

CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW  
URBAN FORESTRY BOARD  
RESOLUTION NO.  
SERIES 2025

A RESOLUTION OF THE URBAN FORESTRY BOARD OF THE CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW  
TO DENY THE APPEAL, UPHOLD STAFF'S DECISION, AND DENY THE REMOVAL OF  
TWO HERITAGE TREES AT 573 CARLA COURT

WHEREAS, an application was received for the removal of two Heritage trees at 573 Carla Court on November 6, 2024; and

WHEREAS, on November 20, 2024, the Urban Forest Manager issued a decision on the application denying the removal of two Heritage trees; and

WHEREAS, the decision denying the removal of the Heritage trees was timely appealed; and

WHEREAS, at its duly noticed public hearing on April 9, 2025, the Urban Forestry Board considered the appeal of the application for removal of the Heritage trees and independently reviewed and considered the application, staff report, public testimony, City's Protection of the Urban Forest Ordinance (Article II of Chapter 32 of the Mountain View City Code), and other information in the record; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: that the Urban Forestry Board of the City of Mountain View that the Heritage Tree Removal Permit appeal is hereby denied, and the Heritage trees shall be preserved based on the required findings pursuant to the Mountain View City Code Section 32.35 set forth below:

1. The City Code requires the preservation of all healthy Heritage trees unless specific criteria are met pursuant to Mountain View City Code Section 32.25;
2. The City Code places emphasis on the preservation of trees; and when mitigation is possible, efforts should be made to preserve trees as opposed to removal; and
3. The Urban Forestry Board determines that the removal of the Heritage tree(s) does not meet any of the criteria set forth in City Code Section 32.25, specifically as follows:
  - a. The condition of the tree with respect to age of the tree relative to the life span of that particular species, disease, infestation, general health, damage, public nuisance, danger of falling, proximity to existing or proposed structures, and interference with utility services. (Section 32.35(a)(1))

The Urban Forestry Board agrees with staff's evaluation of both trees, which did not find that the condition of the trees required their removal as their overall health and structure is good, and

there is no evidence of large limb failure or any other nuisance, damage, or interference issues that cannot be addressed through corrective pruning.

- b. The necessity of the removal of the Heritage tree in order to construct improvements and/or allow reasonable and conforming use of the property when compared to other similarly situated properties. (Section 32.35(a)(2))

The Urban Forestry Board agreed with staff's evaluation of both trees, which did not find that removal of the tree was necessary in order to construct improvements as the Appellant did not provide any information indicating proposed improvements, nor did the Appellant provide any information for the need to remove the trees to allow reasonable and conforming use of the property when compared to other similarly situated properties.

- c. The nature and qualities of the tree as a Heritage tree, including its maturity, its aesthetic qualities, such as its canopy, its shape and structure, its majestic stature, and its visual impact on the neighborhood. (Section 32.35(a)(3))

The Urban Forestry Board agreed with staff's evaluation of both trees, which found that the trees and structure of the canopy is good, therefore, this criterion was not met.

- d. Good forestry practices, such as, but not limited to, the number of healthy trees a given parcel of land will support and the planned removal of any tree nearing the end of its life cycle and the replacement of young trees to enhance the overall health of the urban forest. (Section 32.35(a)(4))

The Urban Forestry Board agreed with staff's evaluation of both trees, which did not find that the trees should be removed due to good forestry practices as no facts to support this criterion was provided or observed.

This decision of the Urban Forestry Board is final. The time within which judicial review of this decision must be filed is governed by Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. Notice of this decision shall be posted at the site, City Hall, and at the Urban Forest Division Office.

-----

RH/AF/1/RESO  
228-04-09-25ufbr-2