

## Glen Jia

---

**From:** Archie Roboostoff <archie@mosshub.io>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 6, 2023 5:23 PM  
**To:** Glen Jia  
**Subject:** Comment Agenda Item #2 - Coastside Design Review Mtg. 3/9

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.

Glen,

Thanks for allowing for public comment on this project. My understanding is this unit will actually consist of a primary home for the owners and TWO additional ADUs that will be rented out. In my opinion this home is FAR TOO big for the lot size, will restrict precious views, and is a vehicle to generate REVENUE for the owners which is akin to building a hotel in our residential area - where does it end?

As it is we have density issues and this will only make things worse. The owners should be compelled to redesign this home to be at least 50% smaller/taller and not have multiple families living or renting in it.

I'm hoping the planning department will see through this and adjust the approved plans accordingly.

Thanks

Archie Roboostoff - Kelmore street homeowner.

**From:** [Scott Clemens](#)  
**To:** [Glen Jia](#); [Camille Leung](#)  
**Cc:** [David Alumnaugh](#); [Mark Dinh](#); [Daniel Kennedy](#)  
**Subject:** Coastside Design Review Committee meeting of March 9, 2023  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 7, 2023 12:51:47 PM

---

**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.**

---

From:

Scott Clemens  
740 Stetson Street  
Moss Beach, CA 94038

To:  
Glen Jia  
Coastside Design Review Officer

RE: File No.: PLN2022-00348  
Parcel No.: 037-096-120  
Etheldore Street, Moss Beach

Our house is located behind and to the side of the proposed building. I'm concerned about the possible impact on our views. The proposed structure is 44 feet high from the garage floor to the ridge of the roof, and is set further upslope than the flanking houses. Solar panels would further add to the height. We've tried holding up a pole to ascertain the visual impact at various points on the lot, but without knowing exactly where the four corners of the house are located, or where the highest point is in relation to the proposed excavation, it's hard to visualize. It would be very helpful if the owners would erect story-poles, with tape, or at the very least commission an artist's renderings of the building in relation to the houses around it. I would rather not be surprised that our views have been obstructed only after the framing is done, when a small change now might allay our concerns.

Sincerely,

**From:** [Megan McDow](#)  
**To:** [Glen Jia](#)  
**Subject:** Comment Agenda Item #2 - Coastside Design Review Mtg. 3/9  
**Date:** Monday, March 6, 2023 4:29:41 PM

---

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.

Glen,

I'm writing today regarding a new house being proposed on Etheldore Street, Moss Beach (parcel no. 037-096-120), agenda item #2 on Thursday's, 3/9, Coastside Design Review Committee meeting. I am a neighbor, two streets above Etheldore on Kelmore St. I will be able to see the new house from my residence. I have some concerns about the size of the proposed house. It is a 5000 sq ft lot and the proposed house is almost 4000 sq feet and 4-stories. This is HUGE for that lot and will dwarf the surrounding houses and cut off ocean views of the neighbor directly above, on Stetson St. The surrounding houses were all built 50+ years ago and a new house should blend in with the neighborhood, not stand out with its enormous size. I'd like it to go on record that I'm opposed to the house as it's currently designed and would like to ask the owners to be good, new neighbors and downsize/redesign so as not to block views and invade the privacy of neighbors.

Thank you,  
Megan McDow

March 6, 2023

To: Coastside Design Review Committee  
& Glen Jia: Design Review Officer  
From: Mark Dinh, 722 Stetson Street, Moss Beach  
Re: Item 2 on the March 9, 2023 CDRC Agenda:

**Owner: Wayne C. and Kelly G. Robinson**  
**Applicant: Rebecca Katkin**  
**File No.: PLN2022-00348**  
**Location: Etheldore Street, Moss Beach**  
**Assessor's Parcel No.: 037-096-120**

*Consideration of a Design Review (DR) permit recommendation for the construction of a new 1,710 sq. ft. three- Coastside Design Review Committee Meeting March 9, 2023 story, single-family residence with an attached 441 sq. ft. garage, 495 sq. ft. junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU), and 800 sq. ft. accessory dwelling unit (ADU) on a legal 5,000 sq. ft. parcel (Recorded Certificate of Compliance, PLN2022-00242), associated with a staff-level Grading Permit (GP). The project involves 740 c.y. of grading and the removal of four (4) significant trees.*

### Summary

We request that the committee not provide a DR permit recommendation for File No. PLN2022-00348 at Assessor's Parcel 037-096-120 due to the following concerns: 1) conflicts with San Mateo County (SMC) [Zoning Regulations](#) ("Zoning Regulations"), 2) conflicts with SMC [Standards for Design for One- and Two-Family Residential Development in the Midcoast](#) ("Midcoast Design Standards"), and 3) conflicts with SMC [Policies on Demonstration of Project Scale, Major/Minor Modifications & Height Adjustments During Construction](#) ("Demonstration of Project Scale").

### Conflicts with Zoning Regulations

1. Notification (Section 6565.9):  
To our knowledge, notification has not been provided to neighbors within a 300' radius by 10 days prior to the March 9 CDRC meeting. We, and our concerned neighbors, have either not been made aware of this project or have had limited time to review the proposed plans. Thus my comments in this letter are preliminary.
2. Parcel Coverage for SR-17 (Section 6300.2.4):  
Plan sheets A0.4 excludes 67 square feet (sf) of "Allowed ADU specific" coverage. These areas are above the garage story and below the primary residence stories, which would mean this area should be included in the parcel coverage calculation. Including this area will push parcel coverage above the 35% limit of 1750 sf for a 5000 sf lot.
3. Building Floor Area (Section 6300.2.5):  
Plan sheet A0.5 excludes ~406 sf for basement space. The basement space on the plan is a full 11' height basement space with bathroom and laundry facilities, which should not qualify it as "uninhabitable or unfinished areas" as defined in the Zoning Regulation.

If this was properly included in the building floor area, it would push the total the maximum limit of 53% of lot size.

4. Attached Accessory Dwelling Units (Section 6429.3.3):  
“An attached accessory dwelling unit that [is not]...a junior accessory dwelling unit, may not be built in combination with any other attached or detached dwelling unit on the same parcel.” This appears to rule out having an attached ADU and a junior ADU within the same parcel as proposed in the plans.

#### Conflicts and Considerations From Midcoast Design Standards

1. *“Neighborhood Character: How houses are sited on their lots”*. Attachment A includes an exhibit created from SMC’s GIS maps, using its measuring tools to determine distances from property lines. We feel the proposed property should be within reasonable alignment with the front and rear setbacks of the neighboring properties. For example, the second story of 711 Etheldore is ~35’ from the rear setback; for 723 Etheldore this distance is ~46’ from the rear setback. Sliding the property forward towards Etheldore would lessen impact to neighboring properties and will be in alignment with the front and rear setbacks for neighboring houses.
2. *“Neighborhood Character: Scale, or the appearance or proportion of a house relative to others, including the number of stories.”* The neighborhood has 1- and 2-story houses on top of, or to the side of, garages. The proposed property has 3-stories on top of the garage/basement story, for a total of 4-stories.
3. *“Complementing Other Structures in the Neighborhood: Views. ...effort should be made to minimize the affect on views from neighboring houses.”* The standard include multiple recommendations to minimize impact, including increase setbacks for second stories and lowering roof plate heights that would greatly improve impact to neighbors.
4. *“Neighborhood Scale: is it properly related in size, height or other characteristics...to other homes in the neighborhood”*. We do not feel a 4 story building on a 5,000 sf lot relates well to neighboring homes.
5. *“Grading: ...so that grading activity and the area disturbed by grading is limited”* Siting of the house closer to the front of the lot should significantly reduce grading, currently proposed at 740 cubic yards.
6. *“Second-Story Location: Locate the primary portion of the second stories towards the center of the first story and away from property lines whenever feasible.”* Highest story is located at the rear setback line.
7. *“Lowering the Eave Line: Consider bringing some portions of the roof down to the gutter or eave line of the first-story roof to reduce the apparent mass of the building.”* The proposed fourth-story roof is a hip roof, but the roof line can be lowered by using the guidance above.

#### Conflicts with Demonstration of Project Scale

1. *Per May 28, 2020 revision, “The construction of story poles, including netting, is the standard way to demonstrate compliance with design review standards related to project scale. If story poles are not constructed, other visual methods may be used to demonstrate project scale...In using these other methods, the following standards*

*apply... Images should represent all sides of the project along with immediately adjacent structures.”*

Story poles were not used for this project, nor were graphic renderings prepared from all side of the project along with immediately adjacent structures.

2. Drawings A0.1 and A0.2 and pavement section on C-3 indicate an impervious 4” deep concrete driveway of 35’x20’ (700 sf). This exceeds the maximum allowable impervious surface area of 10% parcel size.
3. Drawings A0.1 and A0.2 appear misleading in their placement of neighboring properties. 711 Etheldore’s front deck does not appear in either illustrations (Attachment B). Additionally, using SMC GIS Map (Attachment A), the front window bay for 723 Etheldore should be in alignment with the front of the proposed garage (Attachment B), both near the 20’ front setback. The illustrations improperly shows the proposed building to be further forward towards Etheldore Street than it will be constructed, and we estimate the real placement of the building to be 15’ further back in the parcel away from Etheldore Street.

#### Recommendation

We respectfully request that the CDRC work with the owners and architect to achieve a project that adheres to SMC’s Zoning Regulations, Midcoast Design Standards, and Demonstration of Project Scale guidelines. This would include proper 10-day notification to neighbors, story poles and/or required images, and adherence to R-1 and S-17 zoning restrictions for parcel coverage and building area. Finally, we request that the committee not provide a DR permit recommendation for File No. PLN2022-00348 at Assessor’s Parcel 037-096-120 at this time and until these significant concerns are addressed in a redesign.

Respectfully,



Mark Dinh



# Attachment A: San Mateo County GIS MAP



Back of house at 1 story above grade

Blue lines indicate distance from property line using SMC's GIS Map Measuring Tool

Proposed building footprint (60'x35') going to front (20'), rear (20') and side setback (15' combined) limits.

"Envelope" of multi-story houses along Etheldore. Dotted lines indicate front and rear alignments

1-story house.

Blue lines indicate distance from property line using SMC's GIS Map Measuring Tool

0.01 0 0.00 0.01 Miles

WGS\_1984\_Web\_Mercator\_Auxiliary\_Sphere  
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

1: 282

This map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable.  
THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION

**Attachment B: 711 and 723 Etheldore at front of property**

**711 Etheldore:**



**711 Etheldore Street on left, 723 Etheldore Street on right:**



**From:** [Dan Kennedy](#)  
**To:** [Glen Jia](#)  
**Subject:** Regarding Parcel No.037-096-120 Design Review  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 7, 2023 6:02:51 PM

---

**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.

---

To: Glen Jia, Design Review Officer  
Regarding Parcel No.037-096-120

I'm writing to comment about the proposed building for the lot situated between 711 and 723 Etheldore Street. I am located about 1-block from the property, at 771 Stetson.

Following the "Standards for Design For One-Family and Two-Family Residential Development" 9-15-10 (Reference 1), this design may violate numerous points which should be addressed:

- 1) Neighborhood Character (Sections b - Blending and d - Scale). The proposed blocks large swaths of natural setting, and is very large for the lot size; larger than all nearby structures.
- 2) Site Planning and Structure Placement (Sections a - Vegetation, b - Grading). Most existing vegetation and trees will be removed. Considerable grading will be done to the hill (see below point 2) due to an 11 foot tall "basement". This multi-unit house simply does not fit here without major disruption of natural terrain.
- 3) Complement Other Structures in the Neighborhood. Considerable privacy concerns exist due to the size and proximity to the surrounding Etheldore houses. Several nearby houses on Etheldore and Stetson will have existing views significantly impacted, and Story Poles ought to be erected to show the community what to expect from the four story structure and owners allowed to give feedback. The structure gains mildly advantageous views by sacrificing those of neighbors' homes which were built decades earlier and cannot be altered now.
- 4) Elements of Design (Sections c - Second Stories, Second Story Location, Lowering the Eve Line). It would be much better for neighboring houses if they made the fourth story smaller, further forward, or lowered the roof to the eve line of the lower floor.
- 5) Landscaping, Paved Areas, Fences, Lighting and Noise (Section 2. Paved Areas; front asphalt driveway, stairs, possibly rear patio are impervious and % of lot coverage presents drainage concerns.

My other concerns (not particular to the Midcoast Guidelines) are:

- 1) This appears to be a 3-unit apartment building, not a single family home. This is a large house with two ADUs under it, on the same structure, on a 5000 sq-ft single family home parcel.
- 2) There is considerable excavation to be done - around 20,000 cubic feet of the earth will be removed from a natural green belt, home to numerous critters and birds, and drainage with trees and plants. The "basement" alone (which is a full size bonus room/storage unit, excavated from the hillside) will have over 11-foot high ceilings but is also not being counted as square footage. It seems like a major oversight to exempt this space, and only allows further the environmental impact and construction of such a large development. Why is this not counted as square footage?
- 3) I believe drainage will be a problem for Etheldore St. and Highway 1 at this location,

possibly impacting the post office, Odyssey Pizza, Coastal Vine, and homes in lower Moss Beach. Currently the rain percolates and is absorbed into the dirt of this hill. We could have major problems with flooding if more lots follow this trend, and it sets a precedent. We have considerable rain and erosion fears. There are several nearby houses which could be compromised.

4) I did not receive any notice in the mail telling me about this large structure being built. No neighbors I have talked to, many who are closer than me to this project, received any notice in the mail. I find it very disturbing that there can be a single public comment forum, but without informing the public of the event.

5) I find it inexcusable that the meeting can be only attended in person, on a weekday, during working hours. I know the building where the meeting takes place has "hybrid capable" offices (aka, in-person and Zoom ready). We pay a LOT of money in county taxes, and surely there is a budget for accommodating this. It severely limits public participation and forces many people who are working or unable to travel, such as for seniors or those with disabilities.

Daniel Kennedy  
771 Stetson Street  
Moss Beach, CA 94038

Reference 1:

"The Design Review Administrator, the Coastside Design Review Committee, the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors will also use these standards in their review of projects, as set forth in Section 6565.7."