

From: [Erica Adams](#)
To: [Fred Herring \(flh1741@sbcglobal.net\)](#); [Francoise Monet](#); [Philippe Branchu](#)
Cc: [Mercedes Segura](#)
Subject: Fw: PLN2019-00400 correspondence
Date: Tuesday, July 25, 2023 8:50:33 PM

From: PLANNING_PlanningProjects <PlanningProjects@smcgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2023 4:23 PM
To: Erica Adams <eadams@smcgov.org>
Subject: Fw: PLN2019-00400

Para ti

San Mateo County Planning & Building Department
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
Email: PlanningProjects@smcgov.org

****Planning Division public assistance counters are closed on Fridays. Additionally, please note staff rotates shifts daily, any planner can assist. ****

From: william perasso <williamperasso@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2023 4:16 PM
To: PLANNING_PlanningProjects <PlanningProjects@smcgov.org>
Cc: James E Thompson <JThompson@jet-engr.com>
Subject: PLN2019-00400

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Greetings

I am William Perasso Jr. Last September I purchased 566 Live Oak Lane. I share property lines with 570 Live Oak Ln.

To be clear: **I am not against someone building on their property. As long as it conforms to standards and laws and rules regarding size, set backs etc. etc etc. Neighbors' rights to continue to have full enjoyment of their holdings should be considered as important as anybody's right to "improve" their property.**

When I purchased my property there was a dilapidated garage on my 15 ft strip of land that gives me direct access to Live Oak Lane and is the only place where I can place a garage. The old garage was at least 75 years old and falling down. It was dangerous and I had it removed. I made an appointment with planning to discuss the process of building a replacement garage

and was informed that a new garage would have to be built by today's rules. To build a new "non conforming" garage would call for a 3 ft set back. That would leave me only 9 ft. I was told I would not be allowed to build a 9ft garage. I am very disappointed.

I expect that any new building, especially one built right up to my property line, will be held to the same rules. I see that the builder is asking for a one ft. set back to the paper road. What if in the future someone wants to extend that road and develop their property? Are all of the other setbacks conforming ?

There seems to be a whole lot of "Non Conforming" issues involved with this proposed project. "Non Conforming" floor area, "Non Conforming" lot coverage.

The swimming pool and one of the water retention pits are near my property, very close to where there was a mudslide in the 1980's. If the pool fails the water in the creek will be tainted. The deer, racoon and mountain lions that frequent the area could be poisoned. The creek is also the main feed for Lower Emerald Lake. The fish could be poisoned. Both Fish and Game would be affected by a mishap

There are mudslides at 647, 649 and 655 Park Rd. Directly across the creek from this proposed project.

The cutting down of "6 significant trees" will reduce my privacy and have a negative impact on my holdings.

This project is too big for the size of the parcel. Build if you must. Please downsize. Please ditch the pool.

Please do not place the porta potty next to the property line.

I will see you tomorrow.

Best Regards,
William Perasso