

Hello Coastside Design Review,

Once again I am writing my concerns in regards to 700 George St and again I am opposing this oversized house. I am doing so by showing how the Demonstration of Scale does not align with the regulation set forth in the CRDC Guideline standards and distorts the size, mass and its relationship to the neighboring houses. It does not confront the drainage issues. By covering the lot with impervious roof and hardscape that will intrude on our right of way and ours and our neighbors private property.

It was suggested to the applicant at their last hearing that they seek out professional assistance on on the drawings, design and application. This seems to not have not occurred.

The Demonstration of Scale is defined in the CDRC's guild lines and requires the applicant to provide an accurate depiction of the street view with the new house relationship to them. This option has been undermined and taken advantage of by distorting the actual results and the direction in which the DOS renderings are facing. They mostly show its relationship to the grand house across the street. One rendering photo shows the partial one-story next to the south end. The east facing view barely shows the existing house, dwarfed by the proposed one. Using the trees as a reference point, the largest trees on the property are 25 feet tall yet on one of the photo renderings they project about 4+ feet above the roof line and in another they are about 2 feet above it and the house is taller than that. I believe that accurate Story Poles would show the applicant and the neighbors what is really to be constructed.

These plans seem to consume every lineal, square and cubic foot allowed in Building Standards. In addition they do very little to mitigate the water displacement. As designed it would increase the water flow from the property by more than 40% with the impervious roof and concrete hardscape. The driveway shows pervious concrete and pervious pavers. Pervious hardscape is not available at this grade of driveway; permeability is at slopes less than 6% in San Mateo county. This driveway is at 12% (not reflected in the renderings). This slope would also increase because DPW requires the height at property line to be the same at the crown of the road in front of it, which would increase the slope even more. The site plan and the driveway profile differ from each other. Drainage from Birch street comes around down George street then onto Cedar Street. We have been maintaining this right of way for 37 years, grading and graveling it to achieve positive drainage and have managed to stop intrusion into our houses. There is less than 2% grade across the front of our house.

Items like this occur all over the plans. This project is not ready for review for many reasons and should have Story Poles required. It is the second time under this PLN2022-00173 number and one other time under the previous number PLN2015-0062 that this project has been reviewed since its approval in PLN2014-00360 for a smaller more practical house. The CDRC should not be in the practice of plan checking as well as design review.

April 13, 2023

Dear Members of the San Mateo County Design Review Committee,

We, Jane Okon and Susan Andrews, homeowners of 1220 Cedar Street, are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed project at 700 George Street (PLN2022-00173). We have carefully reviewed the design and have concerns regarding its size and scale, which we believe are not appropriate for our neighborhood.

As 17 year residents of Cedar Street, we have always made efforts to ensure that new homes in our neighborhood conform to the existing adjacent homes, such as 1220 & 1234 Cedar Street and 1217 and 1227 Birch Street. The proposed project, located on the promontory at the corner of George and Birch, is far too large for the neighborhood, and its scale does not align with the character of our community.

While we acknowledge the newly built 1212 Birch home, we believe that its design is irregular in scale compared to the rest of the neighborhood. The majority of houses in our neighborhood are single-story, with some modest bi-level homes incorporated. The proposed project, with its oversized structure, is not in harmony with the surrounding homes and would disrupt the aesthetic and ambiance of our neighborhood.

We are also aware that the applicant has been to three CDRC hearings, and despite feedback from the local community and requests to not build such a large home, the proposed structure continues to be oversized. It is the same height or taller than the house across the street and stretches 15' longer when you include the detached garage, taking up almost the entire west side of the property, leaving only 20' of space.

We strongly urge the San Mateo County Design Review Committee to carefully consider our concerns and the impact of this proposed project on our neighborhood. We believe that the applicant should honor the character of our neighborhood without seeking excessive grandeur in the form of a 6-bedroom, 5-bathroom home. We request that you deny the approval of this project in its current form and ensure that any new development in our neighborhood adheres to the established design guidelines and maintains the integrity of our community.

Thank you for considering our input on this matter. We appreciate your attention to our concerns. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require any further information or have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jane Okon & Susan Andrews

1220 Cedar Street Montara

Coastside Design Review Committee,

RE: PLN 2022-00173

After reviewing the plans for 700 George Street unfortunately I have found many inconsistencies that are concerning.

Page A1.0 - Renderings are different than what was posted.

Page A2.0 - 1. There are no closets in three of the bedrooms

2. Gas appliances which are not allowed, also there is no accommodation for Mechanical, Electrical, or Plumbing services including fire sprinklers, or "Mechanical closet".

Page A.3/ A - Elevations are wrong compared to most recent surveys from construction across the street that have been recorded with the County.

A.3/C - No articulation on eastern wall, plus three large blank walls.

A5.0 & A 5.1 - Elevations don't match current conditions.

C0.1. Conflict of interest. Owner is the Civil engineer responsible for his own inspections.

C1.0. Conflict of interest. Owner is the Civil engineer that has submitted a very conflicting survey.

C1.1 Retaining wall with three foot drop will be dangerous in the dark, especially on Halloween, maybe add a short fence on top.

C1.2. Overflow box will flood out existing conditions.

C1.3 Utility plan

1. Location of gas and water utilities on Birch conflict with the spacing from existing services. There are no gas service connections allowed.

2. Since the applicants address is on George all utilities should be taken from George street.

3. No electrical service shown. The utility pole that is located on Birch Street has already received the max size of transformer with the max amount of services allowed on it. I also personally paid for and installed the electrical vault and there are no more available underground to locations available to tap into even for temp power.

C2.0. Details don't match plans. Detail #7 is potentially allowing drainage on county property behind the retaining wall.

C3.0

1. Move portable sanitation to North West corner of house. This is extremely close to neighbors bedroom windows.

2. No gas generators to be used for construction and show temp power location if it is feasible.

Denise and I believe that a multiple story home should be built on this site, but with the overwhelming inconsistencies in the total design, we can not support this project at this time. As a professional builder, these design issues do not make us confident or comfortable about how the construction of this project will go. Especially since there are three families with five children under the ages of 4 directly adjacent to the project on all sides. All construction access should be at the North West corner of the lot to minimize impact.

I also believe that the amount of earthwork or grading for this project has been grossly under calculated, and not included. There is over 100 cubic yards based on these plans to come out of the western section of the property alone based on the current conditions. That still doesn't account for any portion of the house or its potential footings.

I would also like to add as a homeowner and builder I believe that ANY and ALL multistory residential projects in the CDRC should be mandatory in erecting story poles based on an official survey with clear markings of elevations and perimeters. After going through this process ourselves, Denise and I realized that our house was too tall and removed 2' from the top floor. I believe this is helpful to the neighboring home owners due to renderings being easily corruptible and out of scale. If done correctly all of the materials for the story poles can easily be recycled back into the project, and I believe shows real investment and honesty in completing the project.

Any communication I have had with the applicants has been through "Gary" the owner over the last two years, who I know realize is in-fact is "Igor M. Kleyнар" the Civil Engineer for the project due to connecting information. Is it a conflict of interest that during the building process he will be conducting inspections on his personal home that should be done by an independent third party? There is a huge difference between self performing work or self designing and self inspecting.

Thanks You,

Michael Uniacke
1212 Birch Street
Montara, CA 94037