



City of Mountain View
City Clerk's Office
500 Castro Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

Heritage Tree Removal at 505 Cypress Point Dr. (Tree #1)
- APPEAL -

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves as APPEAL regarding the pending action of the removal of a Holly Oak (Tree #1) located at 505 Cypress Point Drive, Mountain View and as a request for a review regarding said action by the Urban Forestry Board based on the following reasoning:

- a). the tree's interference with the structure, a carport, given as the reason for the removal application, can be easily corrected by the removal of 1 (i.w. ONE) main branch of the tree. It is furthermore feasible to remove a small part of the carport roof (a mere few inches) if applicant considers the remaining tree trunk too close to the structure. Structurally essential parts of the carport are not impacted by such a minor modification. A complete removal of the tree is therefore unnecessary.

Documentation: Exhibit A (Photograph)
 Exhibit B (Photograph)

Aside from said main branch, which can be removed easily without removing the tree as a whole, there seems NO impact of the tree, neither by the tree's branches nor by its roots, on any structure nearby, conceded by the applicant for the removal by way of applicant tolerating the proximity of other trees considerably larger and closer to the structure of the residential units, removal of which has not been applied for.

- b) the tree as it stands - and also after, as suggested, removal of said main branch - provides comprehensive shade cover from noon to sunset to at least 8 (i.w. EIGHT) units of 505 Cypress Point Drive, Mountain View. Said Units are: Unit 145, Unit 146, Unit 147, Unit 148, Unit 149, Unit 150 [REDACTED] Unit 151, Unit 152. The architectural and legal circumstances (HOA Rules) regarding said units do not allow for the installation of air conditioning in said units. The removal of the tree as a whole would therefore cause considerable reduction of the general quality of life for the appellant and for the other parties residing in the other units impacted, due to temperatures in said units increasing in the summer months to next to unbearable conditions (the estimated average temperature increase inside units without shade provided by the tree is 9° to 36°F [Source: United States Department of Agriculture, Publication PSW-GTR-205, Vargas, McPherson, Simpson et al, December 2007]). were the tree indeed to be removed as a whole. The removal of such an important, decades old shade tree appears, given science's prediction of more extreme heat conditions in the future appears insensible as it exposes a considerable number of parties to such extreme heat conditions with no recourse. The tree, once removed is, essentially, irreplaceable.
- c) Removing a tree opposite a west wall, as in the action in question, increases energy consumption, reduces air quality, increases atmospheric CO2 to a cost level of \$3,040.00 per unit for a large tree [Source: United States Department of Agriculture, Publication PSW-GTR-205, Vargas, McPherson, Simpson et al, December 2007], resulting in a burden of not less than \$24,320.00 (not adjusted for inflation) for the unit owners while the expense of a selective tree trimming and, if desired, a minor modification of the carport roof is certainly considerably less and does not lead to a loss in quality of life for any of the parties concerned.

Appellant therefore requests after review of this appeal the previously approved action for removal of said tree to be denied.

Mountain View this 3rd day of March 2020



Daniel Reimann
Appellant