



MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW BOARD (ERB)
Santa Monica Mountains
MEETING OF July 18, 2011
(Minutes approved via email July 29, 2011)

PERSONS IN ATTENDANCE

ERB MEMBERS

Rosi Dagit (absent)
Ron Durbin
Suzanne Goode
Dr. Margot Griswold
Richard Ibarra (absent)
Dr. Travis Longcore (absent)
David Magney (absent)

REGIONAL PLANNING STAFF

Dr. Wesley Colvin (ERB Coordinator)
Gina Natoli (ERB alternate)
Kevin Finkel (ERB alternate)
Dr. Shirley Imsand

PROJECT APPLICANTS/REPRESENTATIVES

Chris Deleau (for Rydings Residence)
Don Schmitz (for Rydings Residence)
Marshall Lewis (for Gelb Addition)

.....
AGENDA ITEMS

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **Project No. R2007-03242/ RPPT 2007-02078/ RENVT 2009-00035**
Rydings Residence, 2525 Hawks Nest Trail, pp. 2-5.
2. **Project No. R2006-01582/ RPP 2011-00290**
Gelb Addition, 34861 Rotunde Mesa Rd., pp. 5-6.

OLD BUSINESS:

3. Approval of June 20, 2011, ERB meeting minutes, p. 6

the project site. All of the applicant's parcel occurs within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. There are no blue-line streams on the property.

Request: **Review plans for the proposed single-family residence.** The ERB recommendations will be used as guidelines for the Director's Review and as part of any necessary environmental review of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Projects normally exempt from CEQA are subject to environmental review when in sensitive locations [PRC §15300.2(a)].

ERB COMMENTS:

- Dr. Wesley Colvin made a site visit
- You didn't discuss the designated significant ridgeline: Will the house be built on top of it?
- Is there a flatter location to site the house?
- The steep slopes are in the fuel modification zone?
- I wouldn't expect any fuel modification to the north for the existing structures
- Is fuel modification being performed now on this property for the adjacent structures in the big-pod ceanothus area?
- Did you include a fuel modification plan aside from delineating the clearance zones for adjoining neighbors?
- Some of the species on the plant list are invasive and not acceptable.
- Is the Mexican elderberry in fuel modification Zone C existing or proposed?
- Is there anything else that can be done to reduce the visual impact of the structure on the ridgeline?
- What is the footprint of the project on the site?
- I'd prefer not to see the basement in the plan due to the amount of excavation that would be required
- What can you do to screen the 6' retaining wall from view along Tuna Canyon Rd?
- Is it possible to keep the big pod ceanothus chaparral on the north-slope facing Tuna Canyon Rd.?
- What are you doing with driveway paving materials and drainage?
- How are you capturing the first 3/4" of storm runoff from the hardscape?
- Have you looked at cisterns?
- Is there anywhere on the bottom of the site to increase infiltration?
- Can you clarify your septic treatment?
- What is the circle in the Fire Dept. turnaround?
- Will the driveway be lighted?

APPLICANT COMMENTS:

- Who was able to make a site visit?
- Schmitz and Associates was hired in September 2009 to further modify the project in response to ERB and Fire Dept. comments, and the revised design was submitted in May 2011
- The existing 2.78 acre site is highly disturbed and mostly in existing fuel modification zones
- The previously proposed access road was not consistent with County Fire Dept. standards, and the redesigned access road is now approved by the County Fire Dept.
- Line-of-sight issues with DPW have been addressed
- The Topanga CSD only applies to lots that are less than 1 acre, and this parcel is 2.78 acres

- The access road passes through the Significant Watershed SERA, but the proposed residence is outside of the SERA
- The Coastal Commission staff report for adjacent parcel states the isolated chaparral does not constitute ESHA
- The house is proposed to be built on top of the significant ridgeline, but it will only be 26' tall
- No, the house is sited on the flattest portion of the property
- Yes, a fuel modification plan was prepared by a forester
- If the elderberry is adjacent to the access road in Zone C, it will be planted for erosion control
- The redesign of the project moved the footprint of the house to the south in order to reduce the size of the retaining wall to 6' on the north side of the access road
- We could put *Quercus agrifolia* as screening trees in front of the retaining wall
- If the vineyard is causing concern on the north side, the vineyard will be limited to the south side
- We will do bio-swale and capture and infiltration where we can in consultation with DRP and Coastal Commission staff once ERB is completed
- On sites with little flat topography, we prefer to bore infiltration pits instead of using cisterns. In non-erosive discharge areas, we would install energy dissipaters and filtration devices- like inset drop-ins.
- Permeable paving is OK, but the Fire Dept. may have concerns on steeper driveways, such as portions of our proposed access road
- Sewage will be on-site wastewater seepage pits using the EnviroServer ES-25 model from MicroSepTec.
- The architect originally designed the circle as a planter for a tree, but it has to remain open for the Fire Dept. and will be paved.
- The driveway will not be lighted. We accept the standard conditions for lighting and color

ERB RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **Remove the invasive *Gazania* from the plant list on the landscape plan**
- **Provide a list of the species in the proposed native seed mix and make sure it conforms to the list of CNPS approved plants for the Santa Monica Mountains**
- **Toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) should be substituted for the Coast live oaks, since they grow faster than the oak trees.**
- **Keep the native vegetation on the north side of the driveway that grades down to Tuna Canyon Rd.**
- **Capture and infiltrate as much stormwater from impermeable surfaces advised by the geotechnical report, and incorporate as much permeable surface into the access road as possible**
- **Exterior night lighting shall be minimized to what is necessary, should be of using low intensity (lights not exceeding 800 lumens), shall be of low stature fixtures(2.5-3 ft.), and shall be directed downwards with good shielding against projection into the nighttime sky, surrounding properties, and undeveloped areas. If DPW (Department of Public Works) requires no does not require public lighting, then none shall be used. Security lighting, if used, shall be on an infrared detector.**
- **The house and landscaping shall be in earth tones to camouflage the structures, coordinating with the color of soil, rocks, and native vegetation of the site. Use of native vegetation in the landscaping plan will help to screen the structure.**
- **A copy of the minutes and amended plan should go to Richard Claghorn for plan check, and the applicant does not need to return for further review by the ERB.**

ERB Meeting Date: July 18, 2011

ERB Evaluation: Consistent X Consistent after Modifications
 Inconsistent No decision

2. 1:00 PM Gelb Addition

Project No. R2006-01582
Permit No. RPP 2011-00290
APN: 4453-025-031, -037, -039
Location: 34861 Rotunde Mesa Rd., Malibu, CA 90265
Applicant: Marshall Lewis of Marshall Lewis Architecture

Project: The project proposes to add a 940 sq. ft. addition onto the existing 3,360 sq. ft. single family residence. The addition will consist of a master bedroom and bath and separate laundry facilities.

Resource: The project site is located southwest of Saddle Peak and north of Piuma Rd. within the Malibu Local Coastal Plan of the Santa Monica Mountains. The parcel where the addition is proposed is south and east of the boundary for Malibu Creek State Park. The B5 SEA Buffer Area and Malibu/Cold Creek Resource Management Area overlay all three of the applicant's parcels. The existing single family residence and 572 sq. ft. garage are within a Significant Oak Woodland and Savannah on parcel 4453-025-031. A tributary of Cold Creek crosses east to west across parcel 4453-025-039 south of the proposed addition. There are no recorded occurrences of Braunton's Milkvetch Habitat nor species listed in the California Natural Diversity Database on the project site. All of the applicant's parcels occur within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity and Seismic Hazard for Landslide Zones.

Request: **Review plans for the proposed addition to the single-family residence.** The ERB recommendations will be used as guidelines for the Director's Review and as part of any necessary environmental review of the project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Projects normally exempt from CEQA are subject to environmental review when in sensitive locations [PRC §15300.2(a)].

ERB COMMENTS:

- What vegetation exists where the addition is proposed?
- Is there any brush clearing or fuel modification done in the area of the proposed addition?
- The existing residence is 3,360 sq. ft.: what's on the first floor?
- How much grading will have to be done to site the addition as proposed on the plan?
- Is the height of the addition 11'6" high?
- Would you have a problem pivoting the addition to make it parallel to the house: what architectural problem would be created if the addition was pivoted to the east?
- Are you taking anything out to increase the fuel modification?
- There doesn't seem to be a need to rotate the addition, since the fuel modification within Zone C will not be much more impactful than it is now.

- Is the neighboring property owned by State Parks?

APPLICANT COMMENTS:

- This is one of the 1st pyramid houses built in southern California during the ‘60s
- Plan-wise, there were a lot of features marginalized to have the spectacular pyramid visually
- One of those features was the master bedroom on the second floor of the pyramid
- Currently, the laundry facilities are outside of the house in the existing detached garage
- Master suite will include bedroom, reading area, bathroom, walk-in closet, and laundry
- Existing vegetation consists of a few trees, low growing shrubs, and non-invasive groundcover
- The first floor contains a living room, dining room, kitchen, office, children’s bedroom and den. The second floor contains a loft-type bedroom.
- The only grading will be for the foundation of the addition
- Yes. The height of the addition varies between 9’ to 11’6”’: It is no taller than 12’ tall.
- Plan-wise, the proposed placement is preferred because one can walk through the existing den into the addition: It is the one wall on this side of the structure that can be broken through
- The ground would get the same disturbance whether the addition remains sited as proposed or rotates to the east: This would be a compromise on the design when there is reason for one
- We’re not taking any vegetation out to build the addition.
- Visually, no one can see the addition.
- No, the parcel to the north is owned by someone else: State Parks own the property north of the adjacent parcel

ERB RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **They should change the color of the pyramid.**
- **The house and landscaping shall be in earth tones to camouflage the structures, coordinating with the color of soil, rocks, and native vegetation of the site. Use of native vegetation in landscaping will help screen the structure.**
- **Exterior night lighting shall be minimized using low intensity (lights not exceeding 800 lumens), low stature fixtures (2.5-3 ft.). Lights shall be directed downwards with good shielding against projection into the nighttime sky, surrounding properties, and undeveloped areas. If DPW does not require public lighting, then none shall be used. Security lighting, if used, shall be on an infrared detector.**

ERB Meeting Date: July 18, 2011

ERB Evaluation: X Consistent Consistent after Modifications
 Inconsistent No decision

OLD BUSINESS

3. The meeting minutes for the June 20, 2011, ERB meeting were approved.

OTHER MATTERS

- 4. Public comment pursuant to Section 54954.3 of the Government Code.
No comments from the public were made.**