out at any time.


Sincerely,



Jennifer Tso, Michelia Arboriculture, LLC
Board Certified Master Arborist #WE-10270B
Registered Consulting Arborist #876
925-515-1362 | jennifer@micheliarborist.com



Figure 3. Redwood #2 grows along the property line, within 2' of the neighbor's house (at left).



Tree Protection Legend

- Tree locations adapted from survey
- ① Tree #s (metal tag)
- X Proposed tree removals
- Dripelines by arborist
- Tree inventory notes, for reference only
- Tree protection recommendations

Tree Inventory Table
The tree inventory table includes individual tree data as required by the City of Menlo Park. The data is explained as follows:

ID #	# assigned to each tree, correlating with a metal tag affixed to their trunks. Off-site trees are not tagged if their trunks are not accessible from the property; tags may be applied to the property line fence if feasible.
Species	Common & botanical name
DBH	Diameter at Breast Height (4.5' above ground) in inches; trunk is measured with a diameter tape. For off-site or inaccessible trees, the trunk size may be visually estimated instead.
Status	Denotes whether the tree is a StreetCity tree, Heritage Tree, or off-site tree
Height	Height, visually estimated
Health	Health and vigor of the tree. Ratings are broken down into: - Good: The tree is growing well with vigor appropriate for its age – canopy is full with good color. Pest or disease issues may be present but have low impact on the tree. - Fair: The tree is showing signs of stress, exhibited as sparseness of canopy, change in foliage color, and minor/moderate signs of pest or disease issues. It can recover as long as conditions naturally improve. - Poor: The tree is stressed with tip dieback. It is unable to overcome pest & disease issues. Immediate long-term intervention and care is needed to avoid decline to the point of non-recovery. - Very Poor: The tree has significant issues and has declined so far that it is unlikely to recover. - Dead: No life remains in the tree.
Structure	Architecture & defects of the tree. Ratings are broken down into: - Good: The tree has ideal trunk & branch architecture. - Fair: Branch defects, poor attachments and decay may be present, but they can be mitigated with 1-2 pruning cycles (over 3-5 years). - Poor: Defects cannot be mitigated without long term management (10+ years); support systems like cabling and bolting may be needed in conjunction with pruning to reduce risk to the property. - Very Poor: The tree has significant issues that cannot be corrected and may be a hazard to the property.
Dripeline	The canopy ("dripeline") radius is visually estimated in feet in each cardinal direction (north, east, south, west).
Notes & Impact	Proximity to the project's improvements, and the anticipated impact based on tree condition, species tolerance to disturbance, future longevity, etc.
Actions	Includes recommended actions based on impacts, including tree protection measures.

ID #	Species	DBH (in)	Status	Height	Health	Structure	Dripeline (NESW, ft)	Notes & Impact	Actions
1	Glossy privet (<i>Ligustrum lucidum</i>)	17.5	Heritage	30'	Fair	Fair	11, 16, 15, 10	Codebook trunks at 4' above grade, canopy elevated to half of height. Dead branches throughout interior despite competition only to N, no dieback. E side of trunk has buttresses (note that flatter along walkway does not grow over), debris and vines obscuring the rest of the trunk here. Concrete patio extends about 10' long on E side of trunk. Neighbor's house 7.5' to 100' 1' from proposed patio, 6.5' from proposed house (2 stories), in permeable paver area.	Remove.
2	Coast redwood (<i>Sequoia sempervirens</i>)	~20	Heritage	35'	Good-Fair	Good-Fair	8 NEBW	Diameter estimated since trunk is flush to and jutting over fence 2' from neighbor's house. Slightly sparse canopy, root sprouts have dying tops. Brown in upper canopy mostly from dead vines. Concrete walkway 14' to 6'-9" from proposed house, in permeable paver area.	Remove.
3	Hum (Prunus sp.)	7		12'	Very Poor	Poor	0, 10, 0, 0	Moderately dead. Trunk leans to SE with sparse living foliage top dieback. Clear of construction.	Remove. (due to health)

TREE PROTECTION PLAN For 411 Chester St, Menlo Park May 27, 2026

By Jennifer Tso, Michelia Arboriculture, LLC
RCA #876 | BCMA #WE-10270B
925-515-1362 | jennifer@micheliarborist.com

Drawn on site plan by Sandhill Design Studio
(April 6, 2026), tree locations copied from
survey by Zhen's Land Surveying Corp (March 2026)

(N) SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

LOCATION: 411 Chester St.	PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2026-00013	APPLICANT: Shu Wu	OWNER: Shu-Wei Hsu
PROJECT CONDITIONS: 1. The use permit shall be subject to the following standard conditions: a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by September 28, 2027) for the use permit to remain in effect. b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Sandhills Design Studio consisting of 26 plan sheets, dated received September 15, 2026, and approved by the Planning Commission on September 28, 2026, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project. d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project. e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes. f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division. g. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits. h. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by Michelia Arboriculture, LLC dated May 27, 2026. i. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay all fees incurred through staff time spent reviewing the application. j. The applicant or permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Menlo Park or its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the City of Menlo Park or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the Planning Commission, City Council, Community Development Director, or any other department, committee, or agency of the City concerning a development, variance, permit, or land use approval which action is brought within the time period provided for in any applicable statute; provided, however, that the applicant's or permittee's duty to so defend, indemnify, and hold harmless shall be subject to the City's promptly notifying the applicant or permittee of any said claim, action, or proceeding and the City's full cooperation in the applicant's or permittee's defense of said claims, actions, or proceedings.			

LOCATION: 411 Chester St.	PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2026-00013	APPLICANT: Shu Wu	OWNER: Shu-Wei Hsu
PROJECT CONDITIONS: k. Notice of Fees Protest – The applicant may protest any fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions imposed by the City as part of the approval or as a condition of approval of this development. Per California Government Code 66020, this 90-day protest period has begun as of the date of the approval of this application.			



City of Menlo Park
Location Map
411 Chester Street



Scale: 1:4,000

Drawn By: BJT

Checked By: CDS

Date: 9/28/2026

Sheet: 1

Brian Toy

From: Wuyang Dai [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 5:33 PM
To: Brian Toy
Subject: Comments on 411 Chester St Use Permit Application

Hi Brian,

I hope you are doing well. I am a nearby resident writing to share early comments on the proposed project at 411 Chester Street.

We understand the project is still under review and appreciate the opportunity to provide input at this stage.

Given the substandard lot and the proposed increase in scale to a two-story residence, we have several concerns regarding potential neighborhood impacts:

- Traffic and street conditions. Chester Street is relatively narrow and already experiences high traffic volumes due to its proximity to the highway and nearby businesses. In practice, even a single parked vehicle can make the street difficult to pass at peak hours, and there are frequent backups from cars waiting to merge, which can block residents from exiting onto the main road. Additional occupancy from a larger home and JADU is likely to further exacerbate these conditions.
- Access to sunlight and shadow impacts. The transition from a single-story structure to a two-story home on a constrained lot raises concerns about potential loss of sunlight and increased shading on neighboring properties. This could materially affect the usability of adjacent outdoor spaces and reduce natural light within nearby homes. We would appreciate the opportunity to review any shadow analysis, or request that the City consider such analysis as part of its review.
- Neighborhood compatibility and scale. The proposed massing on a substandard lot raises concerns about overdevelopment relative to the existing neighborhood context.
- Privacy impacts. A two-story structure may introduce second-story windows overlooking adjacent properties.

In light of the above, we respectfully request that the project be carefully evaluated and, where feasible, revised to:

- Reduce overall massing and/or height given the lot constraints
- Consider and mitigate shadow and sunlight impacts on neighboring properties
- Minimize traffic and parking impacts
- Address privacy concerns through thoughtful window placement or screening

We would also appreciate the opportunity to review the submitted plans when available.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,
Wuyang Dai
Bay Area

411 Chester – Attachment D: Data Table

	PROPOSED PROJECT	EXISTING PROJECT	ZONING ORDINANCE
Lot area	6,500 sf	6,500 sf	7,000.0 sf min.
Lot width	50.0 ft.	50.0 ft.	65.0 ft. min.
Lot depth	130.0 ft.	130.0 ft.	100.0 ft. min.
Setbacks			
Front	20.0 ft. (Main House) 25.0 ft. (ADU)	43.25 ft.	20.0 ft. min.
Rear	54.6 ft. (Main House) 73.3 ft. (ADU)	41.25 ft.	20.0 ft. min. 4.0 ft. min.
Side (left)	5.0 ft. (Main House) 5.0 ft. (ADU)	5.25 ft.	5.0 ft. min. 4.0 ft. min.
Side (right)	5.0 ft. (Main House) 30.0 ft. (ADU)	19.5 ft.	5.0 ft. min. 4.0 ft. min.
Building coverage	2,121.3 sf 32.6 %	1,394.0 sf 24.8 %	2275.0 sf max. 35.0 % max.
FAL (Floor Area Limit)	3,268.3 sf* 50.2 %	1,394.0 sf 24.8 %	2,800.0 sf max. 43.1 % max.
Square footage by floor	1,211.6 sf/1 st main home 468.5 sf/1 st ADU 1,163.1 sf/2 nd main home 425.2 sf/garage	1,148.0 sf/1st 404.0 sf/detached carport 135.0 sf/accessory storage sheds	
Square footage of buildings	3,268.4 sf	1,687.0 sf	
Building height	25.8 ft.	14.0 ft.	28.0 ft. max.
Parking	2 covered	2 covered	1 covered/1 uncovered per unit
Note: Areas shown highlighted indicate a nonconforming or substandard situation.			

Trees	Heritage trees	2**	Non-Heritage trees	1	New Trees	3
	Heritage trees proposed for removal	2	Non-Heritage trees proposed for removal	1	Total Number of Trees	3***

* Includes the ADU, which is permitted to exceed the FAL.

** The two heritage trees comprise two on-site trees.

*** This number includes the two 24-inch box Male ginkgo trees in the rear yard along the rear fence and one 24-inch box Hedge maple street tree in the front yard between the existing water meter and proposed front walkway.



STAFF REPORT

Planning Commission

Meeting Date:

9/28/2026

Staff Report Number:

26-043-PC

Public Hearing:

Consider and adopt a resolution to approve a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and detached garage and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district, at 253 Yale Road. The project includes an attached ADU (accessory dwelling unit), which is a permitted use and not subject to discretionary review. Determine this action is categorically exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15303's Class 3 exemption for new construction or conversion of small structures.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a resolution to approve a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and detached garage and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to lot width in the R-1-U (Single Family Urban Residential) zoning district, at 253 Yale Road. The proposal would include an attached ADU (accessory dwelling unit), which is a permitted use that is not subject to discretionary review. The draft resolution, including the recommended actions and conditions of approval, is included as Attachment A.

Policy Issues

Each use permit is considered individually. The Planning Commission should consider whether the required use permit findings can be made for the proposed project.

Background

Site Location

The subject property is located at 253 Yale Road. Using Yale Road in the east-west orientation, the subject property is located on the south side of Yale Road between College Avenue and Cambridge Avenue. A location map is included as Attachment B.

The property is zoned R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential District). The property is bordered by properties in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential District) on all sides. Properties across the street on the north side of Yale Road are also zoned R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential District).

Analysis

Project Description

The subject property is currently occupied by a single-story, single-family, residence and detached garage. The existing single-story residence was built in 1936 and is 1,700 square feet. The existing detached garage is 369 square feet.

The lot is substandard with regard to lot width. The lot has a width of 50 feet where 65 feet is required. A use permit is required to construct a two-story home on a substandard lot.

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing single-story, single-family residence and detached garage and construct a new two-story, single-family residence with three bedrooms, 3.5 bathrooms and an attached one-car garage, which provides one compliant covered parking space. The proposal also provides one compliant uncovered parking spaces resulting in two compliant parking spaces. The new residence would have an attached 798.66 square-foot ADU, which would exceed the floor area limit (FAL) by 786.72 square feet and exceed the building coverage by 158.56 square feet. The attached ADU would be located on the first floor of the new two-story residence, in the front left corner. The proposed ADU, FAL exceedance and building coverage exceedance are permitted and not subject to discretionary review.

The applicant proposes frontage improvements in the public right-of-way to relocate the driveway from its existing location on the left side of the property to its proposed new location on the right side of the property. Should the project be approved, the applicant would be required to submit revised plans that encompass the removal and replacement of the sidewalk, curb and gutter along the entire project frontage, subject to review and approval by the Engineering Division at the building permit stage. This requirement would be implemented and ensured as part of condition 2a.

The existing single-story, single-family residence on the property is nonconforming with regard to the right side setback, as there is an existing 3.9-foot setback where 5 feet is required. The proposed two-story, single-family home would comply with all required setbacks, removing the nonconforming structure currently on the property and replacing it with a conforming structure. The proposed two-story single-family home would conform with all applicable Zoning Ordinance regulations.

Design and Materials

The proposed two-story single-family residence would be designed with a transitional style blending traditional and modern elements. The façade would generally consist of horizontal wood siding with stone around the garage door. The roof would be metal and would be designed as a hip roof to reduce massing and create a gradual transition in relation to adjacent homes. A perspective rendering of the proposed residence can be found on Sheet A-CS of the plan set, included as Exhibit A to Attachment A.

Second floor windows on the front (north) elevation would have a minimum sill height of two feet, while second floor windows on the rear (south) and side (east and west) elevations would have a minimum sill height of three feet. A large window in the stairwell is proposed along the west elevation. This window would have obscured glass and would be located in a transitional space where residents typically would not linger as they move between floors. These factors would help to reduce potential privacy impacts.

Windows on the first floor would have a minimum sill height of two feet nine inches. On the front (north) elevation, three bay windows are proposed, one of which would be on the first floor and two of which would be on the second floor. The first-floor bay window would be for the proposed ADU, while the second floor bay windows would be for the main house. These bay windows are excluded from floor area calculations as they do not provide foundation and are no more than seven feet in length.

The rear (south) elevation of the proposal includes a large sliding glass door leading to a covered rear porch that includes an outdoor barbecue. The rear (south) elevation also includes a second-floor balcony. The covered porch and second-floor balcony would be located more than 42 feet from the rear property line and the second-floor balcony would be 20 feet from each side property line. Balconies in single-family residential zoning districts above the first floor must be at least 30 feet from the rear property line and 20 feet from the side property lines. The proposed balcony meets or exceeds these requirements.

The main house would have a front setback of 25 feet, side setbacks of nine feet and six feet, and a rear setback of 42.2 feet. All proposed setbacks would exceed the minimum required setbacks of the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential District) for this property. There is a six-foot-tall fence proposed along the side and rear property lines that does not extend into the front setback.

The streetscape along the south side of Yale Road between College Ave. and Cambridge Ave consists of single-family residences. The neighboring property to the west at 263 Yale Road is a one-story single-family residence. The neighboring property to the east at 241 Yale Road is also a one-story single-family residence. Although the residences immediately to the east and west of the subject property are one-story, the residences directly across the street on the north side of Yale Road at 262 Yale Road, 250 Yale Road, and 240 Yale Road are all two-story. While there would be a change in the streetscape along the south side of Yale Road, this change would align with development in the vicinity and keep with the character of the neighborhood.

Trees and Landscaping

The applicant submitted an arborist report (Attachment A, Exhibit C), detailing the species, size, and conditions of on-site and nearby trees. A total of 14 trees were assessed, including eight heritage trees (trees #1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, and 13 in the table below). There is one street heritage tree proposed for removal (tree #2, a 16.1-inch Southern magnolia). The mitigation plan for the heritage tree removal is the planting of one 36-inch box Autumn Gold ginkgo in the front yard. The City Arborist has reviewed and approved the heritage tree removal permit based on development, pending Planning Commission approval of the project.

To protect the heritage trees and non-heritage trees on and off site, the arborist report outlines requirements for tree protection fencing during construction as well as necessary pre- and post-construction measures. All recommended tree protection measures identified in the arborist report would be implemented and ensured as part of condition 1h.

Table 1: Tree summary and disposition						
ID #	Species	Trunk Diameter	Condition	Status	Removal or Retention	Location
1	Southern magnolia	15	Poor	Heritage	Retain	Street
2	Southern magnolia	16.1	Fair	Heritage	Remove	Street
3	Camphor	40	Fair	Heritage	Retain	Street
4	Southern magnolia	18	Fair	Heritage	Retain	Street
5	Coast live oak	6	Fair	Non-heritage	Retain	Property line
6	Saucer magnolia	9	Fair	Non-heritage	Retain	Property line
7	Japanese privet	9.5	Poor	Non-heritage	Retain	Property line
8	Japanese maple	13.3	Fair	Non-heritage	Remove	On-site
9	Edible fig	6.2	Fair	Non-heritage	Remove	On-site
10	Coast live oak	32	Fair	Heritage	Retain	On-site
11	Redwood	24	Good	Heritage	Retain	Property line
12	Redwood	30	Good	Heritage	Retain	Property line
13	Redwood	45	Good	Heritage	Retain	Property line
14	Edible fig	4	Fair	Non-heritage	Remove	On-site

Correspondence

The applicant indicates they conducted neighborhood outreach. The project description letter states the applicant shared the proposed plans with neighbors at 240, 250, 262, 241, and 263 Yale Road as well as 250 Princeton Road. The applicant stated that no comments were received from neighbors. Staff has not received any direct correspondence regarding the proposed project.

Conclusion

Staff believes that the scale, materials, and style of the proposed residence are compatible with the overall neighborhood. The area immediately surrounding the project site along Yale Road consists of single-family residences that are both single-story and two-story. The proposal would meet all Zoning Ordinance requirements. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the proposed project.

Impact on City Resources

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

Environmental Review

The project is categorically exempt under Class 3 (Section 15303, “New construction or conversion of small structures”) of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Public Notice

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

Appeal Period

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

Attachments

- A. Draft Planning Commission Resolution approving the Use Permit
 - Exhibits to Attachment A
 - A. Project plans
 - B. Project description letter
 - C. Arborist report
 - D. Conditions of approval
- B. Location map
- C. Data table

Report prepared by:
Brian Toy, Associate Planner

Report reviewed by:
Corinna Sandmeier, Principal Planner

PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 2026-0XX

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MENLO PARK APPROVING A USE PERMIT REQUEST TO DEMOLISH AN EXISTING SINGLE-STORY, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND DETACHED GARAGE AND CONSTRUCT A NEW TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE, ON A SUBSTANDARD LOT WITH REGARD TO LOT WIDTH, IN THE R-1-U ZONING DISTRICT, AT 253 YALE ROAD.

WHEREAS, the City of Menlo Park ("City") received an application requesting a use permit to demolish an existing single-story, single-family residence and detached garage and construct a new two-story, single-family residence on a substandard lot with regard to minimum lot width, in the R-1-U (Single-Family Urban Residential) zoning district, (collectively, the "Project") from Babak Homayouni ("Applicant") and Ahmad Hokmabadi ("Owner"), located at 253 Yale Road (APN 071-394-130) ("Property"). The Project use permit is depicted in and subject to the development plans and project description letter, which are attached hereto as Exhibit A and Exhibit B, respectively, and incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, the Property is located in the Single-Family Urban Residential (R-1-U) zoning district, which supports single-family residential uses; and

WHEREAS, the Property is substandard with regard to minimum lot width, in the R-1-U zoning district; and

WHEREAS, two-story residences are allowed to be constructed on a substandard lot, subject to the granting of a use permit; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Project complies with all objective standards of the R-1-U district; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Project was reviewed by the Engineering Division and found to be in compliance with City standards; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant submitted an arborist report, attached hereto as Exhibit C, prepared by KIELTY Arborist Services, LLC, which was reviewed by the City Arborist and found to be in compliance with the Heritage Tree Ordinance, and proposes mitigation measures to adequately protect heritage trees in the vicinity of the project; and

WHEREAS, the Project requires discretionary actions by the City as summarized above, and therefore the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA," Public Resources Code Section §21000 et seq.) and CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code of Regulations, Title 14, §15000 et seq.) require analysis and a determination regarding the Project's environmental impacts; and

WHEREAS, the City is the lead agency, as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, and is therefore responsible for the preparation, consideration, certification, and approval of environmental documents for the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Project is categorically exempt from environmental review under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New construction or conversion of small structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, all required public notices and public hearings were duly given and held according to law; and

WHEREAS, at a duly and properly noticed public hearing held on September 28, 2026, the Planning Commission fully reviewed, considered, and evaluated the whole of the record including all public and written comments, pertinent information, documents and plans, prior to taking action regarding the Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE MENLO PARK PLANNING COMMISSION HEREBY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Recitals. The Planning Commission has considered the full record before it, which may include but is not limited to such things as the staff report, public testimony, and other materials and evidence submitted or provided, and the Planning Commission finds the foregoing recitals are true and correct, and they are hereby incorporated by reference into this Resolution.

Section 2. Conditional Use Permit Findings. The Planning Commission of the City of Menlo Park does hereby make the following Findings:

The approval of a use permit for the construction of a new two-story residence on a substandard lot is granted based on the following findings, which are made pursuant to Menlo Park Municipal Code Section 16.82.030:

1. That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use applied for will, under the circumstance of the particular case, not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort, and general welfare of the persons residing in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or injurious or detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the city because:
 - a. Consideration and due regard were given to the nature and condition of all adjacent uses and structures, and to general plans for the area in question and surrounding areas, and impact of the application hereon; in that, the proposed use permit is consistent with the R-1-U zoning district and the General Plan because two-story residences are allowed to be constructed on substandard lots subject to granting of a use permit.
 - b. The proposed residence would include the required number of off-street parking spaces because two parking spaces would be required at a minimum, and one covered parking space is provided in an attached garage and one uncovered parking space is provided that is not located in any required front or side yard.
 - c. The proposed Project is designed to meet all the applicable codes and ordinances of the City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, and the Commission

concludes that the Project would not be detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding community as the new residences would be located in a single-family neighborhood.

Section 4. Conditional Use Permit. The Planning Commission approves Use Permit No. PLN2025-00052, which use permit is depicted in and subject to the development plans and project description letter, which are attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as Exhibit A and Exhibit B, respectively. The Use Permit is conditioned in conformance with the conditions attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as Exhibit D.

Section 5. Environmental Review. The Planning Commission makes the following findings, based on its independent judgment after considering the Project, and having reviewed and taken into consideration all written and oral information submitted in this matter:

1. The Project is categorically exempt from environmental review under Class 3 (Section 15303, "New construction or conversion of small structures") of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines

Section 6. Severability. If any term, provision, or portion of these findings or the application of these findings to a particular situation is held by a court to be invalid, void or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of these findings, or their application to other actions related to the Project, shall continue in full force and effect unless amended or modified by the City.

I, Corinna Sandmeier, Principal Planner of the City of Menlo Park, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing Planning Commission Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted at a meeting by said Planning Commission on September 28, 2026, by the following votes:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Official Seal of said City on this ____ day of September, 2026.

PC Liaison Signature


Corinna Sandmeier
Principal Planner
City of Menlo Park

Exhibits

- A. Project plans
- B. Project description letter
- C. Arborist report
- D. Conditions of approval

253 YALE ROAD MENLO PARK CALIFORNIA

VICINITY MAP



PROJECT CONTACT

- OWNER: **FARHAD MIRKHANI**
253 YALE ROAD MENLO PARK CALIFORNIA

- DESIGNER: **UTOPIA CONSTRUCTION**
11248 CATALINA COURT, CUPERTINO, CA 95014
(408)329-3296

- CIVIL: **SMP ENGINEERINGS**
1534 CAROB LANE, LOS ALTOS CA.
94024
(650)941-8055

- STRUCTURE:

- SOIL ENGINEER:

SCOPE OF WORK

- CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE
- CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW ATTACHED ADU

PROJECT DATA

ADDRESS: 253 YALE ROAD MELO PARK CALIFORNIA

APN: 071-394-130

LOT SIZE: 7,499.92

NET LOT SIZE: 7,499.92

ZONING DISTRICT: R1U

OCCUPANCY: R-3/U

CONSTRUCTION TYPE: V-B

SETBACKS	EXISTING	ALLOWED	PROPOSED
FRONT:	30'-2"	20'	25'
EAST SIDE:	10'-10"	5'	6'
WEST SIDE:	3'-11"	5'	4' (ADU)
REAR:	61'-9"	20'	42'-4"

FAL	ALLOWED	EXISTING	PROPOSED
HOUSE:	2925 ft ²	1700 ft ²	FIRST FLOOR: 1269.74 ft ² SECOND FLOOR: 1368.16 ft ²
GARAGE:	369 ft ²		275.16 ft ²
TOTAL:	2069 ft ²		2913.06 ft ²
ALLOWED:			2925 ft ²
PROPOSED COVERAGE AREA:			
FIRST FLOOR:		LIVING AREA:	1269.74 ft ²
		COVERED TERRACE:	431 ft ²
		GARAGE:	275.16 ft ²
		TOTAL:	1975.90 ft ²
		ALLOWED :	2625 ft ²
SECOND FLOOR:		LIVING AREA:	1368.16 ft ²
ATTACHED ADU:			798.66 ft ²

DRAWING INDEX

A-CS COVER SHEET & PROJECT DATA	L-0 TREE PROTECTION PLAN
A-0.0 AREA PLAN	L-1 LANDSCAPE PLAN
A-0.1 STREET SCAPE	L-2 IRRIGATION PLAN
A-0.1.1 EXISTING STRUCTURE PHOTOS	L-3 HYDROZONE DIAGRAM
A-0.2 PROPOSED SITE PLAN	T-1 SURVEY
A-0.3 EXISTING SITE PLAN	C-1 CIVIL COVER SHEET
A-0.4 EXISTING HOUSE PLAN	C-2 GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
A-1.1 FIRST FLOOR PLAN	C-3 SUB&UT
A-1.2 SECOND FLOOR PLAN	C-4 IMPER AREA
A-1.3 ROOF PLAN	C-5 DETAILS
A-2.1 ELEVATIONS	C-6 EROSION CONTROL PLAN
A-2.2 ELEVATIONS	C-7 BMPS
A-3.1 FLOOR AREA DIAGRAMS	
A-4 SECTIONS	
A-5 WINDOW SCHEDULE	

FACEDE



GENERAL NOTES

GENERAL NOTES:
ALL WORK DESCRIBED IN THE DRAWINGS SHALL BE VERIFIED FOR DIMENSION, GRADE, EXTENT AND COMPATIBILITY TO THE EXISTING SITE. ANY DISCREPANCIES AND UNEXPECTED CONDITIONS THAT AFFECT OR CHANGE THE WORK DESCRIBED IN THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS SHALL BE BROUGHT TO THE UTOPIA CONSTRUCTION DESIGN'S ATTENTION IMMEDIATELY. DO NOT PROCEED WITH THE WORK IN THE AREA OF DISCREPANCIES UNTIL ALL SUCH DISCREPANCIES ARE RESOLVED. IF THE CONTRACTOR CHOOSES TO DO SO HE SHALL BE PRECEDING AT HIS OWN RISK.

OMISSIONS FROM THE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS OR THE MIS-DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK WHICH IS MANIFESTLY NECESSARY TO CARRY OUT THE INTENT OF THE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS, OR WHICH IS CUSTOMARILY REFORMED, SHALL NOT RELIEVE THE CONTRACTOR FROM PERFORMING SUCH OMITTED OR MIS-DESCRIBED DETAILS OF THE WORK AS IF FULLY AND COMPLETELY SET FORTH AND DESCRIBED IN THE DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS.


SITE CONDITIONS: ALL CONTRACTORS AND SUB-CONTRACTORS SHALL VERIFY DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS AT THE SITE PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF THEIR WORK.

FAILURE TO DO SO SHALL NOT RELEASE THEM FROM THE RESPONSIBILITY OF ESTIMATING THE WORK. IF ANY VARIATION, DISCREPANCY OR OMISSION (BETWEEN THE INTENT OF THESE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS AND THE EXISTING CONDITIONS ARE FOUND, THE CONTRACTOR OR SUB-CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY AMS DESIGN IN WRITING AND OBTAIN WRITTEN RESOLUTION FROM AMS DESIGN PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH ANY RELATED WORK.

FIRE SPRINKLER WILL BE REQUIRED FOR THIS PROJECT UNDER A SEPERATE PERMIT.

POOL WILL BE COVERED UNDER A SEPERATE PERMIT

AREA KEY PLAN



All work shall comply with the following codes and standards:

- . 2025 California Building Code (CBC)-CCR Title 24, part 2
 - . 2025 California Building Code (CBC)-CCR Title 24, part 2.5
 - . 2025 California Electrical Code (CEC)-CCR Title 24, part 3
 - . 2025 California Mechanical Code (CMC)-CCR Title 24, part 4
 - . 2025 California plumbing Code (CPC)-CCR Title 24, part 5
 - . 2025 California Energy Code -CCR Title 24, part 6
 - . 2025 California Fire Code (CFC)-CCR Title 24, part 9
 - . 2025 California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen)-CCR Title 24, part 11
 - . 2025 California Existing Building Code (CEBC)-CCR Title 24, part 10 (if applicable)
 - . 2025 California Historical Building Code (CHBC)-CCR Title 24, part 8 (if applicable)
- Local Codes:
- . City of Menlo Park Municipal Code
 - . City of Menlo Park Local Amendments To Title 24



CONSULTANT:
BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:
253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA


DRAWING TITLE:
COVER SHEET

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
△	04/08/26	CITY COMMENTS
△	05/23/26	CITY COMMENTS
△	06/25/26	CITY COMMENTS
△	07/11/26	CITY COMMENTS
△	08/21/26	CITY COMMENTS
△	08/25/26	CITY COMMENTS
△	09/16/26	CITY COMMENTS
△	09/18/26	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-CS

SHEET OF





Utopia
Construction

CONSULTANT:

BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:

253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA

DRAWING TITLE:

AREA PLAN

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	04/08/26	CITY COMMENTS
2	05/23/26	CITY COMMENTS
3	06/25/26	CITY COMMENTS
4	07/11/26	CITY COMMENTS
5	08/21/26	CITY COMMENTS
6	08/25/26	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-0.0


SHEET

01

- General:
- 1.) The project is subject to the California Green Building Standards Code (Cal Green) and any local amendments in effect at the time of Building permit submittal. Other forms of green building checklist will not be accepted in-lieu of the Cal Green requirements.
 - 2.) On site detached structures are required to meet all Building Code requirements associated with their occupancy and location on site.
 - 3.) Separate building permits are required as follows:
 - On-site civil work: A separate permit for each lot is required;
 - For each building and each site structure such as trellis, garbage enclosure, etc.;
 - For site lighting, at grade pedestrian paths, the proposed boardwalk: A separate permit for each lot is required.
 - 4.) On site detached structures are required to meet all Building Code requirements associated with their occupancy and location on site.
 - 5.) All deferred submittals other than trusses are to be approved by the Building Official prior to Building Permit application.



PROPOSED STREET SCAPE
SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"



EXISTING STREET SCAPE
SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"



Utopia
Construction

CONSULTANT:

BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:

253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA

DRAWING TITLE:

STREET SCAPE

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	04/08/24	CITY COMMENTS
2	05/23/24	CITY COMMENTS
3	06/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
4	07/11/24	CITY COMMENTS
5	08/21/24	CITY COMMENTS
6	08/26/24	CITY COMMENTS
7	09/16/24	CITY COMMENTS
8	09/18/24	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-0.1

SHEET

OF



EXISTING STRUCTURE PHOTOS



CONSULTANT:
BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:
253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA


DRAWING TITLE:
EXISTING STRUCTURE
PHOTO

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	04/08/24	CITY COMMENTS
2	05/23/24	CITY COMMENTS
3	06/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
4	07/11/24	CITY COMMENTS
5	08/21/24	CITY COMMENTS
6	08/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
7	09/16/24	CITY COMMENTS
8	09/18/24	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-0.1.1

SHEET OF





Utopia
Construction

CONSULTANT:

BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:

253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA


DRAWING TITLE:


EXISTING SITE PLAN

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	04/08/24	CITY COMMENTS
2	05/23/24	CITY COMMENTS
3	06/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
4	07/11/24	CITY COMMENTS
5	08/21/24	CITY COMMENTS
6	08/25/24	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-0.3





Utopia
Construction

CONSULTANT:

BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:

253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA

DRAWING TITLE:


EXISTING HOUSE PLAN

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
04/08/24		CITY COMMENTS
05/23/24		CITY COMMENTS
06/25/24		CITY COMMENTS
07/11/24		CITY COMMENTS
08/21/24		CITY COMMENTS
08/25/24		CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-0.4

SHEET ____ OF ____





Utopia
Construction

CONSULTANT:

BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:

253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA

DRAWING TITLE:

FIRST FLOOR PLAN


REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
Δ	04/08/26	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	05/23/26	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	06/25/26	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	07/11/26	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	08/21/26	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	08/25/26	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-1.1


DRAWN BY:

OF



SECOND FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"



Utopia
Construction

CONSULTANT:

BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:

253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA

DRAWING TITLE:


SECOND FLOOR PLAN

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	04/08/24	CITY COMMENTS
2	05/23/24	CITY COMMENTS
3	06/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
4	07/11/24	CITY COMMENTS
5	08/21/24	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-1.2

SHEET ____ OF ____



ROOF PLAN
SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"



CONSULTANT:

BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:

253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA

DRAWING TITLE:

ROOF PLAN


REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
△	04/08/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	05/23/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	06/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	07/11/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	08/21/24	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-1.3


SHEET

OF



NORTH ELEVATION


SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"



SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
Δ	04/08/24	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	05/23/24	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	06/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	07/11/24	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	08/21/24	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	08/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	09/16/24	CITY COMMENTS



EAST ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"

WEST ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"



Utopia
Construction

CONSULTANT:

BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:

253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA

DRAWING TITLE:

ELEVATIONS

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
△	04/08/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	05/23/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	06/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	07/11/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	08/21/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	08/26/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	06/16/24	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-2.2

DRAWN BY:



OF

FLOOR AREA LIMIT CALCULATION		
AREA	DIMENSIONS	SF
9	12'-4" x 17'-0"	209.66
10	19'-0" x 31'-0"	589
TOTAL		798.66

FLOOR AREA LIMIT CALCULATION		
AREA	DIMENSIONS	SF
11	29'-0" x 16'-8"	483.34
12	2'-0" x 11'-5 1/2"	22.91
13	7'-0" x 19'-4"	135.33
14	8'-2" x 5'-8"	46.27
15	9'-4" x 5'-8 1/2"	53.27
16	23'-8" x 5'-8"	134.10
17	17'-0" x 13'-0"	221
18	9'-6" x 10'-8"	101.33
19	13'-10" x 12'-4"	170.61
TOTAL		1368.16

FLOOR AREA LIMIT CALCULATION		
AREA	DIMENSIONS	SF
1	19'-6" x 32'-6"	633.75
1.1	9'-0" x 1'-0"	9
2	12'-4" x 20'-6"	252.83
3	21'-0" x 15'-10"	332.50
4	8'-0" x 3'-4"	26.66
5	13'-0" x 21'-2"	275.16
6	12'-0" x 2'-0"	24
7	20'-6" x 14'-0"	287
8	12'-0" x 12'-0"	144
TOTAL		1984.90
TOTAL FLOOR AREA		1544.90

BUILDING FLOOR AREA CALCULATION	
	SF
FIRST FLOOR+GARAG	1544.90
TERRACE +FIRE PLACE	440
ADU FIRST FLOOR	798.66
SECOND FLOOR	1368.16
BUILDING COVERAG WITH ADU	2783.56
BUILDING COVERAG ALLOWED	2625.00
FLOOR AREA WITH ADU	3711.72
FLOOR AREA ALLOWED	2925.00



Utopia Construction

CONSULTANT:

BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:

253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA

DRAWING TITLE:


FLOOR AREA DIAGRAMS

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
Δ	04/08/24	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	05/23/24	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	06/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	07/11/24	CITY COMMENTS
Δ	08/21/24	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-3.1

SHEET ____ OF ____





Utopia
Construction

CONSULTANT:

BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:

253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA

DRAWING TITLE:

SECTIONS

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	04/08/24	CITY COMMENTS
2	05/23/24	CITY COMMENTS
3	06/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
4	07/11/24	CITY COMMENTS
5	08/21/24	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:

A-4

WINDOWS SCHEDULE :

WINDOW SCHEDULE																
NUMBER	QTY	FLOOR	ROOM NAME	SIZE	WIDTH	HEIGHT	BOTTOM	TOP	AREA ACTUAL(SQFT)	TYPE	TEMPERED	EGRESS	U-FACTOR	SHGC	COMMENTS	
W1	1	GF	STAIR BOX		72"	147"	5'-11"	18'-2"	10584"	FIXED GLASS						
W2	1	GF	GARAGE		60"	72"	3'	9'	4320"	HINGED						
W3	1	GF	ADU		65"	74"	2'-9"	8'-11"	4810"	SLIDER						
W3.1	1	GF	ADU		36"	74"	2'-9"	8'-11"	2664"	HINGED						
W3.2	1	GF	ADU		36"	74"	2'-9"	8'-11"	2664"	HINGED						
W4	1	GF	ADU BATH ROOM		36"	72"	3'	9'	2592"	HINGED						
W5	1	GF	ADU BEDROOM		60"	72"	3'	9'	4320"	HINGED						
W6	1	GF	ADU BEDROOM		42"	72"	3'	9'	3024"	HINGED						
W7	1	GF	KITCHEN		36"	72"	3'	9'	2592"	SLIDER						
W8	1	GF	KITCHEN		36"	72"	3'	9'	2592"	SLIDER						
W9	1	GF	KITCHEN		60"	72"	3'	9'	4320"	SLIDER						
W10	1	GF	GREAT ROOM		180"	108"	0'	9'	19440"	SLIDER						
W11	1	GF	DINING ROOM		96"	72"	3'	9'	6912"	SLIDER						
W12	1	1	I.D.		33"	53"	14'-2"	18'-7"	1749"	HINGED						
W13	1	1	BED ROOM 1		65"	105"	13'-2"	21'-7"	6825"	SLIDER						
W14	1	1	BATH ROOM 1		36"	56"	14'-2"	18'-10"	2016"	SLIDER						
W15	1	1	BATH ROOM 2		36"	56"	14'-2"	18'-10"	2016"	SLIDER						
W16	1	1	BED ROOM 2		65"	105"	13'-2"	21'-7"	6825"	SLIDER						
W17	1	1	STAIR BOX		74"	56"	14'-2"	18'-10"	4144"	SLIDER						
W18	1	1	CLOSED M.B.ROOM		30"	56"	14'-2"	18'-10"	1680"	HINGED						
W19	1	1	M.BEDROOM/BATH		24"	56"	14'-2"	18'-10"	1344"	HINGED						
W20	1	1	M.BEDROOM/BATH		60"	56"	14'-2"	18'-10"	3360"	HINGED						
W21	1	1	M.BEDROOM		72"	96"	11'-10"	18'-10"	6912"	SLIDER						
W22	1	1	M.BEDROOM		72"	56"	14'-2"	18'-10"	4032"	SLIDER						
TOTAL	22															



CONSULTANT:
BABAK HOMAYOUNI

CLIENT:
253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK CA


DRAWING TITLE:
WINDOW SCHEDULE

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
△	04/08/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	05/23/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	06/25/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	07/11/24	CITY COMMENTS
△	08/21/24	CITY COMMENTS

SHEET No.:


A-5

SHEET ____ OF ____



#	QU.	SIZE	BOTANICAL NAME	COMMON NAME	MOGOLS PLANT FACTOR
1	14	156	FIGUS NITIDA (COLUMN FORM)	INDIAN LAUREL FIG	MOD
2	16	156	PITTOSPORUM SILVER SHEEN	PITTOSPORUM	MOD
3	5	156	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA	CAROLINA LAUREL CHERRY	LOW
4	10	56	CALAMAGROTIS 'KARL FORESTER'	KARL FORESTER GRASS	LOW
5	6	56	PHORMIUM 'DUSKY CHIEF'	BRONZE NEW ZEALAND FLAX	LOW-MOD
6	23	16	LOMONDRA 'FOM FOM' OR 'BREEZE'	MATT RUSH	LOW
7	5	156	PITTOSPORUM 'SOLF BALL'	PITTOSPORUM	MOD
8	15	26	ROSA 'WHITE CARPET'	CARPET ROSE	MOD
9	15	16	MYOPORIUM PARVIFOLIUM	CREEPING MYOPORIUM	LOW
10	23	56	LOROPETALUM 'JAZZ HANDS BOLD'	FRINGE FLOWER	LOW
11	8	56	POLYGALA 'PETITE BUTTERFLIES'	SWEET PEA BUSH	LOW-MOD
12	8	16	GERANIUM 'BIOKOVQ'	TRUE GERANIUM	LOW-MOD
13	1	36" BOX	SINKSO BLOEA 'AUTUMN GOLD'	MAIDENHAIR TREE	MOD
14	6	56	ACACIA 'COUSIN ITT'	COUSIN ITT MATTLE	MOD

REQUIRED REPLACEMENT TREE VALUE \$2700
1-36" BOX REPLACEMENT TREE VALUE \$1200
IN-LIEU OF FEE TO BE PAID TO CITY \$1500



NOTES

I HAVE COMPLIED WITH THE CRITERIA OF THE WATER CONSERVATION IN LANDSCAPE ORDINANCE AND APPLIED THEM FOR THE EFFICIENT USE OF WATER IN THE LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION DESIGN PLAN.

PROPOSED LANDSCAPE AREA= 3655 S.F.
1" WATER METER
STATIC WATER PRESSURE =40 PSI

AT TIME OF FINAL INSPECTION, THE PERMIT APPLICANT MUST PROVIDE THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY WITH A CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION, CERTIFICATE OF INSTALLATION, IRRIGATION SCHEDULE AND SCHEDULE OF LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION MAINTENANCE.

A MINIMUM OF 3" LAYER OF MULCH SHALL BE APPLIED ON ALL EXPOSED SOIL SURFACES OF PLANTING AREAS EXCEPT TURF AREAS, CREEPING OR ROOTING GROUNDCOVERS OR DIRECT SEEDING APPLICATIONS WHERE MULCH IS CONTRAINDICATED.

COMPOST AT A RATE OF 4 CY/1000 S.F. LANDSCAPE AREA. TILL A MINIMUM OF 6" DEEP AND MULCH ALL NON-SOD AREAS WITH MINIMUM 3" THICK LAYER PIR BARK OR REDWOOD MULCH.



REVISIONS	BY
6/23/26	MY
7/31/26	MY



LANDSCAPE PLAN

new residence for:
253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

071-394-130
DRAWN MH
CHECKED MY
DATE 2/13/26
SCALE 1/8"=1'-0"
JOB NO. XXX
SHEET

L-1

OF SHEETS

IRRIGATION EQUIPMENT LEGEND

VALVE LEGEND				
VALVE	SYSTEM TYPE	GPM	PRECIP RATE	OPERATING PRESSURE
1	DRIP VALVE	2.0-3.0	.34	30-40
2	LAWN SPRAY	4.5	.41	40
3	DRIP VALVE	2.0-3.0	.34	30-40
4	DRIP VALVE	2.0-3.0	.34	30-40
5	DRIP VALVE	2.0-3.0	.34	30-40
6	DRIP VALVE	2.0-3.0	.34	30-40
7	DRIP VALVE	2.0-3.0	.34	30-40


SYMBOL	DESCRIPTION	NOTES
	FEBCO 1" BACKFLOW DEVICE	
	NIBCO BRONZE 1" GATE VALVE	INSTALL AS PER MANUFACTURERS SPECS AND CODES
	HUNTER PRO-HC 1200 WIFI CONTROLLER WITH ADDITIONAL MR RAIN-GLUE	INSTALL AS PER OWNER
	HUNTER 1" CONTROL VALVE FOR SPRAY AND FOR DRIP (USE PRESSURE REDUCER FOR DRIP)	INSTALL IN 10" CARSON VALVE BOX
	MAIN LINE 1" SCHEDULE 40 PVC	18" MINIMUM DEPTH USE PRIMER AND GLUE
	LATERAL LINE SCH. 40 PVC	1" OR AS SHOWN 12" MINIMUM DEPTH
	DRIP IRRIGATION DURA FLOW JR 1/4" DRIP LINE AROUND EACH PLANT	
	1/2" FLEXIBLE DRIP LINE BETWEEN PLANTS	
	HUNTER HC 100 FLOW SENSOR	
	HUNTER MASTER VALVE INSTALL BEFORE FLOW SENSOR WITH SHIELDED WIRE	
	HUNTER MP 1000 SPRAY HEAD ON 6" POP UP	

I HAVE COMPLIED WITH THE CRITERIA OF THE WATER CONSERVATION IN LANDSCAPING ORDINANCE AND APPLIED THEM FOR THE EFFICIENT USE OF WATER IN THE LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION DESIGN PLAN.


LANDSCAPE AUDIT REPORT MUST BE COMPELED PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION.

IRRIGATION SYSTEM PROGRAMMED TO WATER BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 8:00 PM AND 10:00 AM.

IRRIGATION SYSTEM AND COMPONENTS DESIGNED IN SUCH AS WAY AS TO CONSERVE WATER AND PREVENT OVERSPRAY AND RUNOFF



REVISIONS		BY
	6/23/26	MY
	7/31/26	MY



IRRIGATION PLAN

new residence for:
253 YALE ROAD
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

071-394-130
DRAWN MY
CHECKED MY
DATE 2/4/26
SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"
JOB NO. xxx
SHEET L-2
OF SHEETS



TOTAL LAWN AREA = 811 S.F. (22%)




TREE #1 - 15" MAGNOLIA
GRANDIFLORA-SOUTHERN
MAGNOLIA (KEEP AND
PROVIDE TREE PROTECTION
AS NOTED ON SHEET L-O)

TREE #5
6" GUERCUS AGRIFOLIA -
COAST LIVE OAK

© 2004 by The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. This book is a registered trademark of The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

MARA YOUNG
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
(650) 704-9255

OF SHEETS



LEGEND			
---	PROPERTY LINE	AC	ASPHALT
---	EXISTING LOTS	AD	AREA DRAIN
---	CENTERLINE	ANC	ANCHOR
---	EASEMENT LINE	BSBL	BUILDING SETBACK LINE
---	SS	C&G	CURB AND GUTTER
---	SANITARY SEWER LINE	CB	CATCH BASIN
---	STORM DRAIN LINE	CO	CLEAN OUT
---	OVERHEAD POWER LINE	DM	DRIVEWAY
---	WOOD FENCE	EB	ELECTRIC BOX
---		EM	ELECTRIC METER
---		EP	EDGE OF PAVEMENT
---		FI	FIRE HYDRANT
---		GA	GUY ANCHOR
---		GM	GAS METER
---		GV	GAS VALVE
---		IV	IRRIGATION VALVE
---		LP	LIGHT POLE
---		MB	MAIL BOX
---		MH	UTILITY MANHOLE
---		P.U.E.	PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT
---		PP	BRICK CONC PILLAR
---		PP	POWER POLE
---		PP	RADIAL BEARING
---		PP	STREET LIGHT
---		PP	STORM DRAINAGE MANHOLE
---		PP	SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
---		PP	SANITARY SEWER CLEAN OUT
---		PP	THROUGH CURB DRAIN
---		PP	TRAFFIC SIGN
---		PP	VALLEY GUTTER
---		PP	WATER METER
---		PP	WATER VALVE

SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT

I CERTIFY THAT THIS PARCEL'S BOUNDARY WAS ESTABLISHED BY ME OR UNDER MY SUPERVISION AND IS BASED ON A FIELD SURVEY IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE LAND SURVEYOR'S ACT. ALL MONUMENTS ARE OF THE CHARACTER AND OCCUPY THE POSITIONS INDICATED AND ARE SUFFICIENT TO ENABLE THE SURVEY TO BE RETRACED.

Ryan A. Mix
RYAN A. MIX, PLS 8743



DISCLAIMER:

SMP ENGINEERS OR ITS OFFICERS OR AGENTS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF THIS PLAN.

NOTE:

THIS MAP REPRESENTS TOPOGRAPHY OF THE SURFACE FEATURES ONLY. UNLESS SPECIFIED ON THIS MAP, LOCATIONS OF THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES ARE NEITHER INTENDED NOR IMPLIED. FOR THE LOCATIONS OF UNDERGROUND UTILITIES CALL "USA" (1-800-642-2444). SURFACE FEATURES ARE LOCATED BY MEANS OF A STATION AND OFFSET FROM THE CONTROL LINE.

BASIS OF BEARINGS:

FOUND SURVEY MONUMENTS ALONG THE RIGHT OF WAY. RECORD INFORMATION WAS USED. PER RECORD MAP, BOOK/VOL (LLS):13 PAGE:126 WHICH IS FILED IN THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO RECORDER'S OFFICE.

PROJECT BENCHMARK:

CITY OF MENLO PARK BENCHMARK BM #7

ELEVATION=65.71' (NAVD 88 DATUM)


SITE BENCHMARK:

SURVEY CONTROL SET MAG NAIL

ELEVATION=73.60' (NAVD 88 DATUM)

NOTES:

- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE GIVEN IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF.
- THE GROSS AREA OF LAND OF RECORD IS 7,499.92 SQ. FT. ±.
- THE MAP WAS BASED ON A GRANT DEED DOC# 31388 BY LAWYERS TITLE CO. DATED 6-20-2024, RECORDED IN SAN MATEO COUNTY.
- ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS ARE WOOD.
- FOR PRECISE SPECIES OF TREES A CERTIFIED ARBORIST SHALL BE CONSULTED.
- DUE TO THE ABSENCE OF A TITLE REPORT, ANY EASEMENT OF RECORD IS UNDETERMINABLE AND NOT SHOWN AND THE OWNER IS REQUIRED TO PROVIDE THE TITLE REPORT.
- THIS DRAWING REPRESENTS A TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY PREPARED IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAND SURVEYOR'S ACT. THE PROPERTY LINES SHOWN HEREON ARE COMPILED FROM RECORD DATA AND REPRESENT THE BEST GRAPHICAL FIT BETWEEN RECORD INFORMATION AND THE TOPOGRAPHICAL FEATURES SURVEYED AND SHOULD NOT BE RELIED UPON OR USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSES. PURSUANT TO THE CLIENT'S DIRECTION A BOUNDARY SURVEY WAS NOT PERFORMED AT THIS TIME WHICH MAY HAVE DETERMINED THE ACTUAL PROPERTY LINES.



253 YALE RD.
MENLO PARK, CA 94025
A24 APN: 071-394-130



SMP ENGINEERS
CIVIL ENGINEERS—LAND SURVEYORS
1534 Carob Lane Los Altos, CA 94024
Tel. (650) 941-8055 Fax (650) 941-8755

Scale: 1" = 10'
Prepared by: J.N.
Checked by: R.M.
Date: 05/15/2026
Project No: 225088

BOUNDARY AND TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY MAP

Sheet No:

T1

REVISIONS	DESIGN	DATE	CITY	APPR.	DATE
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

CITY OF MENLO PARK

Sheet :

1 OF 3

ABBREVIATIONS		DESCRIPTION	DESCRIPTION
AB	AGGREGATE BASE (CLASS AS NOTED)	LP	UP OF GUTTER
AC	ASPHALT CONCRETE	MON	LOW POINT MONUMENT
AD	AREA DRAIN	NEW	NEW
BC	BACK OF CURB	OG	ORIGINAL GROUND
BFP	BACK FLOW PREVENTER	PCB	POCKET BOX
BW	BACK OF WALL	PCEV	POCKET VAULT
C&G	CURB AND GUTTER	P/L	PROPERTY LINE
QT	GARAGE FINISH FLOOR (BACK)	PP	POWER POLE
K/C/A	CENTERLINE	PERF	PLASTIC PERFORATED PIPE
CLSW	CENTERLINE SWALE	PSE	PUBLIC SERVICE EASEMENT
CD	CLEANOUT	PVC	POLYVINYL CHLORIDE
CP	CONTROL POINT	R/W	RIGHT OF WAY
DWT	DRIVEWAY	RCP	REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE
DI	DROP INLET	SD	STORM DRAIN
D/L	DETAIL	SMH	STORM DRAIN MANHOLE
ELECT	ELECTRIC	STD	STANDARD
EP	EDGE OF PAVEMENT ELEVATION	SS	SANITARY SEWER
EUC	EDGE OF CALYPTUS TREE	SSMH	SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
(E)EX	EXISTING	SW	SIDEWALK
FF	FINISHED FLOOR	T	TOP OF CURB
FG	FINISH GRADE	TF	TOP OF FOUNDATION
FI	FIRE HYDRANT	TOS	TOP OF SLAB
FL	FLOWLINE	TM	TOP OF WALL
FNC	FENCE	TP	TOP OF PAVEMENT
GB	GRADE BREAK	TPP	TYPICAL
GFT	GARAGE FINISHED FLOOR (FRONT)	USS	UNDERGROUND SANITARY SEWER
QUT	GUT WIRE	UE	UTILITY EASEMENT
HP	HIGH POINT	U/G	UNDERGROUND WATER
HDPE	HIGH-DENSITY POLYETHYLENE PIPE	UW	UNDERGROUND WATER
INV	INVERT	V	VITRIFIED CLAY PIPE
JP	JOINT POLE	WL	WHITE LINE STROPE
JB	JUNCTION BOX (UTILITY)	W/M	WATER METER
		WV	WATER VALVE

LEGEND

EXISTING	PROPOSED	DESCRIPTION
---	---	PROPERTY LINE
F	F	FILL AREA LIMIT
C	C	CUT AREA LIMIT
102	102	CONTOUR
W	W	WATER LINE
SD	SD	STORM DRAIN PIPE (SOLID)
SS	SS	SANITARY SEWER PIPE
SUB	SUB	SUBDRAIN PIPE (PERFORATED)
OH	OH	OVERHEAD UTILITIES WITH POLE
G	G	GAS LINE
E	E	ELECTRIC LINE (UNDERGROUND)
JT	JT	JOINT TRENCH
SLV	SLV	STREET LIGHT VAULT
SSCO	●	CLEANOUT
○	●	SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
○	●	STORM DRAIN MANHOLE
⊗	⊗	ELECTROLUER
RM	RM	WATER METER
○	○	TREE WITH TRUNK
102.23	102.23	6" WOODEN FENCE
---	---	SPOT ELEVATION
---	---	TREE PROTECTION FENCE
---	---	5' TALL CHAIN LINK
---	---	SWALE
→	→	DIRECTION OF FLOW IN PIPE
→	→	AREA DRAIN/ INLET
→	→	OVERLAND RELEASE PATH
→	→	GRADING DIRECTION
○	○	(E) TREE TO BE REMOVE
○	○	DOWN-SPOUT

GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLANS

NEW SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE

253 YALE RD., MENLO PARK, CA 94025

APN: 071-394-130

WEST BAY SANITARY SEWER NOTES:

- THE PROPERTY LINE CLEANOUT MUST BE PLACED IN A LOCATION THAT PROVIDES EASY ACCESS FOR MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT AND IS OUTSIDE OF ANY ENCLOSURES. A MINIMUM OF 6' IS REQUIRED BETWEEN THE PROPERTY LINE CLEANOUT AND STRUCTURE.

- A BACKFLOW PREVENTION OR OVERFLOW DEVICE IS RECOMMENDED IMMEDIATELY UPSTREAM OF THE REQUIRED CLEANOUT NEAR THE PROPERTY LINE TO PREVENT BACKFLOW OF SEWAGE INTO THE BUILDING.

- IF THE EXISTING LATERAL FROM THE PROPERTY LINE CLEANOUT TO THE SEWER DISTRICT MAIN WILL BE ABANDONED AND A NEW LATERAL CONNECTION WILL BE MADE AT A DIFFERENT LOCATION, THE EXISTING LATERAL CONNECTION SHALL BE PLUGGED WITH CEMENT SLURRY. IF THE MAIN REPAIRED BY THE PROJECT APPLICANT, A MINIMUM OF 12" IN LENGTH OF THE ABANDONED LATERAL IMMEDIATELY UPSTREAM FROM THE PREVIOUS CONNECTION POINT SHALL BE PLUGGED WITH CEMENT SLURRY. IF THE DISTANCE BETWEEN NEW AND OLD CONNECTION IS 5 FEET OR LESS, THE ENTIRE SECTION OF THE SEWER MAIN BETWEEN THE CONNECTION POINTS SHALL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SEWER DISTRICT STANDARDS. A SEWER INSPECTION PERMIT IS REQUIRED FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING LATERAL CONNECTION AND SEWER MAIN REPAIR.

- SANITARY SEWER CONNECTION AND TESTING MUST BE MADE IN THE PRESENCE OF A SEWER DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE.

- THE SEWER DISTRICT OFFICE SHALL BE CONTACTED TO SCHEDULE INSPECTIONS. INSPECTIONS MUST BE SCHEDULED A MINIMUM OF ONE WORKING DAY PRIOR TO THE INSPECTION. NO INSPECTIONS SHALL OCCUR ON FRIDAYS, WEEKENDS OR HOLIDAYS UNLESS SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS ARE MADE WITH THE SEWER DISTRICT.

- A VIDEO INSPECTION OF THE SEWER MAIN (MANHOLE TO MANHOLE) WHERE THE NEW LATERAL CONNECTS TO THE SEWER DISTRICT MAIN AND/OR THE EXISTING CONNECTION IS TO BE REMOVED SHALL BE PERFORMED BY THE APPLICANT OR CONTRACTOR AND SUBMITTED TO THE SEWER DISTRICT FOR REVIEW AFTER LATERAL CONNECTION HAS BEEN MADE AND/OR THE MAIN REPAIRED. THE VIDEO INSPECTION SHALL BE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS DESCRIBED IN THE SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION INSPECTION OF SANITARY SEWER MAINS (A COPY CAN BE OBTAINED FROM OUR WEBSITE AT [HTTP://PUBLICWORKS.MGOW.ORG/SEWER-SERVICES](http://PUBLICWORKS.MGOW.ORG/SEWER-SERVICES)). THE SEWER DISTRICT WILL REVIEW THE VIDEO INSPECTION TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE WORK PERFORMED IS ACCEPTABLE. ALL UNACCEPTABLE WORK SHALL BE CORRECTED TO THE SEWER DISTRICT'S SATISFACTION AT THE APPLICANT'S EXPENSE.

- CARE MUST BE TAKEN TO PROTECT THE EXISTING SEWER DISTRICT FACILITIES WHEN A NEW SEWER LATERAL AND CONNECTION IS INSTALLED. ANY DAMAGES TO THE SEWER DISTRICT FACILITIES DURING THE INSTALLATION OF THE NEW LATERAL SHALL BE REPAIRED BY THE APPLICANT PER THE SEWER DISTRICT STANDARD DETAILS AND AT THE APPLICANT'S EXPENSE. THE SEWER DISTRICT MUST BE NOTIFIED OF ANY DAMAGES TO THE SANITARY SEWER FACILITIES AND ANY REPAIRS MUST BE INSPECTED BY A SEWER DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE.

- SEWER INSPECTION PERMITS (SIPs) MUST BE OBTAINED BY THE APPLICANT OR CONTRACTOR FOR THE INSPECTION OF:
a) CAPPING OF THE EXISTING LATERAL PRIOR TO DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING BUILDING.
b) PROPOSED SEWER DISTRICT STANDARD CLEANOUT AT THE PROPERTY LINE.
c) LATERAL CONNECTION TO THE SEWER DISTRICT MAIN.
d) LATERAL BETWEEN THE PROPERTY LINE CLEANOUT AND THE SEWER DISTRICT MAIN.
e) REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING LATERAL CONNECTION AND SEWER MAIN REPAIR.

MENLO PARK CITY DRAINAGE MANUAL:

1. NO NET INCREASE IN STORMWATER RUNOFF (RELATIVE TO UNDEVELOPED CONDITIONS) MAY DRAIN ONTO ADJACENT PROPERTIES. THE EXISTING STORM DRAINAGE FROM THE ADJACENT PROPERTIES SHALL NOT BE BLOCKED BY THE NEW DEVELOPMENT.

2. THE OWNER SHALL ADEQUATELY MAINTAIN THE PROPERTY'S STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES.

CITY STREET FRONTAGE NOTES:

- CIVIL ENGINEER SHALL COORDINATE WITH PROJECT ARBORIST TO DETERMINE THE LOCATIONS OF EDGE OF PAVEMENT, STORM DRAIN LINES AND OTHER UTILITY LINES NEAR TREES. THE LOCATIONS OF IMPROVEMENTS NEAR CITY TREES SHALL BE APPROVED BY CITY ARBORIST.

- ALL CONCRETE WORK IN THE CITY RIGHT OF WAY SHALL COMPLY WITH CITY STANDARDS

- PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION, THE APPLICANT SHALL OBTAIN AN ENCROACHMENT PERMIT FROM THE CITY'S ENGINEERING DIVISION FOR ALL EXISTING PRIVATE STRUCTURES, IMPROVEMENTS AND LANDSCAPING OF ANY LOCATED IN THE CITY'S RIGHT-OF-WAY ALONG THE PROPERTY FRONTAGE.

- THE APPLICANT SHALL REMOVE AND REPLACE ALL CRACKED, DAMAGED, UPLIFTED OR DEPRECATED FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS (CURB, GUTTER, SIDEWALK, DRIVEWAY, ETC.), EXISTING OR DAMAGED BY THE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. PER CITY STANDARDS ALONG THE ENTIRE PROPERTY FRONTAGE. IF FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS DO NOT CURRENTLY EXIST, THE APPLICANT IS REQUIRED TO INSTALL FRONTAGE IMPROVEMENTS PER CITY STANDARDS ALONG THE ENTIRE PROPERTY FRONTAGE. ALL IMPROVEMENTS ARE TO BE COMPLETED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY PUBLIC WORKS INSPECTOR PRIOR TO THE FINAL INSPECTION BY THE BUILDING INSPECTOR

GRADING AND DRAINAGE NOTES:

- Surface water shall be directed away from all buildings into drainage swales, gutters, storm drain inlets and drainage systems.
- Connect roof down spouts to 6" solid pvc (4" for individual down-spouts) @ minimum 1% slope and min. 6" ground cover. Connect pipes to on-site inlets. See architectural plans for roof downspout locations.
- On site storm drain lines shall consist of solid PVC-SDR35 minimum or better.
- Storm drain inlets shall be precast concrete, Christy U23 type or equivalent.
- Property owner must maintain the drainage system including the drainage swales to be working order at all time.

TRAFFIC NOTE:

CONTRACTOR TO MINIMIZE PARKING AND LOADING IN THE STREET

NOTE:

ALL UNSPECIFIED PERVIOUS SURFACES OF THE SITE WILL BE COVERED WITH MULCH. MARK ON-SITE INLETS WITH THE WORD "NO DUMPING" FLOWS TO BAY"

EARTHWORK TABLE FOR LOT RIGHT

	FILL (CY)	CUT (CY)	IMPORT (CY)	EXPORT (CY)
HOUSE	0	24		
ADJ.	0	18		
GARAGE	0	3		
TOTAL BUILDINGS	0	45		
DRIVEWAY	0	7		
PATIO	12	0		
WALKWAY	0	16		
SITE	5	0		
TOTAL SITE	17	23		
TOTAL PROJECT (CY)	17	68	0	51

NOTE:

1. EARTHWORK QUANTITIES ON THIS TABLE ARE FOR INFORMATION ONLY. CONTRACTORS ARE TO PERFORM THEIR OWN QUANTITY TAKE OFFS.



PROJECT LOCATION LOCATION MAP N.T.S.

SHEET INDEX:

- C-1 COVER SHEET/ NOTES/
- C-2 GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
- C-3 SUBDRAIN AND UTILITY PLAN
- C-4 IMPERVIOUS AREA
- C-5 DETAILS
- C-6 EROSION CONTROL PLAN
- C-7 CONSTRUCTION BMP

BASIS OF BEARINGS:

FOUND SURVEY MONUMENTS ALONG THE RIGHT OF WAY. RECORD INFORMATION WAS USED. PER RECORD MAP, BOOK/VOL (LLS):13 PAGE:126 WHICH IS FILED IN THE CITY OF SAN MATEO RECORDER'S OFFICE.

PROJECT BENCHMARK:

CITY OF MENLO PARK BENCHMARK BM #7 ELEVATION=65.71' (NAVD 88 DATUM)

SITE BENCHMARK:

SURVEY CONTROL SET MAG NAIL ELEVATION=73.60' (NAVD 88 DATUM)

NOTE:

- IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT THE PROJECT CIVIL ENGINEER WILL INSPECT THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FEATURES DURING CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR SHOULD BE NOTIFIED TO COORDINATE SUCH INSPECTIONS WITH THE CIVIL ENGINEER. IF THE CIVIL ENGINEER IS UNABLE TO CONDUCT THE CONSTRUCTION INSPECTIONS, THE CITY MUST BE NOTIFIED PRIOR TO PERMIT ISSUANCE.
- PRIOR TO FINALING THIS PERMIT, YOU WILL NEED A FINAL BY CIVIL AND DRAINAGE DEPARTMENT. FOR THE FINAL BY CIVIL AND DRAINAGE TO PASS, A FINAL APPROVAL LETTER FROM THE CIVIL ENGINEER WILL BE ASKED AT THE TIME WHEN THE PERMIT IS READY TO FINAL

NOTE:

GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLANS SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE PROJECT GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER.

NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS

CONTRACTOR TO NOTIFY U.S.A. (UNDERGROUND SERVICE ALERT) AT 800-227-2600 A MINIMUM OF 2 WORKING DAYS BEFORE BEGINNING UNDERGROUND WORK FOR VERIFICATION OF THE LOCATION AND DEPTH OF UNDERGROUND UTILITIES.



1534 CAROB LANE
LOS ALTOS, CA 94024
TEL: (650) 941-8005
FAX: (650) 941-8755
EMAIL: SRAZAVIMS@SMPENGINEERS.COM

OWNER / DEVELOPER:

COPYRIGHT © 2024
SMP ENGINEERS
CIVIL ENGINEERS

COVER SHEET
NEW SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE
253 YALE RD., MENLO PARK, CA 94025
GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLANS

Revisions:



Date: 04/03/2026

Scale: NTS

PREPARED BY: S.S.S.

CHECKED BY: S.S.S.

Job #: 225088

Sheet:

1 OF 7
C-1


GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
NEW SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE
253 YALE RD, MENLO PARK, CA 94025
GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLANS

Revisions:



Date: 04/03/2026
Scale: 1" = 10'
PREPARED BY: S.S.
CHECKED BY: S.R.
Job #: 225088

Sheet:
2 OF 7
C-2




GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
NEW SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE
253 YALE RD, MENLO PARK, CA 94025
GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLANS


Revisions:




Date: 04/03/2026
Scale: 1" = 10'
PREPARED BY: S.S.
CHECKED BY: S.R.
Job #: 225088

Sheet:
3 OF 7
C-3






EXISTING IMPERVIOUS AREA
TOTAL = 4720 SQFT



EXISTING IMPERVIOUS AREA TO BE
REPLACED WITH NEW IMPERVIOUS AREA
TOTAL = 3643 SQFT



PROPOSED IMPERVIOUS AREA
TOTAL = 4627 SQFT

253 YALE RD., MENLO PARK, CA 94025

ON-SITE IMPERVIOUS AREAS:

PRE-DEVELOPMENT:

DESCRIPTION	AREA
BUILDINGS	1,701 SQ FT
GARAGE	369 SQ FT
DRIVEWAY	1,109 SQ FT
PATIO	1,088 SQ FT
WALKWAY	305 SQ FT
PORCH	171 SQ FT
TOTAL	4,720

POST-DEVELOPMENT:

DESCRIPTION	AREA
BUILDINGS	1,271 SQ FT
A.D.U.	812 SQ FT
GARAGE	261 SQ FT
DRIVEWAY	430 SQ FT
PARKING	205 SQ FT
PATIO	430 SQ FT
PORCH	135 SQ FT
WALKWAY	1,088 SQ FT
TOTAL	4,627


A28

253 YALE RD., MENLO PARK, CA 94025


IMPERVIOUS AREA CALCULATION

(CITY IMPERVIOUS AREA WORKSHEET)


A	7,500 SQ.FT.	TOTAL AREA OF PARCELS (NET)
B	2,790 SQ.FT.	EXISTING PERVIOUS AREA
C	4,720 SQ.FT.	EXISTING IMPERVIOUS AREA
D	63%	EXISTING % IMPERVIOUS
E	3,643 SQ.FT.	EXISTING IMPERVIOUS AREA TO BE REPLACED W/ NEW IMPERVIOUS AREA
F	984 SQ.FT.	EXISTING PERVIOUS AREA TO BE REPLACED W/ NEW IMPERVIOUS AREA
G+H+F	4,627 SQ.FT.	NEW IMPERVIOUS AREA (CREATING OR REPLACING)
H	1,077 SQ.FT.	EXISTING IMPERVIOUS AREA TO BE REPLACED W/ NEW IMPERVIOUS AREA
I+H-F	-43 SQ.FT.	NET CHANGE IN IMPERVIOUS AREA
J+H-I	2,873 SQ.FT.	PROPOSED PERVIOUS AREA
K	4,627 SQ.FT.	PROPOSED IMPERVIOUS AREA
L+K	7,500 SQ.FT.	VERIFY THAT L+K=A
L	62%	PROPOSED PERCENTAGE IMPERVIOUS





CONCRETE PAVERS DETAIL
NTS




EARTH SWALE DETAIL
N.T.S.




STORM DRAIN AREA DRAIN
N.T.S.



ROOF DOWN-SPOUT CONNECTION
N.T.S.




STORM DRAIN CLEANOUT DETAIL
N.T.S.




PUMPWELL DETAIL FOR OVERFLOW

PUMP NOTES:


1. HARD WIRE THE PUMPS TO PREVENT ANY UNPLUGGING.
2. PUMPS TO BE CONNECTED TO BACKUP GENERATORS OR BATTERIES TO PREVENT FLOODING IN CASE OF BACKOUT.
3. PROVIDE BACK FLOW PREVENTOR VALVE FOR PUMP OUTLET.
4. PROVIDE RESERVE PUMP FOR EACH PUMP WELL.
5. PROVIDE FLOATING DEVICE, CONNECTED TO SOUND/ LIGHT ALARM, TO NOTIFY RESIDENTS OF POSSIBLE RISE OF WATER IN PUMPWELL.
6. PROVIDE TWO SEPARATE SYSTEM AND PUMP WELLS FOR: a) SUBDRAIN AND b) LIGHTWELL AREA DRAINS.




CURB AND GARAGE SLAB DETAIL
N.T.S.



SANITARY SEWER BACKFLOW PREVENTER DETAIL
N.T.S.




SECTION L-L




SECTION Y-Y


STORM DRAIN INLET
N.T.S.



STORM DRAIN INLET & DETENTION BASIN
N.T.S.





SECTION W-W



BUBBLER BOX DETAIL
N.T.S.

NOTES:

1. 1. RIGID PLASTIC, A.C., C.I., OR STEEL PIPE ALLOWED TO BOX FROM PUMP.
2. BOX SHALL BE SET WITH ADJACENT GRADES SLOPING AWAY TO PREVENT RAINWATER & LANDSCAPE WATER FROM ENTERING.
3. BOX SHALL BE SET IN LANDSCAPE AREA TO FACILITATE PERCOLATION.
4. BOX SHALL NOT HAVE CONCRETE BOTTOM TO FACILITATE PERCOLATION.
5. BOX MUST BE LOCATED AT LEAST 10 FEET FROM BACK OF SIDEWALK AND 3 FEET MIN. AWAY FROM SIDE AND REAR PROPERTY LINES, APPROX. LOCATED IN SWALE, VEGETATED OR RETENTION AREA.



NOTES

PERFORM CLEARING AND EARTHMOVING ACTIVITIES ONLY DURING DRY WEATHER. MEASURES TO ENSURE ADEQUATE EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL SHALL BE INSTALLED PRIOR TO EARTHMOVING ACTIVITIES AND CONSTRUCTION.

MEASURES TO ENSURE ADEQUATE EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL ARE REQUIRED YEAR-ROUND. STABILIZE ALL DENuded AREAS AND MAINTAIN EROSION CONTROL MEASURES CONTINUOUSLY BETWEEN OCTOBER 1 AND APRIL 30.

STORE, HANDLE, AND DISPOSE OF CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS AND WASTES PROPERLY, SO AS TO PREVENT THEIR CONTACT WITH STORMWATER.

CONTROL AND PREVENT THE DISCHARGE OF ALL POTENTIAL POLLUTANTS, INCLUDING PAVEMENT CUTTING WASTES, PAINTS, CONCRETE, PETROLEUM PRODUCTS, CHEMICALS, WASH WATER OR SEDIMENTS, AND NON-STORMWATER DISCHARGES TO STORM DRAINS AND WATERCOURSES.

USE SEDIMENT CONTROLS OR FILTRATION TO REMOVE SEDIMENT WHEN DEWATERING SITE AND OBTAIN REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD (PDES) PERMITS AS NECESSARY.

AVOID CLEANING, FUELING, OR MAINTAINING VEHICLES ON-SITE, EXCEPT IN A DESIGNATED AREA WHERE WASH WATER IS CONTAINED AND TREATED.

LIMIT AND TIME APPLICATIONS OF PESTICIDES AND FERTILIZERS TO PREVENT POLLUTED RUNOFF.

LIMIT CONSTRUCTION ACCESS ROUTES TO STABILIZED, DESIGNATED ACCESS POINTS.

AVOID TRACKING DIRT OR OTHER MATERIALS OFF-SITE. CLEAN OFF-SITE PAVED AREAS AND SIDEWALKS USING DRY SWEEPING METHODS.

TRAIN AND PROVIDE INSTRUCTION TO ALL EMPLOYEES AND SUBCONTRACTORS REGARDING THE WATERSHED PROTECTION MAINTENANCE STANDARDS AND CONSTRUCTION BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.

PLACEMENT OF EROSION MATERIALS AT THESE LOCATIONS ARE REQUIRED ON WEEKENDS AND DURING RAIN EVENTS PER PLAN.

THE AREAS DELINEATED ON THE PLANS FOR PARKING, GRUBBING, STORAGE, ETC., SHALL NOT BE ENLARGED OR "RUN OVER".

CONSTRUCTION SITES ARE REQUIRED TO HAVE EROSION CONTROL MATERIALS ON-SITE DURING THE "OFF-SEASON". DUST CONTROL IS REQUIRED YEAR-ROUND.

EROSION CONTROL MATERIALS SHALL BE STORED OFF-SITE.

USE OF PLASTIC SHEETING BETWEEN OCTOBER 1 AND APRIL 30 IS NOT ACCEPTABLE, UNLESS FOR USE ON STOCKPILES WHERE THE STOCKPILE IS ALSO PROTECTED WITH FIBER ROLLS CONTAINING THE BASE OF THE STOCKPILE.

TREE PROTECTION SHALL BE IN PLACE BEFORE ANY DEMOLITION, GRADING, EXCAVATING OR GRUBBING IS STARTED.

EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL NOTES AND MEASURES

- The facilities shown on this Plan are designed to control Erosion and sediment during the rainy season, October 1st to April 30. Facilities are to be operated prior to October 1 of any year. Grading operations during the rainy season, which leave denuded slopes shall be protected with erosion control measures immediately following grading on the slopes.
- This plan covers only the first winter following grading with assumed site conditions as shown on the Erosion Control Plan. Prior to September 15, the completion of site improvement shall be evaluated and revisions made to this plan as necessary with the approval of the county engineer. Plans are to be resubmitted for county approval prior to September 1 of each subsequent year until site improvements are accepted by the county.
- Construction entrances shall be installed prior to commencement of grading. All construction traffic entering onto the paved roads must cross the stabilized construction entrances.
- Contractor shall maintain stabilized entrance at each vehicle access point to existing paved streets. Any mud or debris tracked onto public streets shall be removed daily and as required by the county.
- If hydroseeding is not used or is not effectively 10/10, then other immediate methods shall be implemented, such as Erosion control blankets, or a three-step application of: 1) seed, mulch, fertilizer 2) blown straw 3) tackifier and mulch.
- Inlet protection shall be installed at open inlets to prevent sediment from entering the storm drain system. Inlets not used in conjunction with erosion control are to be blocked to prevent entry of sediment.
- Lots with houses under construction will not be hydroseeded. Erosion protection for each lot with a house under construction shall conform to the Typical Lot Erosion Control Detail shown on this sheet.
- This erosion and sediment control plan may not cover all the situations that may arise during construction due to unanticipated field conditions. Variations and additions may be made to this plan in the field. Notify the county representative of any field changes.
- This plan is intended to be used for interim erosion and sediment control only and is not to be used for final elevations or permanent improvements.
- Contractor shall be responsible for monitoring erosion and sediment control prior, during, and after storm events.

- Reasonable care shall be taken when hauling any earth, sand, gravel, stone, debris, paper or any other substance over any public street, alley or other public place. Should any blow, spill, or track over and upon said public or adjacent private property, immediately remedy shall occur.
- Sanitary facilities shall be maintained on the site.
- During the rainy season, all paved areas shall be kept clear of earth material and debris. The site shall be maintained so as to minimize sediment laden runoff to any storm drainage systems, including existing drainage swales and water courses.
- Construction operations shall be carried out in such a manner that erosion and water pollution will be minimized. State and local laws concerning pollution abatement shall be complied with.
- Contractors shall provide dust control as required by the appropriate federal, state, and local agency requirements.
- With the approval of the county engineer, erosion and sediment controls may be removed after areas above them have been stabilized.

MAINTENANCE NOTES

- Maintenance is to be performed as follows:
 - Repair damages caused by soil erosion or construction at the end of each working day.
 - Swales shall be inspected periodically and maintained as needed.
 - Sediment traps, berms, and swales are to be inspected after each storm and repairs made as needed.
 - Sediment shall be removed and sediment traps restored to its original dimensions when sediment has accumulated to a depth of one foot.
 - Erosion removed from trap shall be deposited in a suitable area and in such a manner that it will not erode.
 - Rills and gullies must be repaired.
- All existing drainage inlets on street within the limit of the project shall be protected with sand bags during construction. See detail. Sand bag inlet protection shall be cleaned out whenever sediment depth is one half the height of one sand bag.
- Existing concrete ditch sediment trap shall be cleaned out routinely during construction.



October 31,2025

**City of Menlo Park
Planning Department**

RE: Use Permit for **253 Yale road**, Menlo Park

This proposal seeks Use Permit approval for a new two story single family residence including attached one car garage and attached 800 sq. ft. ADU.

The lot is 50 feet wide by 150 feet deep, and it is non conforming due to its 50 feet width (65 feet is required in R-1-U zone). All the existing structures will be removed for construction of the new residence.

The proposed design is transitional style blending traditional and modern elements. The setbacks at the front, right, and rear exceed the current requirements.

The second floor setbacks and use of hip roofs reduce mass and creat a gradual transition in relation to adjacent homes. There will be no intrusion into daylight plane requirements. The facade of the building is mainly horizontal wood siding with stone around the garage door.

We believe that the style and proportions of this residence preserve the character of the neighborhood.

The main house has an open floor plan connecting the dining, family, and kitchen areas with 3 bedrooms and 3.5 bathrooms. The attached ADU consists of one bedroom, one full bathroom, and an open concept family room with kitchen appliances.

We have shared the proposed plans with neighbors at 240,250, and 262 Yale Road across from the property, 241 and 263 Yale Road on both sides and 250 Princeton Road in the back. We have not received any negative comments from these neighbors.

Babak Homayouni



KIELTY

ARBORISTS SERVICES LLC

Certified Arborist WE#10724A TRAQ Qualified

P.O. Box 6187 San Mateo, CA 94403

650- 532-4418

253 Yale Road Menlo Park, Ca



DAVID BECKHAM
WE#10724A



DAVID BECKHAM
WE#10724A

Prepared For:
Frank Mirkhani

Site: 253 Yale Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Submitted by:
David Beckham
Certified Arborist
WE#10724A
TRAQ Qualified

January 16, 2026

Attn: Frank Mirkhani

Subject: Tree protection plan for 253 Yale Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Kiely Arborists Services LLC conducted a site visit at 253 Yale Road, Menlo Park on November 26, 2025 to evaluate existing trees in relation to the proposed new home construction. The purpose of this assessment is to document tree conditions, identify protected trees as defined by applicable municipal ordinances, and evaluate potential construction-related impacts in order to inform permitting and tree protection requirements.

This report is based on field observations and a review of *Site Plan A-1 through A-6*, no date is listed on the drawing. Tree identification, general health and structural condition, and proximity to proposed improvements were evaluated to determine preservation feasibility, required protection measures, and anticipated impacts. Unless otherwise stated, observations were limited to ground-based visual inspection, and no invasive testing, aerial inspection, or plant tissue analysis was performed.

Data Summary:

Total Trees	Total Street Trees	Neighboring Trees	Protected Trees		Non-Protected Trees		Overall Condition Rating		
			Total	Proposed for Removal	Total	Proposed for Removal	<50%	50%-69%	70-100%
14	4	8	8	1	6	2	4	7	3

A total of 14 trees were surveyed. Of these, eight trees meet the size and species thresholds to qualify as protected trees under the applicable ordinance (#1-4, and #10-13). Three trees are proposed for removal due to documented decline or unavoidable conflicts with proposed project features (#2, 9, and 14). Trees located on neighboring properties and within the construction influence area were visually reviewed from accessible vantage points for context and impact evaluation. Woody plants observed on site that do not meet the minimum diameter or definition of a regulated tree, including shrubs, vines, or sub-threshold stems, may be noted for site context only and may not be subject to tree protection ordinance requirements. Protected trees should be retained and protected as detailed in the recommendations below. With proper protection and cultural practices, all retained trees are expected to survive during and after construction.

Any heritage tree to be retained is protected by the City's Municipal Code and will require replacement according to its appraised value if it is damaged beyond repair by construction. A final inspection is required by the City Arborist at the end of the project before the tree protection fencing

is taken down and after replacement trees are planted. Prior to issuance of the associated demolition and building permits, a tree protection verification letter from the Project Arborist is required. The tree protection should be installed in compliance with the recommendations in the Arborist Report. The Project Arborist should visit the property, verify that the protection measures are in compliance, take photos, and then prepare a brief verification letter for City Arborist review. The Project Arborist must also provide monthly tree protection monitoring inspections. During these inspections, the Project Arborist should monitor the condition of the trees, verify that the tree protection measures are in compliance, provide recommendations for any necessary maintenance and impact mitigation, and prepare monthly reports for City Arborist Review.

ASSIGNMENT

At the request of Frank Mirkhani, Kielty Arborists Services LLC conducted a site visit on November 26, 2025 to prepare a Tree Inventory Report and Tree Protection Plan for the proposed construction project at 253 Yale Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025. This report has been prepared to support plan review and permitting requirements for the City of Menlo Park and is intended to inform municipal decision-making related to tree preservation, protection, and removal.

The assignment consisted of identifying and evaluating trees within the project area that may be affected by the proposed development, determining the extent of anticipated construction-related impacts, and providing arboricultural recommendations to minimize adverse effects. Evaluations focused on tree size, species, general health, structural condition, and proximity to proposed improvements, with particular attention given to potential root disturbance, soil compaction, and crown impacts associated with grading, excavation, foundations, and access.

Based on these findings, this report establishes tree protection measures and preservation strategies intended to maintain tree viability during and after construction, while aligning the proposed improvements with applicable municipal tree protection regulations. Where impacts are unavoidable, the report identifies removal recommendations and associated considerations consistent with local ordinance requirements.

The sections that follow provide detailed documentation of tree conditions, anticipated impacts, and recommended protection measures to guide construction activities and support compliance throughout the duration of the project.

Please note that the report will provide specific details regarding tree assessments, impacts, and preservation measures.

The City of Menlo Park requires the following tree reporting elements for development projects:

1. Map of tree locations.
2. Tree protection or removal recommendations for all trees over 4 inches in diameter.
3. Tree Protection Plan for all protected trees.

LIMITS OF THE ASSIGNMENT

This assessment is based on a ground-based visual inspection of trees conducted from accessible areas at the time of the site visit. The evaluation did not include aerial inspection of the upper crown, detailed root crown excavation, subsurface root investigation, resistograph testing, or plant tissue, soil, or laboratory analysis, unless explicitly stated otherwise in this report. As such, conditions that are not externally visible, including internal decay, root defects, or latent disorders, may not have been detected. No tree risk assessments, hazard ratings, or failure probability determinations were performed as part of this assignment unless specifically identified elsewhere in the report.

The scope of this work is limited to tree identification, general health and structural observations, and evaluation of potential impacts associated with the proposed construction activities, including grading, excavation, and proximity to improvements. Trees located on neighboring properties were observed visually from accessible vantage points only. No access was obtained to off-site properties, and no detailed inspection, testing, or monitoring of neighboring trees was performed unless expressly noted.

Any observations regarding neighboring trees are provided for context and impact evaluation purposes and should not be construed as a complete condition assessment. This report does not assign or imply an appraised monetary value for any tree. Where neighboring trees are discussed, any reference to condition or potential impact is preliminary in nature and not intended to support valuation, compensation, or damage claims. Tree appraisal, if requested, would require a separate assignment and a more comprehensive level of inspection consistent with industry standards. The findings and recommendations presented herein reflect conditions observed at the time of inspection and are based on the information available. Tree condition and site circumstances may change over time due to construction activity, environmental conditions, or other factors beyond the control of the arborist.

METHOD OF INSPECTION

The tree inspections were conducted from the ground without climbing the trees and were limited to visual observations from accessible areas at the time of the site visit. No tissue samples or root crown inspections were performed, and no subsurface or invasive testing was undertaken unless otherwise stated. The trees under consideration were identified based on the provided site plan and field verification where feasible.

To assess the trees, their diameters were measured using a D-Tape, where access allowed. Where site constraints limited direct measurement, trunk diameters were estimated based on visible conditions and professional judgment. For the surveying of multi-trunk trees, our methodology aligns with city ordinances. In cases where the city does not offer specific guidelines for measuring multi-trunk trees, we adhere to the standards outlined in the Guide for Plant Appraisal, 10th Edition, Second Printing by the Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers.

Additionally, the trees were evaluated for their health, structure, form, and suitability for preservation based on conditions observed at the time of inspection and in relation to the proposed construction. These evaluations are intended to support planning, impact assessment, and tree protection

recommendations and should not be interpreted as detailed diagnostic evaluations or tree risk assessments. The following section provides definitions and explanations of the rating categories used in this report.

EVALUATION FIELDS

Tree Tag Number:

An identification number assigned to each tree inventoried and evaluated as part of this report. Tree tag numbers correspond to the numbering shown on the tree site map. Physical tagging of trees is performed where site access allows and where trees are located within the project site. Trees located in inaccessible areas or on neighboring properties are not physically tagged and, where referenced, are identified by number for documentation and impact evaluation purposes only.

Protected Tree Status:

Identifies whether a tree meets the size and species thresholds to qualify as a regulated or protected tree under the applicable city or county ordinance at the time of inspection. Trunk diameter measurements reflect conditions observed on the inspection date. Trees are living organisms and continue to grow over time, and depending on species, site conditions, and project duration, a tree that does not qualify as protected at the time of inspection may reach the protected size threshold during or after construction. We display Protected with a (YES) in green on the tree inventory survey.

Preservation or Removal Recommendation:

Indicates the recommended disposition of each tree based on observed condition, regulatory status, and relationship to the proposed improvements. Trees recommended for preservation are designated with a (P) on the tree inventory and are subject to the protection measures outlined in the Tree Protection Plan. Trees recommended for removal are designated with an (R) on the tree inventory. Trees identified for removal are not included in the Tree Protection Plan and are assumed to be proposed for removal under a separate approval process.

Common Name / Botanical Name:

Identifies the tree species using commonly accepted common names and scientific nomenclature based on visual characteristics observed at the time of inspection. Species identification is made to the best of the arborist's professional judgment using available field indicators. In some cases, environmental conditions, seasonal characteristics, or limited access may affect definitive identification, and nomenclature should be considered an informed professional opinion rather than a guarantee.

Trunk Diameter at Breast Height (DBH, inches):

Represents the trunk diameter, defined by the applicable ordinance. DBH measurements are obtained using a diameter tape where the trunk is accessible. Where direct measurement is not feasible due to site constraints, obstructions, or limited access, DBH values are estimated based on visible trunk dimensions and professional judgment. For trees located on neighboring properties, DBH values are derived from available topographic or tree survey data when provided. Estimates may vary by approximately one to two inches or more from actual measurements.

Individual Trunk Diameters (for Multi-Trunk Trees):

For trees with multiple trunks, individual stem diameters are measured at the required height where the trunks meet ordinance criteria. Total diameter is calculated by using the diameter of the largest trunk and adding one half of the diameter of each additional qualifying trunk, unless a different calculation method is specifically required by the applicable city or county ordinance. Measurement methodology is consistent with guidance outlined in current International Society of Arboriculture references and standard arboricultural practice.

6, 8, 10 Times the Diameter (ft.):

Represents calculated distances derived from the tree's trunk diameter to illustrate applicable tree protection and construction setback zones as defined by local ordinances and project requirements. Distances are calculated by converting the trunk diameter from inches to feet by dividing the DBH by twelve, then multiplying by the applicable factor of six, eight, or ten. These values are provided to assist with planning, fencing layout, and evaluation of proposed improvements in relation to protected root zones and are based on measured or estimated trunk diameters at the time of inspection.

Tree Height (ft.) / Canopy Spread (ft.):

Represents estimated measurements of the tree's overall height and average canopy spread at the time of inspection. Heights are visually estimated based on field observation, and canopy spread is approximated by walking off the dripline extent on site to determine average horizontal canopy dimensions. These values are provided to characterize general tree size and form and are not intended to represent survey-grade measurements.

Overall Health Assessment:

The overall health rating reflects the tree's physiological condition and vigor based on visible indicators at the time of inspection. Trees rated Poor show minimal new growth, significant dieback, pest or disease pressure, and are not expected to reach a normal species-specific lifespan. Trees rated Fair exhibit moderate new growth, canopy density generally ranging from approximately sixty to ninety percent, and may show signs of stress or vulnerability, though they are not actively declining. Trees rated Good demonstrate vigorous growth, healthy foliage, canopy density typically exceeding eighty percent, and are expected to reach a normal lifespan under favorable conditions.

Structural Integrity Assessment:

The structural integrity rating reflects the presence and severity of structural defects observed at the time of inspection and the tree's ability to maintain stability over time. Trees rated Poor exhibit major, largely uncorrectable structural defects, which may include extensive dead wood, advanced decay, multiple competing trunks, or pronounced lean that presents an elevated risk. Trees rated Fair display identifiable structural deficiencies that are less severe but may include moderate lean, trunk crowding, or defects that are only partially correctable through pruning or mitigation. Trees rated Good exhibit minor structural flaws only, with an upright or generally stable trunk, well-spaced scaffold branches, and defects that are largely correctable through standard arboricultural practices, resulting in a balanced or mostly symmetrical canopy.

Form and Aesthetic Quality Assessment:

The form and aesthetic quality rating evaluates the tree's overall structure and visual contribution to the landscape relative to species norms. Trees rated Poor exhibit highly asymmetric, distorted, or abnormal form that significantly limits aesthetic or functional value. Trees rated Fair show noticeable asymmetries or deviations from typical species form that compromise appearance or function to a moderate degree. Trees rated Good display near-ideal form with only minor deviations, maintaining consistent aesthetic value and functional contribution to the landscape.

Preservation Suitability Rating:

The preservation suitability rating evaluates the tree's overall ability to be successfully retained within the proposed development context. Trees rated Poor contribute limited functional or aesthetic value to the landscape, exhibit compromised health or structure, and are unlikely to tolerate construction-related impacts even with protective measures. Trees rated Fair provide moderate landscape value and may be retained where impacts are minor and appropriate protection measures are implemented. Trees rated Good are considered valuable landscape assets with a high likelihood of successful retention during minor to moderate construction impacts when protected in accordance with recommended measures.

Overall Condition Score (0-100%):

The overall condition rating is derived from a weighted evaluation of three core attributes: structural integrity, physiological health, and form. Each attribute is assigned a qualitative rating of Poor, Fair-Poor, Fair, or Good based on observed conditions at the time of inspection. These qualitative ratings are internally converted to an ordinal numeric scale to allow consistent comparison across trees, with Poor representing the lowest condition and Good representing the highest.

Structural integrity is weighted at fifty percent of the overall score due to its direct relationship to risk and long-term retention potential. Physiological health contributes thirty-five percent, reflecting the tree's current vigor and ability to respond to stressors. Form and aesthetic quality contribute fifteen percent and are considered secondary to safety and biological function. The combined weighted score is normalized to a percentage scale and conservatively capped so that even trees rated Good across all categories do not reach a full 100 percent rating. This cap is intentional and reflects professional judgment that no tree is without limitations or future risk, particularly within managed urban environments and active construction contexts. As a result, the overall condition rating spans from zero to eighty percent, with higher values indicating stronger preservation suitability within the defined range from Poor to Good.

Poor (approximately 0–24%)

Trees plotting at the bottom of the scale fall near zero percent and reflect Poor condition across structure, health, and form. These trees exhibit significant limitations to retention, reduced functional capacity, or elevated long-term risk.

Fair-Poor (approximately 25–49%)

As the score rises into the lower-middle portion of the scale, trees fall within the Fair-Poor range. These trees retain some functional value but display notable defects, stress indicators, or structural concerns that limit preservation suitability.

Fair (approximately 50–69%)

Trees in the middle-to-upper portion of the scale represent Fair condition. These trees are generally serviceable, structurally stable, and physiologically functional, with issues that are considered manageable through standard arboricultural practices.

Good (approximately 70–100%)

The upper end of the scale represents Good condition. These trees exhibit strong structural integrity, acceptable health, and functional form. Scores are intentionally capped at eighty percent to reflect professional judgment that no urban tree is without limitations or future risk, particularly within managed landscapes and construction environments.

Appraised Value:

Where provided, appraised value represents an estimate of tree value prepared in general accordance with the current edition of the Guide for Plant Appraisal published by the Council of Tree and Landscape Appraisers. Appraisals are limited to the scope and level of inspection performed as part of this assignment. Trees located on neighboring properties were not fully inspected and, where referenced, any value shown is preliminary in nature. Appraised values are provided for planning and informational purposes only and are not intended for use in legal proceedings, insurance claims, or damage valuation without additional assessment.

Tree Picture:

Photographs were taken in the field at the time of inspection using an iPhone or equivalent mobile device and are intended to document general tree condition and site context. Images were captured from the best available vantage point where access allowed. In some cases, photographs may include multiple trees within a single image or may be partially obstructed due to surrounding vegetation, structures, or limited access. Trees located on neighboring properties may not be fully visible from accessible viewpoints.

Arborist Observations and Tree Notes:

Summarizes field observations recorded at the time of inspection based on a ground-based visual assessment. Notes reflect observed tree condition, structural characteristics, site context, and construction-related considerations visible at the time of the site visit. Observations are limited to conditions apparent from accessible areas and do not include aerial inspection or invasive evaluation unless otherwise stated. Field notes are

documented contemporaneously and may contain minor spelling or grammatical inconsistencies, which do not affect the intent or substance of the observations.

**Note: Not all data fields are applicable to every tree. Certain fields may be left blank where measurements were not accessible, where site conditions limited observation, where sufficient information was not available, or where the parameter is not relevant to the evaluation or regulatory status of a particular tree. All information presented is based on conditions observed at the time of inspection and reflects the defined scope of work for this assignment. Tree conditions and site circumstances may change over time. Condition ratings and scores are intended as comparative planning tools to support preservation and impact evaluation and should not be interpreted as tree risk assessments or predictions of future performance.*

TREE INVENTORY SURVEY



Tree Tag Number	Protected Tree Status	Preservation or Removal Recommendation	Common Name / Botanical Name	Appraised Value	Trunk Diameter at Breast Height (DBH, inches)	Ten Times the Diameter in (ft.)	Tree Height (ft.) / Canopy Spread (ft.)	Overall Health Assessment	Structural Integrity Assessment	Form and Aesthetic Quality Assessment	Preservation Suitability Rating	Overall Condition Score (0-100%)	Arborist Observations and Tree Notes	Tree Picture #1
1	Yes	(P)	Southern magnolia <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	\$2,500	15	13	30/15	Poor	Fair	Fair	Poor	45	Street tree, in between street and sidewalk and planting strip, abundance of deadwood in canopy.	
2	Yes	(R)	Southern magnolia <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	\$2,700	16.1	13	40/18	Fair	Poor	Fair	Fair	45	Minor deadwood in canopy, suppressed by neighboring camphor street tree number three, grows at lean into property.	
3*	Yes	(P)	camphor <i>Camphora officinarum</i>	\$17,500	40	33	40/35	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	80	Neighboring street tree, codominant at 6 feet, recent sidewalk and driveway work done in past near tree. Minor deadwood, sprouting along limbs.	
4*	Yes	(P)	Southern magnolia <i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>	\$4,100	18	15	35/20	Fair	Good	Good	Good	60	Neighboring tree, 8 feet from existing driveway, deadwood at top of canopy, street tree between street and sidewalk.	
5*	No	(P)	coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	N/A	6	5	20/6	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	55	Neighboring tree, at property line. Codominant at 5 feet, heading cuts observed. Young tree, volunteer.	
6*	No	(P)	saucer magnolia <i>Magnolia x soulangiana</i>	N/A	9	8	20/10	Fair	Poor	Fair	Fair	55	Neighboring tree, at property line, codominant at 1 foot, suppressed, heading cuts observed.	
7*	No	(P)	Japanese privet <i>Ligustrum japonicum</i>	N/A	9.5	8	25/12	Poor	Fair	Fair	Poor	40	In decline, abundance of deadwood, ivy on trunk.	
8	No	(R)	Japanese maple <i>Acer palmatum</i>	N/A	13.3	11	12/12	Fair	Poor	Fair	Fair	50	Topped in the past at 7 feet, 4 feet from existing driveway.	
9	No	(R)	edible fig <i>Ficus carica</i>	N/A	6.2	5	10/8	Fair	Poor	Fair	Poor	50	Topped in past at 6 feet, 2 feet away from home foundation. Tree to be removed.	
10	Yes	(P)	coast live oak <i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	\$15,300	32	27	45/40	Fair	Good	Good	Good	70	Tree located on property line; shared tree. Codominant at 18 feet, somewhat thin canopy, suppressed by redwood trees, adjacent to concrete pad and existing garage.	
11*	Yes	(P)	redwood <i>Sequoia sempervirens</i>	\$9,500	24	20	80/20	Good	Good	Good	Good	70	Neighboring tree, limited visual inspection. Estimated 6 feet from property line.	

TREE INVENTORY SURVEY

KIELTY


Tree Tag Number	Protected Tree Status	Preservation or Removal Recommendation	Common Name / Botanical Name	Appraised Value	Trunk Diameter at Breast Height (DBH, inches)	Ten Times the Diameter in (ft.)	Tree Height (ft.) / Canopy Spread (ft.)	Overall Health Assessment	Structural Integrity Assessment	Form and Aesthetic Quality Assessment	Preservation Suitability Rating	Overall Condition Score (0-100%)	Arborist Observations and Tree Notes	Tree Picture #1
12*	Yes	(P)	redwood <i>Sequoia sempervirens</i>	\$14,500	30	26	80/20	Good	Good	Good	Good	70	Neighboring tree, limited visual inspection. Estimated 15 feet from property line.	
13*	Yes	(P)	redwood <i>Sequoia sempervirens</i>	\$20,000	45	36	80/30	Good	Poor	Fair	Fair	45	Neighboring tree, limited visual inspection. Codominant at 4 feet, smaller leader leans in towards property, 5 feet from property line, limited visual inspection. Recommend to have support cable installed. Discuss with owner.	
14	No	(R)	edible fig <i>Ficus carica</i>	N/A	4	3	10/10	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	50	Codominant at grade.	

* Indicates a tree located on an adjacent or neighboring property. Neighboring trees were observed visually from accessible vantage points only and were not physically tagged, measured, or inspected beyond the scope described in this report.

TREE MAP

Disclaimer: The tree inventory map provided by Kieilty Arborist Services LLC is for illustrative purposes only. Tree locations, inventory numbers, trunk diameters, and species depicted on this map are approximate and should not be relied upon for definitive planning or actions. Field verification is required to confirm all tree data prior to any site activity. Kieilty Arborist Services LLC is not responsible for the accuracy of the underlying topographic map and assumes no liability for any discrepancies or inaccuracies associated with it.

KIELTY
ARBORISTS SERVICES LLC



OBSERVATIONS

Site Conditions

The property is currently developed with a single-family residence, driveway, detached garage, and mixed tree species. Existing hardscape, foundations, and utilities have resulted in varying degrees of soil disturbance and compaction across the site. These conditions are expected to influence root distribution, particularly adjacent to existing structures and paved areas.

Species Composition:

- (3) Southern magnolia - *Magnolia grandiflora*
- camphor - *Camphora officinarum*
- (2) coast live oak - *Quercus agrifolia*
- saucer magnolia - *Magnolia x soulangeana*
- Japanese privet - *Ligustrum japonicum*
- Japanese maple - *Acer palmatum*
- (2) edible fig - *Ficus carica*
- (3) redwood - *Sequoia sempervirens*

General Tree Condition

Trees #3-6 and 8-12, and 14 were noted to be in fair to good overall condition and are considered suitable for retention with appropriate protection measures during construction. Several trees exhibit pre-existing stressors related to poor maintenance, prior site disturbance, or competition, which have been documented in the tree inventory and notes.

Trees in Poor Overall Condition

Trees #1, #2, #7, and #13 were observed to be in poor overall condition at the time of inspection due to factors such as reduced vigor, structural defects, or decline. These trees are identified in the Tree Inventory and discussed further where relevant to preservation feasibility and construction impacts. If any of these trees are to be retained, they should be irrigated to help improve the health during the dry season every other week with 25 gallons of water.

Construction Sensitivities

Tree #1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 14 located near existing and proposed improvements may be subject to root disturbance, soil compaction, or canopy conflicts if construction activities are not properly managed. These sensitivities are addressed through the recommended tree protection measures and construction methodologies outlined in this report.

TREES PROPOSED FOR REMOVAL

Trees Proposed For Removal (Permit Needed):

Trees #2, 8, 9, and 14 are proposed for removal.

Total Removed Trees	Significant / Protected Trees	Non-Protected Trees
4	1	3

Protected trees to be removed:



Southern magnolia #2 was assigned a poor condition rating due to the lean of the tree and its limited root structure. Minor deadwood is observed in the crown, the tree is suppressed by a neighboring camphor street tree, and as a result the main stem leans heavily into the property. Magnolia roots grow close to the surface in search of water and nutrients. In urban settings, the shallow, wide-spreading roots of the Southern magnolia are a known concern, as they frequently create tripping hazards for pedestrians and can cause considerable damage, including the lifting and cracking of sidewalks.

The proposed design places the planned construction of a new driveway cut directly adjacent to the tree. This particular area of the landscape is characterized by a significantly limited volume of viable soil, which restricts the tree's capacity for root growth and nutrient uptake.

The proposed construction activities will involve the demolition of existing concrete and substantial soil disturbance which is highly likely to inflict damage to the tree's limited root system. The removal of concrete will necessitate excavation that will cut structural and fine roots essential for the tree's stability and health. This excavation and compaction needed to build a driveway adjacent to the tree will reduce the air and water permeability of the soil, suffocating the remaining roots.

The combination of direct root damage, moisture stress, and reduced soil oxygen levels resulting from compaction and excavation is expected to cause a significant and irreversible decline in the tree's overall health and vigor. This stress will make the tree more susceptible to secondary pests and diseases. Given the extent of the necessary disturbance in an already compromised soil volume, the planned construction poses a severe, immediate threat, and could potentially lead to the complete mortality of the tree. Removal of the tree is recommended and aligns with criteria set forth by the City of Menlo Park.

3. *Tree health rating:*

Intolerance to adverse site conditions can include factors such as soil or water salinity, exposure to sun or wind, or increasingly high temperatures, or overcrowded growing conditions.

Table 4.1 of the Guide for Plant Appraisal, 10th Edition, or its successor manual, defines tree health as the following:

Excellent rating – High vigor and nearly perfect health with little or no twig dieback, discoloration, or defoliation.

Good rating – Vigor is normal for the species. No significant damage due to diseases or pests. Any twig dieback, defoliation, or discoloration is minor.

Fair rating – Reduced vigor. Damage due to insects or diseases may be significant and associated with defoliation but is not likely to be fatal. Twig dieback, defoliation, discoloration, and/or dead branches may comprise up to 50% of crown.

Poor rating – Unhealthy and declining in appearance. Poor vigor. Low foliage density and poor foliage color are present. Potentially fatal pest infestation. Extensive twig and/or branch dieback.

Very poor rating – Poor vigor. Appears to be dying and in the last stages of life. Little live foliage.

Non-Protected Trees to be Removed:

Japanese maple #8, and edible fig #9 and #14 were assigned fair condition ratings. Trees #8 and #9 are positioned near the existing home, while tree #14 is located at the rear of the lot between a wooden retaining wall and the property boundary. These trees exhibit several issues, including evidence of poor past maintenance, main stem codominance, and close proximity to existing structures and hardscape. The new home is proposed for construction directly where trees #8 and #9 are located on the landscape, while demolition and grading to the existing landscape is expected to take place in the area surrounding tree #14. Demolition of site features will cause root damage and soil compaction resulting in a decline in tree health and potential tree mortality.

The proposed demolition of existing site features poses a significant threat to surrounding trees. This work will inevitably cause root damage and considerable soil compaction, which, when combined, rapidly diminishes tree health. Indications of this damage include thinning foliage, branch dieback, and reduced vigor in the production of new shoots and leaves. While these stressors may not cause immediate death, they can ultimately lead to potential tree mortality, manifesting slowly over a period of years following the construction work.

Replacement Tree Plan For Magnolia Tree #2:

In reference to Section 13.24.090 (3) for decisions made under Criteria 1, 2, **3**, or 4, the monetary value of a replacement tree correlates with the size of the heritage tree trunk diameter (measured from 54 inches above grade). For every heritage tree proposed for removal, it must be replaced by the following replacement tree requirement:

Diameter of magnolia #2=16.1" Any heritage tree with a trunk diameter of greater than 15 inches to 20 inches has a minimum replacement tree requirement of one (1) #15 container. The monetary value is \$200.

PROJECT PLAN REVIEW

The following report's recommendations are contingent upon the contractor adhering to the stated responsibilities. It is the contractor's responsibility to contact the project arborist to schedule all required inspections promptly. Failure to schedule these inspections as needed may result in fines or stop work orders from the city.

Any heritage tree to be retained protected by the City's Municipal Code will require replacement according to its appraised value if it is damaged beyond repair by construction. The replacement of such a heritage tree is not discretionary; it is a required action. The value of the replacement is determined based on the appraised value of the damaged heritage tree. This policy underscores the importance of rigorous tree protection measures during construction to safeguard these valuable natural assets.

The findings in this report were based on a review of the preliminary site plan, *Site Plan A-1*, by Utopia Construction (no date listed), and the *Preliminary Boundary and Topographic Survey Map T-1* by SMP Engineers, dated September 15, 2025. A new home and driveway is proposed for construction on the site.

The proposed driveway work is more than 10x the diameter away from mongolia street tree #1 and no impacts are expected.

Demolition of existing driveway near street trees #1 and #4

The existing driveway near mongolia street trees #1 and #4 is recommended to be demolished by hand under the direct supervision of the project arborist. A jackhammer can be used to break the material down into small hand manageable sized pieces. All material shall then be removed by hand when within 10x the diameter of both trees (13' from #1 and 15' from #4) while retaining all encountered roots. Roots encountered during demolition shall remain undamaged as possible and be kept moist by covering/wrapping roots in layers of wetted down burlap. Once the driveway has been removed all exposed roots shall be covered in new top soil with the fill area being irrigated every other week during the dryseason. This will be of benefit for the trees as compaction from the hardscapes can be relieved providing a larger rootable area. During construction this area is recommended to be decompacted with the use of an air knife done by an arborist. No impacts are expected if done in this manner under the project arborist supervision.

Demolition of slab and existing garage near oak tree #10

A small concrete slab and garage are within 10x the diameter away from oak tree #10. All demolition equipment must stay outside the 10x diameter distance during demolition (27' from tree). A jackhammer can be used to break the slab material down into small hand manageable sized pieces. All material shall then be removed by hand when within 10x the diameter of oak tree #10 while retaining all encountered roots. Roots encountered during demolition shall remain undamaged as possible and be kept moist by covering/wrapping roots in layers of wetted down burlap. Once the slab has been removed, all exposed roots shall be covered in new top soil with the fill area being irrigated every other week during the dryseason. Demolition equipment during the removal of the garage and garage foundation shall be as far away from the tree as possible and positioned on the

existing driveway to not compacted existing soil within 10x the diameter of the tree. Any roots exposed during the foundation removal shall be protected by covering/wrapping roots in layers of wetted down burlap. Any exposed roots shall be covered with top soil as soon as possible and irrigated. This will be of benefit for the tree and no impacts are expected.

Patio construction: The patio is proposed for construction within the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ), defined as ten times the diameter at breast height (DBH) of a protected oak #10. Due to the sensitivity of the root zone in this area, special care must be taken to preserve root integrity, maintain soil health, and avoid compaction or changes to the moisture regime. The proposed patio is no closer towards the tree than the existing garage and impacts are expected to be non-existent as the garage has likely acted as a root barrier. All excavation for the patio when within 27' from the tree must be done by hand under the project arborist supervision. If roots are encountered measuring larger than 1.5" in diameter they will be documented and retained where possible.

Required Documentation

For compliance with Menlo Park city requirements, it is imperative to submit a tree protection verification letter ahead of the issuance of demolition and construction permits. This documentation, prepared by the project arborist, must include photographic evidence that corroborates the installation of tree protection measures, which must be consistent with both the city's standards and the suggestions provided in the arborist's report. Furthermore, the project arborist is responsible for performing regular construction monitoring and tree protection inspections at intervals of every four weeks. These inspection reports are to be submitted directly to the City Arborist for evaluation and record-keeping.

Development-related Work:

When development-related work necessitates supervision by a Project Arborist, it is essential that the arborist's report includes a comprehensive description of the recommended work plan and any mitigation treatments proposed. This report should detail the specific actions to be undertaken, the methodologies to be employed, and the rationale behind each recommendation, ensuring adherence to ISA guidelines and relevant city codes.

The work plan should encompass all necessary precautions and measures to protect trees within the construction zone, particularly those within 'ten times the diameter' of a tree, where activities are most impactful. This may include, but is not limited to, the use of specific hand tools such as shovels, air knives, and rotary hammers with clay spade attachments, as per the permitted range.

Furthermore, upon completion of the mitigation activities, the Project Arborist is obligated to provide a follow-up letter. This document serves as a formal attestation that all mitigation measures have been executed as per the specifications detailed in the report. This letter is a critical element, confirming that the protective actions and treatments have been applied correctly and effectively, thereby ensuring the integrity and health of the trees involved. It acts as a record of compliance and due diligence in the tree protection process during the construction project.

Pre And Post-Construction Care:

If the project is approved, a comprehensive soil test is recommended to assess and address any nutrient deficiencies for trees where construction is to be located within the tree protection zones. The soil test shall take place before the start of construction.

Pre-Construction Care:

In the pre-construction phase, it is critical to prepare the trees for the upcoming stress and disturbances. Implementing a deep watering schedule is foundational, ensuring trees receive adequate moisture deep within their root zones. Depending on the recommended soil test analysis, fertilizing may be needed. Within the tree protection zones, it is recommended that an inline drip emitter system be installed in a grid-like manner to provide deep irrigation during the dry season. The irrigation system should be placed on top of the existing grade and require no excavation. The irrigation system shall be turned on by the project arborist as seen fit during the required monthly inspections. Regardless of the soil test results, the use of NutriRoot is still strongly advisable for trees that will be impacted by construction activities. The stresses caused by construction, such as root disturbance, soil compaction, and changes in water availability, can severely affect a tree's health. NutriRoot provides essential nutrients, promotes root growth, and enhances water management, helping trees withstand and recover from these stresses. Importantly, NutriRoot is low in macronutrients, which means it should not cause issues associated with over-fertilization, such as nutrient runoff or root burn. This makes it a safe and effective option for supporting the resilience and vitality of trees during and after construction, ensuring their long-term health and stability.

Post-Construction Care:

Following the completion of construction activities, it's vital to continue supporting the trees' recovery and growth. Annual inspections by a Certified Arborist are recommended to ensure the tree remains in good health. Maintaining the deep watering schedule will ensure that trees remain adequately hydrated. After the first year, the oak tree(s) should be deep-watered during the months of May and September to combat drought stresses. A post-construction application of NutriRoot is advised to sustain soil moisture control and support ongoing root health. It is also pertinent to reintroduce microbial inoculants to restore beneficial microbial communities that may have been disrupted during construction. Additional applications of soil amendments like Biochar and HydraHume will continue to enhance soil structure, fertility, and water-holding capacity, supporting the trees' long-term health and resilience. Employing air spading techniques can also be advantageous to aerate the soil and gently introduce these amendments without causing root damage.


By adopting this dual-phase approach (pre- and post-construction), leveraging a combination of deep watering, nutritional support, and soil health enhancement, the strategy aims to not only protect the trees during construction but also promote their recovery and thriving in the post-construction landscape. This holistic care plan underscores a commitment to sustainable tree management, ensuring that the trees remain a valuable and vibrant part of the ecosystem for years to come.

TREE PROTECTION PLAN

Detailed Tree Protection Plan:

For the aforementioned tree protection plan, this detailed guide has been designed by Kielty Arborists Services LLC. The following section offers an in-depth perspective on the recommended tree preservation guidelines. The aim is to ensure the conservation, vitality, and beauty of trees during construction and developmental endeavors, mitigating any potential detrimental effects. Adherence to these guidelines is essential to uphold both the ecological significance and visual allure of trees within the designated project vicinity. Effective tree protection during construction or development projects requires the use of fencing to demarcate and protect sensitive areas around trees. Should you have any questions or require further clarification, please contact Kielty Arborists Services directly.

Disclaimer: The tree inventory map provided by Kieley Arborist Services LLC is for illustrative purposes only. Tree locations, inventory numbers, trunk diameters, and species depicted on this map are approximate and should not be relied upon for definitive planning or actions. Field verification is required to confirm all tree data prior to any site activity. Kieley Arborist Services LLC is not responsible for the accuracy of the underlying topographic map and assumes no liability for any discrepancies or inaccuracies associated with it.



TREE PROTECTION MAP

Fencing Specifications:

The tree protection fencing should be established and maintained throughout the entire length of the project. It's essential that no equipment, materials, or debris are stored or cleaned inside these protection zones. The zones should remain free from human activity unless explicitly authorized. The choice of fencing type depends on the tree's location and the nature of the surrounding environment and Posted with signs saying "TREE PROTECTION FENCE – DO NOT MOVE OR REMOVE WITHOUT APPROVAL FROM CITY ARBORIST"



WARNING: TREE PROTECTION AREA

ONLY AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL MAY ENTER THIS AREA

No excavation, trenching, material storage, cleaning, equipment access, or dumping is allowed behind this fence.

Do not remove or relocate this fence without approval from the project arborist. This fencing Must remain in its approved location throughout demolition and construction.

Project Arborist contact information:

KIELTY
ARBORISTS SERVICES LLC

David Beckham
650-532-4418

City Arborist contact information:

Jillian Keller
Menlo Park City Arborist
650-330-6793



ADVERTENCIA: ÁREA DE PROTECCIÓN DE ÁRBOLES

SOLO PERSONA AUTORIZADO PUEDE ENTRAR EN ESTA ÁREA

No se permite la excavación, zanjeo, almacenamiento de materiales, limpieza, acceso de equipos o vertido detrás de este cerco.

No quite ni reubique este cerco sin la aprobación del arborista del proyecto. El cerco debe permanecer en su ubicación aprobada durante la demolición y construcción.

Información de contacto del Arborista del Proyecto:

KIELTY
ARBORISTS SERVICES LLC
David Beckham
650-532-4418

Información de contacto del Arborista de la Ciudad:

Jillian Keller
Arborista de la Ciudad de Menlo Park
650-330-6793


Type I Tree Protection:

Description: This is the most comprehensive form of tree protection fencing. It encompasses the full canopy dripline or Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) of trees designated for preservation.

Application: Typically used in areas where trees are a significant distance away from construction activity or when trees have a large canopy spread.

Specifications:

The fencing shall remain intact throughout the duration of the project or until activities within the TPZ are finalized. Tree protection fencing should be a 6-foot-tall metal chain link type supported by 2-inch-thick diameter metal posts pounded into the ground to a depth of no less than 2 feet, ensuring stability even in challenging conditions. Poles should be spaced no more than 10 feet apart from center to center, providing a consistent and strong barrier. For trees near existing hardscape or structures, tree protection fencing shall be placed as close as possible while still allowing access. Sensitive areas may require a landscape barrier if fencing needs to be reduced for access reasons. The location for tree protection fencing for the protected trees on site should be placed at 10x the tree diameters, where possible (TPZ). All other non-protected trees are recommended to be protected by fencing placed at the drip line. No equipment or materials should be stored or cleaned inside protection zones. Apply mulch to the tree protection zones at a depth of 3 inches. Spread the mulch evenly throughout the designated area, ensuring it extends to, but does not touch, the tree trunk. Keep the mulch at least 3 to 4 inches away from the base of the trunk to prevent moisture buildup and potential rot. This will provide the necessary benefits of mulching, such as moisture retention and temperature regulation, while helping to maintain tree health. Signs should be placed on fencing signifying "Tree Protection Zone - Keep Out". If fencing needs to be reduced for access or any other reasons, the non-protected areas must be protected by a landscape buffer. All tree protection and inspection schedule measures, design recommendations, watering, and construction schedules shall be implemented in full by the owner and contractor. Tree #10 is required to be protected by Type I Tree Protection Fencing.



Type II Tree Protection:


Description: This fencing type is specifically designed for trees located within narrow planting strips generally between a sidewalk and street.

Application: It is best suited for urban areas where trees are sandwiched between sidewalks and roads, allowing pedestrian and vehicular movement while protecting the tree.

Specifications: The fencing specifications shall be identical to those of Type I in terms of the material used and installation method. The 6-foot-tall metal chain link fence should be installed in a way that completely encloses the planting strip between the sidewalk and street when within the TPZ. This will keep the sidewalk and street open for public use. Tree #1 is required to be protected by Type II Tree Protection Fencing.

Landscape Barrier Zone

If for any reason a smaller tree protection zone is needed for access, a landscape buffer should be used, composed of wood chips layered to a depth of six inches, complemented by plywood atop the wood chips where tree protection fencing would typically be situated. The plywood should be $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch thick for maximal durability and efficacy. This landscape buffer plays a crucial role in mitigating soil compaction within the tree's vulnerable root zone. For optimum stability, it is advisable to securely join the plywood boards, thus preventing any unwanted shifts in the plywood or underlying wood chips.



Landscape Barrier Zone

Staging:

All tree protection measures must be in place before the start of construction. An inspection prior to the start of construction is often required by the city. All vehicles must remain on paved surfaces if possible. Existing pavement should remain and should be used for staging. If vehicles are to stray from paved surfaces, 6 inches of chips shall be spread, and plywood laid over the mulch layer. This type of landscape buffer will help reduce the compaction of desired trees. Parking will not be allowed off the paved surfaces.

Root Cutting:

If for any reason roots are to be cut, the work shall be monitored and documented. Large roots (over 2 inches in diameter) or large masses of roots to be cut must be inspected by the site arborist. The site arborist, at this time, may recommend irrigation or fertilization of the root zone. All roots needing to be cut should be cut clean with a saw or lopper. Roots to be left exposed for a period of time should be covered with layers of burlap and kept moist.

Trenching/excavation:

Trenching or excavation for irrigation, drainage, electrical, foundation, or any other reason shall be done by hand when inside the dripline of a protected tree. Hand digging and the careful placement of pipes below or besides protected roots will significantly reduce root loss, thus reducing trauma to the tree. All trenches shall be backfilled with native materials and compacted to near their original level, as soon as possible. Trenches to be left open for a period of time (24 hours), will require the covering of all exposed roots with burlap and be kept moist. The trenches will also need to be covered with plywood to help protect the exposed roots.

Grading :

All existing grades underneath the dripline of a protected tree shall remain as is where possible. Grading within the dripline of a protected tree is required to be done under the supervision of the project arborist.

Irrigation:

Non native trees- Irrigating the retained mature trees in the landscape is important to ensure their health and vitality. Proper watering can help the trees continue to thrive. Deep irrigation is recommended to take place every other week during the dry season. During the dry season, trees typically need deep, infrequent watering. Watering every 2 weeks is sufficient for the retained trees on this site. Applying water slowly and consistently until it penetrates at least 12-18 inches into the soil is recommended. Avoid spraying water directly on the trunks, as this can lead to disease and decay. Mulch is recommended to be maintained with mulch added over time, as needed. Mulch helps retain soil moisture, regulates temperature, and prevents weeds, which can compete with the tree for water. The use of soaker hoses or an inline drip emitter system set up in a grid like manner to provide deep irrigation during the dry season is recommended. The irrigation system should be placed on top of grade and require no excavation. This will help to keep the trees healthy.

Native oak trees- Native oak trees are recommended to only be irrigated during the months of May and September or if their root zones are traumatized. Frequent irrigation during dry summer months can significantly raise the risk of oak trees developing oak root fungus disease and is the leading cause of oak tree death and failure in the urban landscape.

Tree Pruning:

Tree pruning during construction is not just about aesthetics and safety; it's also about adhering to best practices and standards set by professional bodies like the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) and the American National Standards Institute (ANSI A300 Pruning Standards) . The ISA sets rigorous standards to ensure trees are cared for sustainably and scientifically. Under these guidelines, and for the well-being of trees during construction, it's imperative to have an expert arborist oversee any pruning. Their knowledge guarantees that only the necessary branches are removed, ensuring both safety and tree health. The guideline to prune no more than 25% of the tree's total foliage is grounded in sound arboricultural practices. This safeguards the tree's photosynthetic capability, reduces undue stress, and preserves the balance between its roots and canopy. Homeowners should be aware of these standards and ensure they are being met, trusting in the expertise of their arborist and keeping open communication about their tree care decisions. This approach not only ensures the tree's compatibility with new construction aesthetics but also its long-term health and vitality.

Roots and Foundations:

Recognize that tree roots typically do not grow under existing houses or buildings due to compacted soil and limited moisture availability during foundation installation. Ensure that foundations are correctly installed to minimize the risk of tree root intrusion. Avoid situations where trees are planted too close to existing or planned structures, as this can result in potential conflicts between roots and foundations. If tree roots are in direct contact with a foundation, consult with a certified arborist to assess the situation and recommend appropriate measures to protect both the tree and the structure.

Traffic Within TPZs:

Strictly prohibit driving vehicles or heavy foot traffic on bare soil within the TPZs of protected trees. Such activities can crush roots directly and compact the soil, impeding oxygen and water infiltration. In areas without existing pavement, use temporary anti-compaction materials, such as wood chips covered with plywood, to prevent damage to tree roots (landscape barrier). Temporary pathways or boardwalks can be constructed to facilitate access while minimizing soil compaction within the TPZ.

Chemical and Material Handling:

Store chemicals and construction materials away from TPZs to prevent accidental spills or exposure that may harm tree health. Follow proper handling and disposal procedures for chemicals to ensure compliance with environmental regulations. Minimize the use of toxic materials near trees and opt for environmentally friendly alternatives whenever possible.

Monitoring and Inspection:

Regularly monitor and inspect the tree protection measures throughout the construction process to ensure their effectiveness and compliance with the Tree Preservation Plan. Assign a qualified individual, such as a project arborist or certified arborist, to conduct periodic inspections and provide recommendations for any necessary adjustments or improvements. Maintain detailed records of inspections, including dates, findings, and any actions taken.

Post-Construction Maintenance:

After construction is completed, continue monitoring the health and condition of preserved trees to address any potential issues promptly. Implement post-construction maintenance practices such as watering, mulching, pruning, and fertilization as needed to support the recovery and long-term health of the trees. Regularly assess the trees for signs of stress, disease, or structural instability and take appropriate measures, including consulting with a certified arborist if necessary.

Compliance with Environmental Laws:

Ensure full compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal environmental laws, regulations, and permit requirements pertaining to tree protection during construction. Familiarize yourself with specific regulations regarding tree preservation in your jurisdiction and consult with local authorities or arborists for guidance if needed.

Responsibility:

Designate a responsible person or team within the project organization to oversee the implementation and enforcement of the Tree Preservation Plan. Clearly communicate the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in the construction project regarding tree protection.

Emergency Procedures:

Develop clear procedures to follow in the event of emergencies that may impact tree preservation, such as severe storms, accidents, or unexpected tree health issues. Ensure that emergency response plans address prompt actions to mitigate potential risks to trees and contact qualified professionals, such as arborists or tree care companies when needed.

Communication and Training:

Facilitate effective communication among all project stakeholders, including contractors, subcontractors, architects, engineers, and landscape professionals, regarding the importance of tree preservation and the specific guidelines to follow. Conduct training sessions or workshops to educate personnel.

PURPOSE & USE OF THE REPORT

This report has been prepared to inform tree management decisions associated with the proposed construction project and to provide professional recommendations intended to maximize the survival and long-term viability of retained trees. The report is based on conditions observed at the time of inspection and on the construction plans provided and reviewed as part of this assignment. It is intended to serve as a technical resource for the project owner, design professionals, contractors, and reviewing agencies to facilitate informed discussion, coordination, and implementation of tree protection measures consistent with applicable municipal requirements.

The findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained in this report are specific to the subject property, the proposed project as described, and the scope of work defined herein. This report is not intended to be relied upon for purposes other than tree protection planning, construction coordination, and permit review. It does not constitute a tree risk assessment, guarantee of tree performance, or prediction of future tree condition, nor does it establish legal responsibility for tree outcomes beyond the scope of the recommended measures.

This report may be submitted to the applicable jurisdiction as part of a development or permit application; however, use of this report by third parties without written authorization from KIELTY Arborists Services LLC is not permitted. Any modifications to the project design, construction methods, or site conditions occurring after the date of inspection may invalidate the conclusions and recommendations contained herein and may require supplemental evaluation.

Tree conditions are dynamic and may change due to construction activity, environmental factors, maintenance practices, or other influences beyond the control of the arborist. Implementation of the recommendations in this report does not ensure tree survival, but reflects accepted arboricultural practices intended to reduce potential impacts within a construction environment.

TESTING & ANALYSIS

Tree evaluation was conducted using a ground-based visual assessment and standard arboricultural field methods appropriate for inventory and tree protection planning. Where trunks were accessible, trunk diameters were measured at the required height using a diameter tape. Where access was limited due to site constraints, existing structures, or vegetation, trunk diameters were visually estimated based on observable conditions and professional judgment. Trees meeting or exceeding the diameter thresholds defined by applicable city or county ordinance were included in the inventory.

Tree health evaluations were based on visible indicators observed at the time of inspection, including canopy density, vigor, presence of dieback, and signs of stress or decline. These observations were interpreted using accepted arboricultural principles and professional experience with the species present. Evaluations were qualitative in nature and intended to support planning, preservation feasibility, and construction impact analysis rather than detailed diagnostic or laboratory-based assessment.

Tree locations were documented using the site map provided for the project and were used to generate the tree inventory exhibits included in this report. Where trees were not shown on the provided site map, their locations were added based on field observations and estimated placement relative to visible site features. Tree locations shown on these exhibits are approximate and are intended for general reference and planning purposes only and may not represent survey grade precision.

TREE WORK STANDARDS AND QUALIFICATIONS

To ensure high-quality tree work, including removal, pruning, and planting, the following standards and qualifications will be adhered to:

Industry Standards:

All tree work will be performed in accordance with industry standards established by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA). These standards encompass best practices and guidelines for tree care and maintenance.

Contractor Licensing and Insurance:

The contractor undertaking the tree work must possess a valid State of California Contractors License for Tree Service (C61-D49) or Landscaping (C-27). Additionally, they must have comprehensive general liability, worker's compensation, and commercial auto/equipment insurance coverage.

Workmanship Standards:

Contractors must adhere to the current Best Management Practices of the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) and the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). These standards, including ANSI A300 and Z133.1, outline guidelines for tree pruning, fertilization, and safety. Compliance with these standards ensures the use of proper techniques and practices throughout the tree work process.

By adhering to these established standards and qualifications, we can ensure the provision of professional and safe tree services that meet the industry's best practices and promote the health and longevity of the trees.

SCHEDULE OF INSPECTIONS

Kielty Arborists Services LLC provides construction-related tree inspections when requested and scheduled in accordance with project needs and applicable city or county requirements. Inspections described below represent typical phases of construction where arborist involvement is commonly required; however, the responsibility to request, schedule, and coordinate required inspections rests with the property owner and/or the contractor. Kielty Arborists Services LLC may or may not have direct contractual relationship or prior communication with the contractor at the time this report is prepared. Failure by the owner or contractor to schedule required inspections may result in non-compliance with municipal conditions and is outside the control and responsibility of the arborist.

Pre-Equipment Mobilization, Delivery of Materials, Tree Removal, and Site Work:

When scheduled, the project arborist will meet with the general contractor and owner to review approved tree protection measures. This inspection may include identification and verification of tree protection zone fencing locations, review of equipment access routes and material staging areas, and evaluation of existing tree conditions to determine whether additional protective measures are warranted prior to commencement of site work.

Inspection Following Installation of Tree Protection Fencing:

Upon notification that tree protection fencing has been installed, the project arborist will inspect the site to verify that fencing and signage are consistent with the approved Tree Protection Plan. Contractor requests for access within tree protection zones, if any, will be reviewed at that time, and visible changes in tree condition since the previous inspection will be documented.

Inspection During Excavation or Work Affecting Protected Trees:

Where construction activities occur within or adjacent to designated tree protection zones, inspections may be performed when scheduled to observe work methods, document compliance with recommended protection measures, and evaluate observable changes in tree condition relative to prior inspections.

Final Site Inspection:

When requested prior to project completion, a final inspection may be conducted to evaluate the condition of retained trees and verify compliance with approved tree protection measures. Where required by the City of Menlo Park, a summary letter documenting observations at the time of final inspection may be provided.

All inspections are limited to conditions observed at the time of each site visit. Kielty Arborists Services LLC is not responsible for construction activities occurring outside of scheduled inspections, nor for failure by the owner or contractor to request or comply with required inspections mandated by the approving jurisdiction.

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS

Legal Descriptions and Titles:

The consultant/arborist assumes the accuracy of any legal description and titles provided. No responsibility is assumed for any legal due diligence. The consultant/arborist shall not be held liable for any discrepancies or issues arising from incorrect legal descriptions or faulty titles.

Compliance with Laws and Regulations:

The property is assumed to be in compliance with all applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or other government regulations. The consultant/arborist is not responsible for identifying or rectifying any non-compliance.

Reliability of Information:

Though diligent efforts have been made to obtain and verify information, the consultant/arborist is not responsible for inaccuracies or incomplete data provided by external sources. The client accepts full responsibility for any decisions or actions taken based on this data.

Testimony or Court Attendance:

The consultant/arborist has no obligation to provide testimony or attend court regarding this report unless mutually agreed upon through separate written agreements, which may incur additional fees.

Report Integrity:

Unauthorized alteration, loss, or reproduction of this report renders it invalid. The consultant/arborist shall not be liable for any interpretations or conclusions made from altered reports.

Restricted Publication and Use:

This report is exclusively for the use of the original client. Any other use or dissemination, without prior written consent from the consultant/arborist, is strictly prohibited.

Non-disclosure to Public Media:

The client is prohibited from using any content of this report, including the consultant/arborist's identity, in any public communication without prior written consent.

Opinion-based Report:

The report represents the independent, professional judgment of the consultant/arborist. The fee is not contingent upon any predetermined outcomes, values, or events.

Visual Aids Limitation:

Visual aids are for illustrative purposes and should not be considered precise representations. They are not substitutes for formal engineering, architectural, or survey reports.

Inspection Limitations:

The consultant/arborist's inspection is limited to visible and accessible components. Non-invasive methods are used. There is no warranty or guarantee that problems will not develop in the future.

ARBORIST DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Arborists specialize in the assessment and care of trees using their education, knowledge, training, and experience.

Limitations of Tree Assessment:

Arborists cannot guarantee the detection of all conditions that could compromise a tree's structure or health. The consultant/arborist makes no warranties regarding the future condition of trees and shall not be liable for any incidents or damages resulting from tree failures.

Remedial Treatments Uncertainty:

Remedial treatments for trees have variable outcomes and cannot be guaranteed.

Considerations Beyond Scope:

The consultant/arborist's services are confined to tree assessment and care. The client assumes responsibility for matters involving property boundaries, ownership, disputes, and other non-arboricultural considerations.

Inherent Risks:

Living near trees inherently involves risks. The consultant/arborist is not responsible for any incidents or damages arising from such risks.

Client's Responsibility:

The client is responsible for considering the information and recommendations provided by the consultant/arborist and for any decisions made or actions taken.

The client acknowledges and accepts these Assumptions and Limiting Conditions and Arborist Disclosure Statement, recognizing that reliance upon this report is at their own risk. The consultant/arborist disclaims all warranties, express or implied.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that all the statements of fact in this report are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and are made in good faith.

David Beckham

Signature of Consultant

David Beckham

Certified Arborist


WE#10724A TRAQ Qualified

January 16, 2026



LOCATION: 253 Yale Road	PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2025-00052	APPLICANT: Babak Homayouni	OWNER: Ahmad Hokmabadi
PROJECT CONDITIONS: 1. The use permit shall be subject to the following standard conditions: a. The applicant shall be required to apply for a building permit within one year from the date of approval (by September 28, 2027) for the use permit to remain in effect. b. Development of the project shall be substantially in conformance with the plans prepared by Utopia Construction consisting of 27 plan sheets, dated received September 22, 2026, and approved by the Planning Commission on September 28, 2026, except as modified by the conditions contained herein, subject to review and approval of the Planning Division. c. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all Sanitary District, Menlo Park Fire Protection District, and utility companies' regulations that are directly applicable to the project. d. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall comply with all requirements of the Building Division, Engineering Division, and Transportation Division that are directly applicable to the project. e. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a plan for any new utility installations or upgrades for review and approval by the Planning, Engineering and Building Divisions. All utility equipment that is installed outside of a building and that cannot be placed underground shall be properly screened by landscaping. The plan shall show exact locations of all meters, back flow prevention devices, transformers, junction boxes, relay boxes, and other equipment boxes. f. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit plans indicating that the applicant shall remove and replace any damaged and significantly worn sections of frontage improvements. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval of the Engineering Division. g. Simultaneous with the submittal of a complete building permit application, the applicant shall submit a Grading and Drainage Plan for review and approval of the Engineering Division. The Grading and Drainage Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of grading, demolition or building permits. h. Heritage trees in the vicinity of the construction project shall be protected pursuant to the Heritage Tree Ordinance and the arborist report prepared by Kielty Arborist Services, LLC dated January 16, 2026. i. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall pay all fees incurred through staff time spent reviewing the application. j. The applicant or permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Menlo Park or its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the City of Menlo Park or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul an approval of the Planning Commission, City Council, Community Development Director, or any other department, committee, or agency of the City concerning a development, variance, permit, or land use approval which action is brought within the time period provided for in any applicable statute; provided, however, that the applicant's or permittee's duty to so defend, indemnify, and hold harmless shall be subject to the City's promptly notifying the applicant or permittee of any said claim, action, or proceeding and the City's full cooperation in the applicant's or permittee's defense of said claims, actions, or proceedings.			

LOCATION: 253 Yale Road	PROJECT NUMBER: PLN2025-00052	APPLICANT: Babak Homayouni	OWNER: Ahmad Hokmabadi
PROJECT CONDITIONS: k. Notice of Fees Protest – The applicant may protest any fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions imposed by the City as part of the approval or as a condition of approval of this development. Per California Government Code 66020, this 90-day protest period has begun as of the date of the approval of this application. 2. The use permit shall be subject to the following project-specific conditions: a. Upon the submission of a comprehensive building permit application, the applicant shall submit revised plans that encompass the removal and replacement of the sidewalk, curb and gutter along the entire project frontage, subject to review and approval by the Engineering Division.			



City of Menlo Park
Location Map
253 Yale Road



Scale: 1:4,000

Drawn By: BJT

Checked By: CDS

Date: 9/28/2026

Sheet: 1

253 Yale – Attachment C: Data Table

	PROPOSED PROJECT	EXISTING PROJECT	ZONING ORDINANCE
Lot area	7,499.9 sf	7,499.9 sf	7,000.0 sf min.
Lot width	50.0 ft.	50.0 ft.	65.0 ft. min.
Lot depth	150.0 ft.	150.0 ft.	100.0 ft. min.
Setbacks			
Front	25.0 ft. (Main House) 30.8 ft. (ADU)	30.2 ft.	20.0 ft. min.
Rear	42.2 ft. (Main House) 75.7 ft. (ADU)	61.75 ft.	20.0 ft. min. 4.0 ft. min.
Side (left)	9.0 ft. (Main House) 4.0 ft. (ADU)	10.8 ft.	5.0 ft. min. 4.0 ft. min.
Side (right)	6.0 ft. (Main House) 27.0 ft. (ADU)	3.9 ft.	5.0 ft. min. 4.0 ft. min.
Building coverage	2,783.6 sf* 37.1 %	2,069.0 sf 27.6 %	2625.0 sf max. 35.0 % max.
FAL (Floor Area Limit)	3,711.7 sf** 49.5 %	2,069.0 sf 27.6 %	2,925.0 sf max. 39.0 % max.
Square footage by floor	1,269.7 sf/1 st main home 798.7 sf/1 st ADU 1,368.2 sf/2 nd main home 275.2 sf/garage	1,700.0 sf/1st 369.0 sf/detached garage	
Square footage of buildings	3,711.8 sf	2,069.0 sf	
Building height	25.8 ft.	18.7 ft.	28.0 ft. max.
Parking	1 covered/1 uncovered	2 covered	1 covered/1 uncovered per unit
Note: Areas shown highlighted indicate a nonconforming or substandard situation.			

Trees	Heritage trees	8***	Non-Heritage trees	6	New Trees	1
	Heritage trees proposed for removal	1	Non-Heritage trees proposed for removal	3	Total Number of Trees	11****

* Includes the ADU, which is permitted to exceed the building coverage.

**Includes the ADU, which is permitted to exceed the FAL.

*** The eight heritage trees comprise four street trees, three trees on neighboring properties, and one tree on-site.

**** This number includes the 36-inch box Autumn Gold ginkgo in the front yard.