

TO: Coastside Design Review Committee, San Mateo County,
Email to <cleung@smcgov.org> and <bjia@smcgov.org>
FR: Vic Abadie, Geologist, 340 Seventh Street, Montara
RE: Please read aloud at 11 April 2024 hearing, Agenda Item #4, 3:15pm,
Support Marina Fastovskaya & Gary Kleyner new house design, 700 George Street, Montara,
APN 036-103-620, File # PLN2022-00173

I support Marina's and Gary's new home construction. I would appear in person if not for a family memorial event today, which also prevents joining via Zoom.

My wife and I have owned and lived in our house at 340 Seventh Street, Montara, 43 years and raised 4 children. I am a self-employed geologist and have rented office space at Main and Seventh since mid-1995.

Unable to attend today, I base my comments on what I heard at previous Design Review meetings.

Past comments protested that Marina's and Gary's house doesn't fit the neighborhood. Compared to what? Opponents claim the house is too big for the neighborhood. Compared to what? There are many large houses on Birch and Cedar Streets. Compared to those, and especially to the huge, fortress-like house immediately across Birch Street at George Street, Marina's and Gary's house is too small. Do you want their house to fit the neighborhood? Then their house should be bigger.

Marina and Gary reduced building height and windows, among other concessions to accommodate neighbors' objections. They show cooperation and respect but get none in return. Did anyone thank them for those concessions? You should thank them. Today.

I heard opponents cite community in protesting the house. I would ask you committee members and attendees personally, if I were in the meeting today, "What is community?" I expect you would agree that community includes support, help, and welcoming. That's how we do community in Montara. Those of you invoking community to oppose Marina and Gary should instead support them, if you are serious about community.

Marina and Gary are not destroying your neighborhood. They won't run rainwater and sludge into your back doors or have rowdy keg parties into the wee hours. They have family, grandchildren. They will not reduce your property values, but, rather, will increase values and neighborhood appearance and, by the way, will increase the County's tax base. Does anyone here today support tax revenue to help the needy? Of course. Then support this house.

Jan and Mark Stegmaier, our families have been good friends for decades. I urge you and your family to support this project. You used to own the lot and could have kept it to prevent construction. Marina and Gary now own it and will be your next door neighbors—good neighbors, for which you should be thankful. Welcome them.

I have known Gary for years. He is a high-caliber gentleman of integrity who works hard, works smart, and succeeds. You can tell by his accent he's not native USA. He emigrated decades ago and comes now to Montara to build a home, and you all pile on him like a mob of bullies. Is that community? Is that how you want him to think we friendly, generous Americans behave? We—you—should welcome him and his wife to Montara.

The Committee should approve Marina's and Gary's design promptly. Please do so.

Best to all,

Vic

Mark Stegmaier
770 George Street
Montara Ca.94037
mark@sierrawestbuilders.com

Hello Members and Staff of the Coastside Design Review Committee.

I write to you as a concerned neighbor of Item #4 George St Montara Project. It appears that the applicant has again not followed the request of the CDRC in making clear and sufficient adjustments to their project. Nor the Story poles that were to be required in the latest report findings by the CDRC APR2023 (attached below). This is the "fourth" hearing held on behalf of this project with only minor concessions being made to the major changes required.

Although the project seems to be improving in articulation and colors, it does not to have the appearance of less bulk and mass than has been the requirement for several preceding hearings by CDRC . Intrusion of second story looming windows into the neighboring properties is another very personal concern (4x6 bedroom window facing neighbors yard and kitchen) this window is above the floor height by 2.5' with a bed in front of it, seems very thoughtless in design. This inappropriate coordination of windows and location have also been very prevalent in the previous designs.

The existing trending single story or smaller houses in this block has been inspirational to the existing traditional and historical "Old Town Montara" that it has retained and maintained. Most of the new houses in this block area have followed the guidelines by the building standards of the SMC 6565.20 elements of design as well as good appropriate neighborly respect. It has been a model of "Emergency Interim Ordinance for smaller homes" (SMC 1999)

Drainage is still a major concern as this project is on a downslope. I understand it is not in your purview but the rain gardens seem that is substantially under engineered. This property historically has been very sensitive to rainfall and its ability to not cause damage to neighboring property. The lot coverage at best is at its maximum and is suggested that it is over the lot coverage specified by SMC as reported below by CDRC. 4/23. We would like this addressed in some manner of recognition.

There has been much personal input with this applicant. We have had meetings, completed designs, offered to assist and requested a plea for a smaller house than has been designed and approved for this property.

I feel that this project has taken much volunteer and public service time and effort, and that it should be completely redeveloped to follow the standards, guide lines of CDRC and respect of the neighbors. By hopefully enrich the neighborhood.

Should this project move forward with this committee because of the applicant integrity, it should require under any circumstance that the height of this project never exceed the height depicted in these recorded plans.

Please refer to highlighted bold in Findings below items that have failed to be completed.

Owner/Applicant: County File No: Location:
APN: 036-103-620
Marina Fastovskaya & Gary Kleyner
APR 2023 PLN2022-00173
700 George Street, Montara

SUBJ: Coastside Design Review Permit

The project has been reviewed for compliance with the Design Review Standards for One-Family and Two-Family Residential Development in the Midcoast, County of San Mateo Zoning Regulations Aug 2019, Chapter 28.1, Section 6565.20.

The Applicant has requested to return to CDRC for project review at a future date tbd, with a design that satisfies the Design Review Standards.

REQUIREMENT for Demonstration of Scale:

To more adequately demonstrate the scale of the new structure, **the Design Review committee has determined that Story Poles are required for this project.**

REQUIREMENTS for compliance with the design standards:

Per the following Required items - ***Reducing the bulk and mass of the second story is of primary importance to a successful design for this site. For a two story design to be successful, stepping the second story volume in from the first story and away from neighboring properties; and reducing the extent of the exterior wall of the house and garage facing the eastern and southern adjoining parcels, is critical. Primary and secondary roof forms can also support a less impactful second story, and must be architecturally compatible with the primary roof form's slope and material.***

1. Section 6565.20(D) ELEMENTS OF DESIGN; 1. Building Mass, Shape & Scale;
2. b. Neighborhood Scale; Standards (1): **New and enlarged homes should respect the scale of the neighborhood through building dimensions, shape, form, facade articulation, and architectural details that appear proportional and complementary to other homes in the neighborhood.**
2. Section 6565.20(D) ELEMENTS OF DESIGN; 1. Building Mass, Shape & Scale; c. Second Stories; Standards (a): Locate the primary portion of the second stories toward the center of the first story and away from the property lines wherever feasible.
3. Section 6565.20(D) ELEMENTS OF DESIGN; 1. Building Mass, Shape & Scale; c. Second Stories; Standards (c): **One story designs are strongly encouraged in areas where one story homes are predominant.** If a two story design is chosen, minimize the size of the second story.
4. Section 6565.20(D) ELEMENTS OF DESIGN; 1. Building Mass, Shape & Scale; d. Daylight Plane/Facade Articulation; Standards: New Residential development shall conform to either daylight plane or facade articulation options...(1) Daylight Plane Option ... as approved by the Design Review Committee (follow description in this section) or 6565.20(D)1.d. Standards(1),(a), (b)) (2): Facade Articulation Option: Facade articulation shall be provided on all building sides*, and is subject to approval by the Design Review Committee. Facade articulation is intended to break up the appearance of walls through the placement of projecting and recessing architectural details, ...
5. (e) Wall Articulation Standards (2) Projecting or recessing architectural details (decks, bays, windows, balconies) and changes in building materials or colors are also encouraged to visually break up walls.

* “In order to approve proposed facade articulation, the Design Review Committee must find that: (a) all building facades are well articulated and proportioned, and (b) each building wall is broken up so as not to appear shear, blank, looming or massive to neighboring properties.”

6. Section 6565.20(D) ELEMENTS OF DESIGN; 2. Architectural Styles and Features; 3. Roof Design; Standards (1): When planning a new home or second story addition, begin with a primary roof form. Consider additions to the primary roof such as secondary roof forms and dormers that may serve to reduce the home’s apparent mass and scale...

The variety of roof forms on the main house are not architecturally compatible, If the garage remains a gable roof, rotate it so that the ridge runs East/West instead of North/South. Add Dimensions to Roof Plan - including but not limited to Eave depths and Trellis dimensions.

7. Section 6565.20(D) ELEMENTS OF DESIGN; 2. Architectural Styles and Features; b.Openings; Standards (2) When designing and placing windows and doors, consider their location, size and proportions and how they may relate to adjacent buildings. Where vertical windows overemphasize height, consider the use of horizontal styles.

Unify the window shapes and styles; either all with dividers or all without dividers.

The current design changed the placement of bedrooms and negatively impacted privacy to the East neighboring property since egress windows are required rather than transom windows.

8. Section 6565.20(D) ELEMENTS OF DESIGN; 4.Exterior Materials and Colors; Standards c.Quantity(2): Encourage the use of three or more colors on larger houses to reduce the appearance of bulk by emphasizing architectural features and trim.

There is too much contrast between the dark blue and the light cream colors. **Use warm, muted colors that blend with the surrounding natural features when viewed from a distance...especially to reduce the mass of the stair tower.**

9. Section 6565.20(D) ELEMENTS OF DESIGN; 4.Exterior Materials and Colors; Standards d. Ornamentation: Use ornamentation or architectural details to reduce the appearance of bulk on larger homes (Consider orienting siding horizontally, on at least one of the Levels instead of vertically to minimize apparent mass and bulk). Apply ornamentation in a manner consistent with the style and size of the house; avoid using ornamentation in a manner that will make the house appear too plain or **overly decorated.**

The material transitions and placements seem arbitrary, and do not relate to the massing issue or and architectural style.

Update the Material/Color/Finishes List in the Project Application.

10. Section 6565.20(F) LANDSCAPING, PAVED AREAS, FENCES, LIGHTING AND NOISE; 2.Paved Areas; : **Driveways, walkways and parking areas on site should be as small as possible within allowable standards, and should drain into adjacent onsite landscaped areas, where possible.**

Reduce the width of the front concrete walkway to align with the width of the front porch pillars. Garage steps to grade to include a 3FT landing and two steps down to grade. Show consistently on all appropriate Architectural, Civil and Landscape drawings. Specify all materials for various walkways.

Perimeter Fencing is to be less than or equal to 6 FT H. Add trees to landscape plan along the East Fence to improve privacy for neighbor to the East.

All site plan elements need to be captured in the site plan and the drainage calculations.

11. Show Lot Coverage calculations on Architectural Drawings. Lot coverage is currently over the maximum allowed.

11. Include Specifications for all doors, including the garage door.

12. Add N/S/E/W orientation symbol to all drawings.

13. Show the South side Exterior Elevation with and without the garage blocking.

SUGGESTION for further compliance with the design standards:

To minimize the mass and bulk, explore attaching the garage to the primary residence to allow for a 20FT setback, which provides more relief from the appearance of a continuous wall along the long sides of the property.

Design Review Committee Members,

I am writing once again in response to the proposed design of the residence at 700 George Street in Montara. Although there have been positive changes made to the previous submittal that improve the design elements of the overall appearance, many of the prior concerns of the neighbors have still not been addressed. The results from the last hearing required that the homeowner provide story poles so that the impact on the neighborhood could be seen. Additionally the committee asked that the design on the second story be set back to reduce the towering structure on the adjacent property. While the front and back sides have been improved, neither of those items on the east adjacent lot seem to be satisfied as required. Nor was there any attempt to reduce the extent of the exterior wall as suggested leaving a structure that will tower above that lot. The most offensive impact to that adjacent property is the large second story (4x6) window that looms over it with really no means to screen it with a fence or trees. It is a very large window for a bedroom; too large to be facing an adjacent lot and unlikely functional to be over a bed as drawn in the plans. There are two other windows in that room on each side of the popped out section that could offer a solution to egress (if the second floor were stepped back as suggested in the results of the previous meeting). With the main floor of the proposed residence starting 3' above the grade of that adjacent lot, it still seems that the design will overwhelm that property.

I appreciate your time in addressing my concerns. As always, you have the opportunity to set a precedent for future homes on this block and your decisions will have a great effect on its harmony.

Thank you,
Janine Stegmaier

770 George Street
Montara