

Ruemel Panglao

From: nic and john skerry <gooddoggies.skerry@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 10:44 PM
To: Ruemel Panglao
Subject: concerns for this proposed project at 415 El Granada Blvd ...Re: PLN2020-00222 Design Review

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.

Hello review board,

My name is nicole skerry and on behalf of my husband john skerry, I would like to echo these following concerns written by our neighbor Robert Eckhardt for the first review hearing...

"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 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 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."

thank you for your time and consideration,
nicole skerry