

April 8, 2021

County of San Mateo Planning and Building  
Mr. Ruemel Panglao  
Design Review Officer

RE: Item 1 PLN2015-00262

Dear Mr. Panglao and Members of the Coastside Design Review Committee,

I am a neighbor of the proposed project at 700 George Street in Montara, CA. I am writing in opposition to the new application and amendment to the approved plans for this project. The initial project and approved plans offered a reasonably-sized residence with minimal impacts to the natural surroundings. It was to be built from natural materials which aligned with the surrounding homes and the feel of the neighborhood. The amended project has departed from that in both size, type of materials used, and design. It also does not fall within Design Review Guidelines in a number of areas.

Design Review Guidelines recommend that construction projects maintain the “neighborhood character.” The neighborhood in which this house is being built is one with smaller homes with lighter footprints on their lots. The homes have small driveways and natural surroundings. This new design monopolizes the land and does not fit with the character of the neighborhood.

Design Review guidelines also specify that construction must not appear “massive or bulky.” The design and addition of a large ADU, a second garage, and a covered deck certainly add to the “massive” look of the revised project. I’ve included a figure from the Design Review Guidelines with recommendations on limiting this look. The revised plans look almost exactly like the “Not This” home pictured within the guidelines. It will certainly feel as if this home is towering over the surrounding homes and blocking views and sunlight.

Design Review Guidelines also offer recommendations for the location, size, and position of garages. This revised design has two garages which face different directions. There is an established pattern of garage-facing within this block, and the revisions to the approved plan do not fall within that pattern. Guidelines also recommend that driveways, walkways, and parking areas are minimized which contributes to a more natural feel. However, this revision has an incredibly large area dedicated to driving and parking. There are 3 cars on the plans, but it seems that the parking areas could suit at least twice as many cars. I’ve again included a figure which seems to show that this new design is not adhering to the guidelines for paved areas.

As a neighbor and community member it is my hope that Design Review denies the new application and asks the builder to build based on the approved plans and design.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Rachael Sage  
(650) 303-2224

