

Ruemel Panglao

From: Robert Eckhardt <rce@mac.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 4, 2021 10:26 PM
To: Ruemel Panglao; Robert Eckhardt
Subject: Coastside Design Review Hearing, Jul 8, 2021 - PLN2020-00222

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.

Re: PLN2020-00222 Design Review 8 July 2021

[Please note that I will be out of town and will be unable to attend this meeting in person.]

While I appreciate that the revised plans for this project have been cleaned up a bit, I am disappointed that most of the issues that I raised at the previous meeting have not been addressed:

— I am still unable to find a drawing showing how the garage is connected to the existing paved common driveway. The front of the garage (ie, the floor level at the garage door) is 9 to 11 feet above ground (see sheets C-1 and A-6:West Elevation) and approximately 16 to 24+ feet from the existing lane. Sheet L1 shows “interlocking paving stones” bridging this gap, but I can’t find any explanation of how the paving stones are supported. Whatever it is, will this structural support maintain the same 6 foot set back from the boundary line as the garage? This set back is very important, to allow adequate fire and emergency access on the hillside between our two garages.

— As far as I can tell, the plans still do not show the boundaries of the two easements — one sewer easement, one easement providing access to a neighboring property — that are known to lie across the top of this lot. As a result, it is unclear if the planned structure (including the apron connecting the garage to the lane, which presumably crosses these easements) is in accord with their restrictions and requirements.

— As several of us explained in February, the common driveway easement under which we all operate is for vehicular access only and does not allow permanent or temporary structures or parking (see Easement Agreement in submitted comments for February meeting). The driveway, established 55 years ago, is narrow and at this point is substandard relative to current fire regulations (again, see SMC Fire Marshall’s Office document CFS-004). Nevertheless, project plans still show a Porta-Potty, refuse piles, a debris box (and presumably construction materials staging) all situated on the driveway (see sheet C-2). Use of the driveway for these purposes, combined with workman vehicle parking (which past history indicates is inevitable), will severely impact, and very likely dangerously curtail, emergency, fire, delivery, and resident access. As noted in February: Previous construction on this lot used San Pedro Road for some of these items, off-driveway areas for others. For all the reasons stated above, the current project should plan to do the same.

— The plans still show underground utilities (“Joint PG&E Trench” on sheet C-1) sourced from the driveway easement. As noted in February, our common roadway easement does not authorize the placement of underground utilities, and none currently exist. As noted in February, utilities for the previous project on the site came from San Pedro Road.

— The permit application refers to the lower level as a 1200 sq ft “unfinished basement”. Sheet A-3 (not marked as such, but located between sheets A-2 and A-4; see bottom right corner of the sheet) shows — even more clearly than in the February plans — a lower level floor plan (marked ADU) with unambiguous labels for a living/dining room, kitchen, bedroom, master bedroom, two fully-outfitted bathrooms, multiple windows, sliding glass doors, two additional entrance doors, and a 9 ft X 31 ft covered exterior deck. Is it the builder’s intention to create a multi-bedroom apartment-style third floor or a self-contained rental unit in the “unfinished basement” at some later date? Or during the current construction? If so, how will residents access this level? (The lower level is 30 feet below the lane and 50 feet

above San Pedro Road [incorrectly labeled Del Monte Road on sheet C-1], and I can find no interior or exterior access stairs in the plans.) Where will they park their cars? How does an additional self-contained unit fit in with the current design's available parking, and the constraints of the lane agreement? Does a third-floor apartment-style unit like this meet code? I believe these issues should be brought up and resolved now if the "unfinished basement" is actually intended to be something else.

-Robert

Robert Eckhardt
PO Box 669
El Granada, CA 94018
650-440-0056
rce@mac.com
www.rephotographs.com

Ruemel Panglao

From: Clint Uyeh <cuyeh100@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 7, 2021 12:35 AM
To: Ruemel Panglao
Subject: Re: PLN2020-00222 Design Review 8 July 2021

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.

This is regarding design review for PLN2020-00222

Looking at the plan, I am concerned about the height of the structure as the new drawing is much more clearer. Along with my neighbor, the garage floor and the support structure is unclear considering the slope of the existing grade.

Also, all utility access should be from San Pedro as it is a direct route. Drawing has PG&E access marked from easement.

Construction material and debris should be located closer to the more open space near San Pedro instead of the more restricted driveway easement.

Easement markings are not clear on the drawings.

Sincerely,

--

Clinton Uyehara
411 El Granada Blvd.
El Granada, CA