

October 28, 2025

Erin Walters
Community Development Department
110 E. Main Street
Los Gatos, CA 95030



Monarch Consulting Arborists

Richard Gessner
P.O. Box 1010 - Felton, CA 95018
1 831 331 8982
www.monarcharborists.com

I have reviewed the plans, most recently revised report, and response to prior comments. Enclosed are the most recent responses and history of comments. At this time I have no further comments on the report provided.

MEMORANDUM



| | | | |
|-----------------|--|-----------------|------------|
| To: | Richard Gessner | Date: | 10/20/2025 |
| From: | HMH | Job No.: | 4185.10 |
| Subject: | Response to 4 th round Surrey Farms Consulting Arborist Review Letter | | |

October 14, 2025 Review

August 19, 2025

Erin Walters
Community Development Department
110 E. Main Street
Los Gatos, CA 95030



Monarch Consulting Arborists

Richard Gessner
P.O. Box 1010 - Felton, CA 95018
1 831 331 8982
www.monarcharborists.com

This letter is in response to the latest submission for 178 Twin Oaks Drive (Surrey Farms) dated July 25, 2025. Enclosed is the prior response and the applicant's response to that submission. Enclosed are the most recent peer review comments and recommendations.

Please see HMH Landscape October responses in GREEN below.



MEMORANDUM



1. **Comment: Lot 3:** Lot 3 has a retaining wall around the site and along the property boundary adjacent to 221 Brook Acres Drive. There are two large trees, one valley oak (*Quercus lobata*) and one coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) located on 221 Brook Acres Drive not accounted for in the plans, survey, or tree detail. Trees within 30 feet of the property boundary are to be included in survey and arborist's report. There are many trees "off site" included in the report but these are not.

- A. **Recommendation:** Tree protection for these two boundary trees is required. An adjustment to the wall location may be required as both trees are at or very close to the property boundary (Image 1). Include trees within 30 feet of the property in the plans and report.



IMAGE 1: ADJACENT OAKS 221 BROOK ACRES

- B. **Recommendation:** Work performed within the drip line or twenty feet (20') of the trunks requires monitoring and documentation from the project arborist. Any work performed to the trees requires specifications in writing according to the most recent ANSI A300 document pertaining to the activity (Pruning, Soil Management etc.)



MEMORANDUM

HMH Response: Trees mentioned in comment are located within project boundary and called out in report and tagged for removal under numbers 566 and 569.

MCA: This item is currently unresolved. Ground observations of the tree locations do not appear to match what is indicated on the plans versus what is observed on site.

Recommendation: Please accurately locate the trees or verify their location accuracy. Please provide methodology used to obtain tree locations for the site. For example “the trees were surveyed by a California licensed engineer” or “trees were located with a GPS receiver with an error of “X” feet and plotted on a plan or aerial map”.

HMH October Response: Please see the updated Landscape T-Sheets for lot 3 and the “Overall” for updated tree 566 and 569 tree locations. The 2 trees are now listed to remain and protect. This information is reflected in the updated Arborist report as well.

McClintock Landscape Horticultural Services used GPS to obtain the original tree locations as well as 3 specific known bench markers/monuments. All tree data for the Los Gatos project were gathered with iPads and iPhones running the ArborPro Software suite, enabling efficient real-time data entry and mapping. Each tree location was plotted directly onto the project's base map using integrated GPS functionality accurate within 1 meter. The location accuracy can change dramatically based on which base map is used, GPS location accuracy, and the quality of the base map image.

HMH's licensed Survey team directed Michael's team to use the 3 known benchmarks based on existing data per HMH's survey work located adjacent to the site, specifically at the cul-de-sac of Longmeadow Drive close to the project. The coordinates provided by Michael's team were inputted by the HMH survey team based on the 3 known benchmarks.

In some cases under heavy canopy coverage GPS coordinates can be offset by approximately 3 to 6 meters, which may explain any perceived discrepancies in this particular location. While such variance is a known limitation of GPS data collection, it has not previously presented an issue in past inventories to Michael Gladden's knowledge. Ariel views and data do reflect localized heavy canopy coverage in this portion of the site. We do believe that the discrepancy in the location of trees #566 and #569 are anomalies. Checks were performed, shifting the trees globally to observe alignment, which yielded results supporting the anomaly related to trees #566 and #569.



MEMORANDUM

2. **Comment: Plan Sheet and Report Discrepancies:** There are few discrepancies between the report disposition table and the plan sheets. The following need to be consistent:

Tree #191 is labeled as “remove” in the report and “save” in the plan sheet.

Trees #192, #195, #199, #202, and #585 are all labeled as “save” in the report and “remove” in the plan sheets.

- A. **Recommendation:** Revise the plans and/or report to be consistent throughout the documents.

2. **HMH Response:** Trees on planning sheets have been updated to match the arborist report and landscape plans- Tree #191 as remove, Trees #192, #195, #199, #202, and #585 are all labeled as “save”.

MCA: Accepted

3. **Comment: Dead Trees marked for retention:** Trees #393, #303, #353, #356, #358, #361, #370, #373, #376, #378, #379, #645, #640, #641, and #647 are labeled as to be in “Dead” condition but are listed as “Save” trees. It is possible to retain these dead trees for various reasons including wildlife habitat, if they don’t pose an unreasonable risk to life or property.

- A. **Recommendation:** Indicate and revise the plans and report to be consistent if changes are made to the disposition of these trees. If they are to be retained provide a Level 2: Basic Tree Risk Assessment to ensure public safety.

3. **HMH Response:** Trees listed above are updated to be removed, planning, landscape sheets and arborist report reflect these updates.

MCA: Accepted



MEMORANDUM

4. **Comment: Number Count Summary:** The inventory sheet and report contains 677 rows of data and the report summarizes twenty-nine (29) species. The summary in the report is incorrect or indicates incorrect counts. The report does not summarize the relevant tree data.

52 trees are listed as "Off Site".

37 trees are "Exempt" but only 11 are listed as "Exempt". There are an additional 26 that should be labeled "Exempt", which are primarily plums, olives, almonds, and one English walnut.

4 spaces are labeled "not used"

7 "stumps" are recorded.

31 "dead" trees are recorded.

The inventory implies twenty-nine (29) species, but there are really twenty-six (26).

Twenty-two (22) of the twenty-six (26) are "Protected" by the ordinance when you remove the four "Exempt" species.

- A. **Recommendation:** Correct the species summary in the report to reflect 26 overall and 22 "Protected". Include all plums, olives, English walnut, and almonds less than 18 inches in diameter as "Exempt" in the table per the Town Ordinance.

HMH Response: Arborist report "Tree Summary" has been updated to correctly reflect noted quantities above.

MCA: "Summary of Findings" on page 9 of the report has not been updated and still contains erroneous data including quantity of trees and quantity of species. There is no summary of tree "Protected", "Large Protected", "Exempt". This section of the report has not been updated.

Recommendation: Update the report page 9 to provide the correct data including a summary of trees to be removed and retained along with what has been expressed and provided above in comment 4.

HMH October Response: Please see the updated Arborist report on page 9 with the requested information, including the categories listed in item 4 above.

4. **Comment: Mitigation:** The replacement trees indicated are 582. It is not clear where this number was derived from. The table at the end of the report indicates 551 replacements are required, eighty-five (85) total replacements are to be installed per the Landscape Plans, and the remaining 466 will still required mitigation. A total of 223 trees are indicated for removal.

HMH Response: 582 trees are not currently indicated on the landscape plans. A total of 551 replacements are calculated in the on-site tree mitigation table in the overall mitigation and protection plan landscape sheets.



MEMORANDUM

MCA: How many trees are indicated for removal and how many calculated replacements are required? How many replacements are shown on the plans?

HMH October Response: Listed on the "Overall" Landscape Plan T-Sheets ("Tree Mitigation Summary Table") and the updated Arborist report: 224 Trees are to be removed. 85 trees are proposed (40-24" box, 45-36" box). Required Trees: 439-24" box, 161-36" box.

5. **Recommendation:** See recommendations in comment 8 and be consistent with the report and plan sheets for replacement trees.
6. **Formatting:** The arborist report states the correct date of "Revision 3" on the title page. However, there are artifact dates of November 23, 2024, December 15, 2024 scattered throughout, and then no header, footer, dates or page numbers for the new appraisal data sheets and included T sheets in the report.
- A. **Recommendation:** Upon next update revise headers, footers, page numbers, and dates for clarity.

HMH Response: Arborist report reflects latest date for headers, footers, and page numbers.

MCA: Accepted

6. **Comment:** All Landscape Plans need to be updated to include tree identification number locations within the plans.
- A. **Recommendation:** Update landscape plans accordingly to reflect tree location/ID numbers.

HMH Response: Landscape plan sheets now have updated existing protected tree ID locations per request.

MCA: Accepted

7. **Comment:** Include the following summaries in the arborist's report:
 - A. **Recommendation:** Include the total quantity of trees on site with trunk diameters greater than four inches at fifty-four inches above grade, and the total quantity of those species.
 - B. **Recommendation:** Include a summary of the total quantity of trees considered "Protected" or Large Protected" on site.
 - C. **Recommendation:** Include a summary of the total quantity of "Protected" or "Large Protected" trees on site proposed for removal.



MEMORANDUM

D. Recommendation: Include the total quantity of trees required for replanting on site pursuant to the Town of Los Gatos Tree Canopy Replacement Standard section Sec. 29.10.0985. Determination and conditions of permit. (1)(2) Table 3-1.

E. Recommendation: Include the total quantity of trees proposed to be planted on site, and be sure this amount is consistent with the submitted Landscape Plans.

8. HMH Response: Arborist report updated with requested summaries in the "Tree Summary" table following tree tag data. Required trees indicated on "T" sheets.

MCA: Partial acceptance, Items D and E need to be included. Items A, B, and C along with quantity of trees removed and retained needs to be updated on Page 9 of the report.

HMH October Response: Items D and E, as related to required and proposed trees, are now listed on page 9 of the updated Arborist report. Items A, B, and C along with quantities are now updated in the Arborist report.

Richard J. Gessner

ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist® #496
ISA Board Certified Master Arborist® WE-4341B
Tree Risk Assessment Qualified - Valid to 2029



October 14, 2025 Review

August 19, 2025

Erin Walters
Community Development Department
110 E. Main Street
Los Gatos, CA 95030

**Monarch Consulting Arborists**

Richard Gessner
P.O. Box 1010 - Felton, CA 95018
1 831 331 8982
www.monarcharborists.com

This letter is in response to the latest submission for 178 Twin Oaks Drive (Surrey Farms) dated July 25, 2025. Enclosed is the prior response and the applicant's response to that submission. Enclosed are the most recent peer review comments and recommendations.

1. **Comment: Lot 3:** Lot 3 has a retaining wall around the site and along the property boundary adjacent to 221 Brook Acres Drive. There are two large trees, one valley oak (*Quercus lobata*) and one coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) located on 221 Brook Acres Drive not accounted for in the plans, survey, or tree detail. Trees within 30 feet of the property boundary are to be included in survey and arborist's report. There are many trees "off site" included in the report but these are not.

- A. **Recommendation:** Tree protection for these two boundary trees is required. An adjustment to the wall location may be required as both trees are at or very close to the property boundary (Image 1). Include trees within 30 feet of the property in the plans and report.

- B. **Recommendation:** Work performed within the drip line or twenty feet (20') of the trunks requires monitoring and documentation from the project arborist. Any work performed to the trees requires specifications in writing according to the most recent ANSI A300 document pertaining to the activity (Pruning, Soil Management etc.)



IMAGE 1: ADJACENT OAKS 221 BROOK ACRES

. HMH Response: Trees mentioned in comment are located within project boundary and



called out in report and tagged for removal under numbers 566 and 569.

MCA: This item is currently unresolved. Ground observations of the tree locations do not appear to match what is indicated on the plans versus what is observed on site.

Recommendation: Please accurately locate the trees or verify their location accuracy. Please provide methodology used to obtain tree locations for the site. For example “the trees were surveyed by a California licensed engineer” or “trees were located with a GPS receiver with an error of “X” feet and plotted on a plan or aerial map”.

- 2. Comment: Plan Sheet and Report Discrepancies:** There are few discrepancies between the report disposition table and the plan sheets. The following need to be consistent:

Tree #191 is labeled as “remove” in the report and “save” in the plan sheet.

Trees #192, #195, #199, #202, and #585 are all labeled as “save” in the report and “remove” in the plan sheets.

- A. Recommendation:** Revise the plans and/or report to be consistent throughout the documents.

2. HMH Response: Trees on planning sheets have been updated to match the arborist report and landscape plans- Tree #191 as remove, Trees #192, #195, #199, #202, and #585 are all labeled as “save”.

MCA: Accepted

- 3. Comment: Dead Trees marked for retention:** Trees #393, #303, #353, #356, #358, #361, #370, #373, #376, #378, #379, #645, #640, #641, and #647 are labeled as to be in “Dead” condition but are listed as “Save” trees. It is possible to retain these dead trees for various reasons including wildlife habitat, if they don’t pose an unreasonable risk to life or property.

- A. Recommendation:** Indicate and revise the plans and report to be consistent if changes are made to the disposition of these trees. If they are to be retained provide a Level 2: Basic Tree Risk Assessment to ensure public safety.

3. HMH Response: Trees listed above are updated to be removed, planning, landscape sheets and arborist report reflect these updates.

MCA: Accepted



4. **Comment: Number Count Summary:** The inventory sheet and report contains 677 rows of data and the report summarizes twenty-nine (29) species. The summary in the report is incorrect or indicates incorrect counts. The report does not summarize the relevant tree data.

52 trees are listed as "Off Site".

37 trees are "Exempt" but only 11 are listed as "Exempt". There are an additional 26 that should be labeled "Exempt", which are primarily plums, olives, almonds, and one English walnut.

4 spaces are labeled "not used"

7 "stumps" are recorded.

31 "dead" trees are recorded.

The inventory implies twenty-nine (29) species, but there are really twenty-six (26).

Twenty-two (22) of the twenty-six (26) are "Protected" by the ordinance when you remove the four "Exempt" species.

- A. **Recommendation:** Correct the species summary in the report to reflect 26 overall and 22 "Protected". Include all plums, olives, English walnut, and almonds less than 18 inches in diameter as "Exempt" in the table per the Town Ordinance.

4. **HMH Response:** Arborist report "Tree Summary" has been updated to correctly reflect noted quantities above.

MCA: "Summary of Findings" on page 9 of the report has not been updated and still contains erroneous data including quantity of trees and quantity of species. There is no summary of tree "Protected", "Large Protected", "Exempt". This section of the report has not been updated.

Recommendation: Update the report page 9 to provide the correct data including a summary of trees to be removed and retained along with what has been expressed and provided above in comment 4.

5. **Comment: Mitigation:** The replacement trees indicated are 582. It is not clear where this number was derived from. The table at the end of the report indicates 551 replacements are required, eighty-five (85) total replacements are to be installed per the Landscape Plans, and the remaining 466 will still required mitigation. A total of 223 trees are indicated for removal.

5. **HMH Response:** 582 trees are not currently indicated on the landscape plans. A total of 551 replacements are calculated in the on-site tree mitigation table in the overall mitigation and protection plan landscape sheets.

MCA: How many trees are indicated for removal and how many calculated replacements are required? How many replacements are shown on the plans?



- 6. Recommendation:** See recommendations in comment 8 and be consistent with the report and plan sheets for replacement trees.
- 6. Formatting:** The arborist report states the correct date of “Revision 3” on the title page. However, there are artifact dates of November 23, 2024, December 15, 2024 scattered throughout, and then no header, footer, dates or page numbers for the new appraisal data sheets and included T sheets in the report.
- A. Recommendation:** Upon next update revise headers, footers, page numbers, and dates for clarity.

6. HMH Response: Arborist report reflects latest date for headers, footers, and page numbers.

MCA: Accepted

- 7. Comment:** All Landscape Plans need to be updated to include tree identification number locations within the plans.
- A. Recommendation:** Update landscape plans accordingly to reflect tree location/ID numbers.

7. HMH Response: Landscape plan sheets now have updated existing protected tree ID locations per request.

MCA: Accepted

- 8. Comment:** Include the following summaries in the arborist's report:
- A. Recommendation:** Include the total quantity of trees on site with trunk diameters greater than four inches at fifty-four inches above grade, and the total quantity of those species.
- B. Recommendation:** Include a summary of the total quantity of trees considered “Protected” or Large Protected” on site.
- C. Recommendation:** Include a summary of the total quantity of “Protected” or “Large Protected” trees on site proposed for removal.
- D. Recommendation:** Include the total quantity of trees required for replanting on site pursuant the Town of Los Gatos Tree Canopy Replacement Standard section Sec. 29.10.0985. Determination and conditions of permit. (1)(2) Table 3-1.
- E. Recommendation:** Include the total quantity of trees proposed to be planted on site, and be sure this amount is consistent with the submitted Landscape Plans.



8. HMM Response: Arborist report updated with requested summaries in the “Tree Summary” table following tree tag data. Required trees indicated on “T” sheets.

MCA: Partial acceptance, Items D and E need to be included. Items A, B, and C along with quantity of trees removed and retained needs to be updated on Page 9 of the report.

Richard J. Gessner



ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist® #496
ISA Board Certified Master Arborist® WE-4341B
Tree Risk Assessment Qualified - Valid to 2029



May 13, 2025

Erin Walters
Community Development Department
110 E. Main Street
Los Gatos, CA 95030



Monarch Consulting Arborists

Richard Gessner
P.O. Box 1010 - Felton, CA 95018
1 831 331 8982
www.monarcharborists.com

Summary

I was asked to review the plans and the applicant's arborist report and provide findings and recommendations.

The previous arborist's report provided by McClintock Landscape Horticultural Services (arborist Michael Gladden) dated December 15, 2024. New information and plans were provided.

- There are no specific tree protection measures regarding those proposed for retention - Sec. 29.10.1000. New property development. (c). **Not Completed:** The design and civil plans still have not been indicated as reviewed by the arborist. There is boiler plate protection information in the plan set and fence locations placed on the T sheets
- The table in the report does not properly indicate the disposition of each tree including "Protected" or "Large Protected". - 29.10.1000. New property development (a)(3). Sec. 29.10.0970. Exceptions. (1) or (2). **Not completed:** The tree table in the report was no not updated and still indicates several "Protected" trees as "Exempt". Unless the trees meet the criteria in 29.10.0970. Exceptions. (1) or (2) they would be considered "Protected." There was a new data sheet provided that does contain this information but it is not consistent or housed in one consolidated arborist report.
- Tree appraisals were performed and values provided per- 29.10.1000. New property development. (c)(3) **Not completed:** but still performed incorrectly. The Appraisal was provided by HMM and states the 10th edition the Guide for Plant Appraisal was used. The appraisals do not use the Western Chapter Supplement 2004 for tree size or those now provided in SelecTree website (same information). There is no discussion as to how the condition ratings provided in the McClintock report were translated to percentages used in the HMM calculations. "Functional and External Limitations" do not appear to follow the guidance in the tenth edition either, and all depreciation factors were indicated to be .6 or .7 (60% or 70%). The result significantly undervalued trees. For example tree #227 (valley oak in good condition with 24 inch trunk diameter) as appraised using the tenth edition, while using the HMM provided depreciation factors, would result in a rounded depreciated value of \$8,100. However the HMM report stated this tree as valued at \$2,118.00.



- No specific development plans were reviewed or indicated or any assessment of impacts (remove or retain). **Partially completed:** The disposition of removal and retention is now provided in the supplemental sheet but needs to be consistent and housed in one consolidated updated arborist's report.
- The plan sheets provide unacceptable tree protection specifications including fence details and materials. **Completed:** Sheets have been updated to reflect the Town's requirements.

Completed: The plan set now contains the required Tree Preservation Instructions (Sheet T-1) sheet Sec. 29.10.1000. New property development. (c) (1) or a Landscape Plan indicating replanting information consistent with the Town of Los Gatos Tree Canopy Replacement Standard section Sec. 29.10.0985. Determination and conditions of permit. (1)(2) Table 3-1.

Observations to be Resolved, and Recommendations

Tree Data Sheets: The overall plan set needs to include the overall data sheets with all the trees, however for each individual lot only the trees on that lot and those directly adjacent that could be affected should be included. At this point each lot plan sheet includes the overall data sheet with all the trees.

Tree Tables on sheets 2.2 and T-1 need to be consistent with the same information, preferably as they appear on sheet 2.2. The T-1 sheet does not include critical information such as species, trunk diameter and other information as included in 2.2.

All plans require the tree numbers to be placed on those plans whether trees are to be removed or retained.

Appraisals: The appraisals need to be performed according to the 10th edition the Guide for Plant Appraisal Trunk Formula Technique. This has not been done correctly to date and trees are significantly under values with incorrect "Replacement Tree Sizes", "Replacement Cost" and unjustified "Functional" and "External Limitations". There is no consistency between the tree condition ratings within the report that use a 1-4 scale and the actual percentages required to perform the appraisal calculations.

Final Arborist Report: The arborist report from December of 2024 provided by McClintock has not been updated and only untethered supplements have been supplied. The final arborist report needs to be updated and housed in one document including the tree inventory, assessment, protection guidelines and specifications, appraisal data and results, expected impacts, and disposition of the trees.



Lot 1: Trees #1, #8, #11 and #41 are all four to six feet from a proposed newly constructed road, it does not appear these trees have any chance to survive construction of that infrastructure and all the other trees in the same trajectory are labeled as removals. Please explain how and why these trees will survive construction.

There is nothing affecting Large protected tree #60 yet it is proposed for removal. Please indicate how this tree meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

Lot 2: There does not appear to be anything affect trees #585 and #578. Please indicate how this tree meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

Tree #36 is not likely to survive construction impacts, please indicate how this tree will be protected throughout construction or label it for removal.

Lot 3: Tree #569 does not appear to have any construction impacts around it causing its removal. Please indicate how this tree meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

Lot 4: Both save trees on this site, #106 and #133, are atop retaining walls and will not survive construction. Please indicate how these trees will be protected throughout construction or label them for removal.

Lot 5: There appears to be a tree adjacent to the driveway with no I.D. number. On the T-1 sheet it looks like it could be a replacement tree, however it also shows up on the grading plans. Please confirm this tree is present or not and if not it should not be on the grading plan.

Lot 6: Tree #170 does not appear to have any construction impacts around it causing its removal. Please indicate how this tree meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

Lot 7: No remarks.

Lot 8: No tree table on sheet 2.2, keep plan sets consistent with tree tables on the same sheets with the same data.

Trees #610, #622, and #616 do not appear to have any construction impacts around them causing removal. Please indicate how these trees meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.



Lot 9: Trees #509, #510, #513, #514, #515, #517, #518, #521, #523, #524, #525, #528, #529, #530, #531, #534, #617, #620, #621, and #627 do not appear to have any construction impacts around them causing removal. Please indicate how these trees meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

Lot 10: No tree table on sheet 2.2, keep plan sets consistent with tree tables on the same sheets with the same data.

Trees #182, #183, #186, #188, #190, #192, #195, and #199 do not appear to have any construction impacts around them causing removal. Please indicate how these trees meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

Lots 11 and 12: No remarks.

Richard J. Gessner



ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist® #496
ISA Board Certified Master Arborist® WE-4341B
Tree Risk Assessment Qualified - Valid to 2029





SUCCESS BUILT ON SERVICE, QUALITY, & COMMITMENT
SINCE 1976



July 28th 2025
Job No. 4185.10

Erin Walters
Richard Gessner
Town of Los Gatos

Re: Twin Oaks | Surrey Farms Arborist Review and Responses

HMH Response to Comments provided by Richard J. Gessner and Erin Walters.

Dear Team:

This letter is in response to plan check comments made on the document titled, "Arborists review" dated May 13, 2025. The HMH responses are in **Green** font below.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Shawn Taylor'.

Shawn Taylor
HMH Landscape
Landscape Architecture Manager
PLA 6755

1570 OAKLAND ROAD SAN JOSE, CA 95131 | 408-487-2200 | HMHCA.COM | HMHLASTUDIO.COM
planning • civil engineering • public works • landscape architecture • land surveying

Page 1 of 4



178 Twin Oaks Drive

Arborist's Review

May 13, 2025

May 13, 2025

Erin Walters
Community Development Department
110 E. Main Street
Los Gatos, CA 95030



Monarch Consulting Arborists

Richard Gessner
P.O. Box 1010 - Felton, CA 95018
1 831.331.8982
www.monarcharborists.com

Summary

I was asked to review the plans and the applicant's arborist report and provide findings and recommendations.

The previous arborist's report provided by McClintock Landscape Horticultural Services (arborist Michael Gladden) dated December 15, 2024. New information and plans were provided.

- There are no specific tree protection measures regarding those proposed for retention - Sec. 29.10.1000. New property development. (c). **Not Completed:** The design and civil plans still have not been indicated as reviewed by the arborist. There is boiler plate protection information in the plan set and fence locations placed on the T sheets

HMH Response: The following note has been added to page 3 of the updated Arborist report:

**Note: Grading and Planting Plans were reviewed as of June 1, 2025. All reviewed plans appear typical and appropriate. However, the Project Arborist should be present during excavation activities within tree protection zones to ensure proper procedures are followed.*

All detailed tree protection information, notes and details are on the "T" sheets within the Landscape Plans. Additionally, the following is stated for future prescriptive measures needed during the construction phase of the project:

(6) RETAIN THE SERVICES OF A CERTIFIED OR CONSULTING ARBORIST WHO SHALL SERVE AS THE PROJECT ARBORIST FOR PERIODIC MONITORING OF THE PROJECT SITE AND THE HEALTH OF THOSE TREES TO BE PRESERVED. THE PROJECT ARBORIST SHALL BE PRESENT WHENEVER ACTIVITIES OCCUR WHICH MAY POSE A POTENTIAL THREAT TO THE HEALTH OF THE TREES TO BE PRESERVED AND SHALL DOCUMENT ALL SITE VISITS.



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 2 of 4



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 18 of 24

178 Twin Oaks Drive

Arborist's Review

May 13, 2025

- The table in the report does not properly indicate the disposition of each tree including “Protected” or “Large Protected”. - 29.10.1000. New property development (a)(3). Sec. 29.10.0970. Exceptions. (1) or (2). **Not completed:** The tree table in the report was not updated and still indicates several “Protected” trees as “Exempt”. Unless the trees meet the criteria in 29.10.0970. Exceptions. (1) or (2) they would be considered “Protected.” There was a new data sheet provided that does contain this information but it is not consistent or housed in one consolidated arborist report.

HMH Response: The Arborist report “June 4 2025, Revision 2” has been updated per your direction.

- Tree appraisals were performed and values provided per- 29.10.1000. New property development. (c)(3) **Not completed:** but still performed incorrectly. The Appraisal was provided by HMH and states the 10th edition the Guide for Plant Appraisal was used. The appraisals do not use the Western Chapter Supplement 2004 for tree size or those now provided in SelecTree website (same information). There is no discussion as to how the condition ratings provided in the McClintock report were translated to percentages used in the HMH calculations. “Functional and External Limitations” do not appear to follow the guidance in the tenth edition either, and all depreciation factors were indicated to be .6 or .7 (60% or 70%). The result significantly undervalued trees. For example tree #227 (valley oak in good condition with 24 inch trunk diameter) as appraised using the tenth edition, while using the HMH provided depreciation factors, would result in a rounded depreciated value of \$8,100. However the HMH report stated this tree as valued at \$2,118.00.

HMH Response: The tree appraisals have been corrected. The formula has been updated to match the 10th edition Guide for Plant Appraisal. SelecTree was used for the approximate cross-sectional area for the LCANT. A methodology explanation was added to the end of the appraisals explaining what criteria was used in converting the ratings from the report to the appraisals.

- No specific development plans were reviewed or indicated or any assessment of impacts (remove or retain). **Partially completed:** The disposition of removal and retention is now provided in the supplemental sheet but needs to be consistent and housed in one consolidated updated arborist’s report.

HMH Response: The Arborist report “June 4 2025, Revision 2” has been updated per your direction, showing this additional information as consistent with the “T” sheets in the Landscape Sheets.



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 3 of 4



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 19 of 24

178 Twin Oaks Drive

Arborist's Review

May 13, 2025

- The plan sheets provide unacceptable tree protection specifications including fence details and materials. **Completed:** Sheets have been updated to reflect the Town's requirements.

Completed: The plan set now contains the required Tree Preservation Instructions (Sheet T-1) sheet Sec. 29.10.1000. New property development. (c) (1) or a Landscape Plan indicating replanting information consistent with the Town of Los Gatos Tree Canopy Replacement Standard section Sec. 29.10.0985. Determination and conditions of permit. (1)(2) Table 3-1.

Observations to be Resolved, and Recommendations

Tree Data Sheets: The overall plan set needs to include the overall data sheets with all the trees, however for each individual lot only the trees on that lot and those directly adjacent that could be affected should be included. At this point each lot plan sheet includes the overall data sheet with all the trees.

HMH Response: The Landscape "T" sheets for each lot are updated to list the specific associated lot information extracted from the overall tree data.

Tree Tables on sheets 2.2 and T-1 need to be consistent with the same information, preferably as they appear on sheet 2.2. The T-1 sheet does not include critical information such as species, trunk diameter and other information as included in 2.2.

HMH Response: The Landscape "T" sheets for each lot are updated to list the specific associated lot critical information as listed/recommended above.

All plans require the tree numbers to be placed on those plans whether trees are to be removed or retained.

Appraisals: The appraisals need to be performed according to the 10th edition the Guide for Plant Appraisal Trunk Formula Technique. This has not been done correctly to date and trees are significantly under values with incorrect "Replacement Tree Sizes", "Replacement Cost" and unjustified "Functional" and "External Limitations". There is no consistency between the tree condition ratings within the report that use a 1-4 scale and the actual percentages required to perform the appraisal calculations.

HMH Response: The tree appraisals have been corrected. The formula has been updated to match the 10th edition Guide for Plant Appraisal. SelecTree was used for the approximate cross-sectional area for the LCANT. A methodology explanation was added to the end of the appraisals explaining what criteria was used in converting the ratings from the report to the appraisals.



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 4 of 4



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 20 of 24

178 Twin Oaks Drive

Arborist's Review

May 13, 2025

Final Arborist Report: The arborist report from December of 2024 provided by McClintock has not been updated and only untethered supplements have been supplied. The final arborist report needs to be updated and housed in one document including the tree inventory, assessment, protection guidelines and specifications, appraisal data and results, expected impacts, and disposition of the trees.

HMH Response: The Arborist report has been updated to contain the specific information as listed/recommended above.

Lot 1: Trees #1, #8, #11 and #41 are all four to six feet from a proposed newly constructed road, it does not appear these trees have any chance to survive construction of that infrastructure and all the other trees in the same trajectory are labeled as removals. Please explain how and why these trees will survive construction.

There is nothing affecting Large protected tree #60 yet it is proposed for removal. Please indicate how this tree meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

HMH Response: The listed trees have been re-evaluated for retention and disposition. Certain tree removals or associated thinning/pruning are associated with Hillside Development Guidelines for Fire Prevention. The disposition updates shown are:

| | |
|---------|--------|
| Removed | 1,8,11 |
| Saved | 60 |

Lot 2: There does not appear to be anything affect trees #585 and #578. Please indicate how this tree meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

Tree #36 is not likely to survive construction impacts, please indicate how this tree will be protected throughout construction or label it for removal.

HMH Response: The listed trees have been re-evaluated for retention and disposition. Certain tree removals or associated thinning/pruning are associated with Hillside Development Guidelines for Fire Prevention. The disposition updates shown are:

| | |
|---------|----------|
| Saved | 585, 578 |
| Removed | 36 |



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 5 of 4



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 21 of 24

178 Twin Oaks Drive

Arborist's Review

May 13, 2025

Lot 3: Tree #569 does not appear to have any construction impacts around it causing its removal. Please indicate how this tree meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

HMH Response: The listed trees have been re-evaluated for retention and disposition. Some trees are removed as related to utility easement conflicts with canopy and additional agency comments. The disposition updates shown are:

Removed 566

Lot 4: Both save trees on this site, #106 and #133, are atop retaining walls and will not survive construction. Please indicate how these trees will be protected throughout construction or label them for removal.

HMH Response: The listed trees have been re-evaluated for retention and disposition. Certain tree removals or associated thinning/pruning are associated with Hillside Development Guidelines for Fire Prevention. Additionally, some trees are removed as related to utility easement conflicts with canopy. The disposition updates shown are:

Removed 106, 133, 163

Lot 5: There appears to be a tree adjacent to the driveway with no I.D. number. On the T-1 sheet it looks like it could be a replacement tree, however it also shows up on the grading plans. Please confirm this tree is present or not and if not it should not be on the grading plan.

HMH Response: This tree is a proposed replacement tree and counted toward mitigation. It shall be removed from the grading plan. Tree 167 now shown for removal based on canopy conflicts with proposed utility easements and additional agency comments.

Lot 6: Tree #170 does not appear to have any construction impacts around it causing its removal. Please indicate how this tree meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

HMH Response: The listed trees have been re-evaluated for retention and disposition. Certain tree removals or associated thinning/pruning are associated with Hillside Development Guidelines for Fire Prevention. Additionally, some trees are removed as related to utility easement conflicts with canopy. The disposition updates shown are:

Removed 170, 171, 172

Lot 7: No remarks.



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 6 of 4



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 22 of 24

178 Twin Oaks Drive

Arborist's Review

May 13, 2025

Lot 8: No tree table on sheet 2.2, keep plan sets consistent with tree tables on the same sheets with the same data.

Trees #610, #622, and #616 do not appear to have any construction impacts around them causing removal. Please indicate how these trees meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

HMH Response: Sheet 2.2 data had to continue to 2.3 due to number of trees and site size. The listed trees have been re-evaluated for retention and disposition. Certain tree removals or associated thinning/pruning are associated with Hillside Development Guidelines for Fire Prevention. The disposition updates shown are:

Saved: 610, 622, 616, 624

Lot 9: Trees #509, #510, #513, #514, #515, #517, #518, #521, #523, #524, #525, #528, #529, #530, #531, #534, #617, #620, #621, and #627 do not appear to have any construction impacts around them causing removal. Please indicate how these trees meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

HMH Response: The listed trees have been re-evaluated for retention and disposition. Certain tree removals or associated thinning/pruning are associated with Hillside Development Guidelines for Fire Prevention. Additionally, some trees are removed as related to utility easement conflicts with canopy. The disposition updates shown are:

Saved 617, 620, 621, 627

Saved 500, 647

Removed 531, 530

Lot 10: No tree table on sheet 2.2, keep plan sets consistent with tree tables on the same sheets with the same data.

Trees #182, #183, #186, #188, #190, #192, #195, and #199 do not appear to have any construction impacts around them causing removal. Please indicate how these trees meets Town findings for removal since there are no construction or arboricultural reasons for removal.

HMH Response: The listed trees have been re-evaluated for retention and disposition. Certain tree removals or associated thinning/pruning are associated with Hillside Development Guidelines for Fire Prevention. The disposition updates shown are:

Saved 182, 184, 186, 186, 188 192

Saved 195, 199, 202

Removed 191



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 7 of 4



178 Twin Oaks Drive

Arborist's Review

May 13, 2025

Lots 11 and 12: No remarks.

Richard J. Gessner



ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist® #496
ISA Board Certified Master Arborist® WE-4341B
Tree Risk Assessment Qualified - Valid to 2029



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 8 of 4



Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC - P.O Box 1010, Felton, CA 95018
831.331.8982 - rick@monarcharborist.com

Page 24 of 24