

## Sonal Aggarwal

---

**From:** Marsha Moutrie <marsha.moutrie@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 11, 2022 12:12 AM  
**To:** Sonal Aggarwal  
**Cc:** Camille Leung; Glen Jia  
**Subject:** Comments on Proposed Structure on Bernal Ave., Moss Beach, APN:037-278-040; CDRC Hearing, 10/13/22, Agenda No. 3. PLN2021-00282

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**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.**

---

Ms. Aggarwal,

As the owners of the property at 30 Bernal Ave., Moss Beach, we write to comment on the proposal to develop a substandard lot directly opposite our property. For the reasons stated below, we oppose the proposed structure's current design and ask the Design Review Committee to recommend against it. Here are three bases for our opposition.

**First, the proposed structure is inconsistent with the coastal, semi-rural, small town character of this Moss Beach Neighborhood and with the Design Review Standards which protect that character; and the inconsistencies are multiple.** Here are a few examples. The Standards include second story setbacks to avoid boxiness and preserve sightlines (pages10,13). However, the proposed structure consists of what might be simply described as two oblong boxes of the approximately same size, one atop the other, with an entry portico appended to the front. The top box (the second story) is not set back on the building sides, or rear. Indeed, at the home's rear, it overhangs the first story. The Standards call attention to the importance of roof form, massing, and articulation (p.21). However, the roof of the main structure consists merely of two, equally-sized planes that slope downward at equal angles from the roof's center-line gable. The Standards include lowered eave lines (p.11). However, the proposed design's eave line is high on the second floor. As to architectural style, the Standards specify that new homes should compliment existing, nearby homes (p.17). The proposed structure does not. The three homes across Bernal and Alvarado from the proposed structure, though diverse in appearance, all reflect the semi-rural, coastal style described in the Standards as "coastal craftsman" (p.17). However, the proposed structure's design style is neither semi-rural nor coastal. To the contrary, it is typical of dense, urban neighborhoods, consisting of very narrow lots, developed with closely adjacent structures, characterized by height significantly exceeding their width.

**Second, adherence to the Standards is particularly important in this case because of the proposed structure's site, which is opposite the main entrance to the Pillar Point Bluff Park.** The Standards stress the importance of how proposed structures "blend with surrounding scenic and natural environment" and require consideration of their "proximity to open space" (p.3). The proposed structure would be located on one of the four lots surrounding the intersection of Bernal and the end of Alvarado, which forms the park entrance. Thus, the proposed structure would become part of the park's residential gateway. The structure's design will therefore impact more than the neighbors and neighborhood. It will also impact the many area residents and visitors who come to the blufftop park seeking respite, exercise, and the experience of being in and with Nature.

The three existing houses on lots surrounding the intersection afford a smooth transition from the semi-rural residential neighborhood into the spectacular natural environment of the blufftop park. All three existing structures are set back from the two roadways. Our home and the other home adjacent to the park trailhead are also set back from the trail and separated from it by substantial, planted side yards which create a soft transition from the developed neighborhood

into natural open space. In contrast, the proposed structure's design would cut the required setback from Alvarado by half. Taken together, the proposed structure and its proposed nine-foot high, property line fence along Alvarado would narrow the sight lines into and out from the park, disrupting the existing smooth transition from natural open space to semi-rural neighborhood.

**Third, the record is not adequate to support design approval.** The record upon which the Committee will base its decision appears to include information about only one of the houses in close proximity to the site. The applicant has apparently focused on that house (at 65 Bernal) solely for the purpose of showing that it is both larger and taller than the proposed structure. The comparison is inapt. In contrast to the proposed structure, the home at 65 Bernal is located on a much larger lot, is set far back from Alvarado, and is creatively designed in conformity with the Standards. The Committee should reject the proposed design for the reasons stated above and because the proposed structure's impact on the neighborhood character (and park visitors' experience) cannot be accurately gauged from the minimal evidence and information provided.

Thank you for your work and for considering our comments.

Respectfully submitted,  
David and Marsha Moutrie

## Sonal Aggarwal

---

**From:** Kate Broderick <katebroderick@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 11, 2022 11:03 AM  
**To:** Sonal Aggarwal  
**Subject:** Bernal Moss Beach

**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.**

---

Dear Sonal Aggarwal,

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to you about the proposed house for Moss Beach on Bernal Ave. I live at [46 Precita Ave Moss Beach](#), the adjacent corner to the proposed property. I am concerned about this proposed home for the following reasons:

- (1) The design does not match the surroundings. It is a very small lot with a really skinny/tall home. Its design looks like something for Daly City rather than Moss Beach.
- (2) The location of the lot is at the trail head. Over the past 5 years, there have been 7 new homes built on Bernal and Ocean Blvd all one block or two from the entrance to the trail head. Such construction has forced numeriors daily visitors to park on the street, condensing an already small city street with parked cars. Why hasn't the county dedicated one of these lots for parking at the trail head?
- (3) As mentioned in #2, there has been a lot of construction in our small neighborhood these past 3 years with no improvements to our neighborhood streets. Currently there are only two exits out of our neighborhood (including Ocean Blvd). As you may already know, Ocean blvd is slowly being lost to erosion. With the numerous construction trucks and near cliff construction, Ocean blvd deterioration has been exacerbated to the point that we will likely lose the road in the next decade. Leaving us with just one exit. This is not safe for our community-we need another access road before you approve more homes to be built in our neighborhood.

I plan to be at the meeting tomorrow and speak during public comment as well. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kate

--

**Kate Broderick, Esq.**

(650) 580-2361

Preferred Pronouns: She/Her

*Consider the environment before printing this e-mail*

**From:** [Tim Machold](#)  
**To:** [Sonal Aggarwal](#)  
**Cc:** [Glen Jia](#); [Camille Leung](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on Proposed Structure on Bernal Ave Moss Beach, APN: 037-278-040  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 5, 2022 11:09:06 AM

---

**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.**

---

Ms. Aggarwal

I hope you received the plan elevation I sent. Upon further consideration I feel that our home at 65 Bernal Ave, used in the required notice is not the closest structure to the proposed project but our 14 ft high garage building on Alvarado Blvd is. In fact, three other homes are as close as ours and not sure why ours was chosen, among the four it looks least like the proposed project and is on 1/3-acre lot with a separate garage building. Further, the use a few square feet of signage in the middle of the lot as a means to alert the community of pending large new structure does not have impact and true representation that story poles do and allows an applicant to graphically skew the data, omitting detail and use tiny font. In this case a misrepresentation of the height of my home by least four feet and no dimension other than heights for the proposed building. Story poles would reveal a 15 X 60 X 25 ft long and narrow warehouse like structure.

I know these decisions are fraught with tension and hope that adherence to regulations and to the surrounding community standards can yield the right recommendations, as in the past with no building permits issued on this extremely undersized lot. Three of the four recently permitted structures on adjacent lots have required much more minimal exceptions in lot coverage and setbacks, and the neighbors have been reluctantly accepting of these decisions. This is the third structure proposed for this lot-and not a single-story cottage or small structure has been conceptualized in the process. This lot is 1/8 (13%) of the size required by zoning regs, and proposed setbacks are 50% of the requirements. This design should not be allowed in its proposed configuration because it does not come close to requirements.

Because this correspondence may be shared on a public website, I ask that a summary of the last two proposals for structures on this lot by Design Review Committee be briefly shared at the meeting, or even better on the website before the meeting. Important comparisons are lot coverage, setbacks, height, ceiling heights, square footage, and elevations revealing the building articulations and finishes compared to this design, highlighting improvements over the previous two rejected designs. From recollection this is the largest and least compelling of the three and represents a step backwards, besides its great lack of zoning compliance.

Again, our neighborhood realizes the need for housing and has worked with the permitting process to welcome four new homes in the immediate area within the past couple of years. This project does not fit and should once again be rejected. Thank you and others for reviewing my comments.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Machold

---

*Tim Machold*  
*(650)759-5669 Cell*  
[\*timmachold@ymail.com\*](mailto:timmachold@ymail.com)

## Glen Jia

---

**From:** Michael Yolken <michael.yolken@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 9, 2022 5:35 PM  
**To:** Glen Jia  
**Subject:** October 13, 2022 Coastside Design Review; AGENDA ITEM #3, PLN2021-00282

**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.**

---

Coastside Design Review Committee,

With respect to agenda item #3, please let it be known that I object to the development of this non-conforming parcel for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed 1,153 sq. ft. home does not fit in with the traditionally larger homes and would detract from the overall appearance of our Seal Cove neighborhood.
- 2) The conforming set-backs are designed to provide separation between homes which effects the density and desirability of Seal Cove.
- 3) The applicant should be held to neighborhood standards which are reasonable, especially in light of the flurry of new construction over the past two years on Bernal Ave.

Thank you,

Michael Yolken  
90 Bernal Avenue  
Moss Beach  
650-245-2445

## Glen Jia

---

**From:** Sonal Aggarwal  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 11, 2022 12:27 PM  
**To:** Glen Jia  
**Cc:** Chong Lim; Andy Singh  
**Subject:** FW: Comments Re. Proposed Home, PLN2021-00282

Hi Glen,

Please see below for the 5th correspondence for Item no.3, PLN2021-00282.

Copying the applicants as well for their consideration.

Regards,  
Sonal Aggarwal

-----Original Message-----

**From:** TJ Glauthier <tjglauthier@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 11, 2022 12:02 PM  
**To:** Sonal Aggarwal <saggarwal@smcgov.org>  
**Cc:** Brigid O'Farrell <mbrigidofarrell@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Comments Re. Proposed Home, PLN2021-00282

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.

Dear Ms.Aggarwal,

We are writing regarding the application for a new two-story single family residence at the corner of Bernal and Alvarado Avenues, file number PLN2021-00282. We are homeowners less than one block away, at 1001 Ocean Blvd. This application is the subject of a review by the Coastside Design Review Committee this week, on October 13th.

We oppose the application as currently submitted because we feel the plans for the house and the lot are not consistent with the character of the local community and with the Design Review Standards. We support the detailed comments submitted to you by David and Marsha Moutrie. Our feeling is that the proposal falls short on several criteria, including: (1) that the design of the building is "boxey" without features that help break up the flat planes and surfaces that the Design Standards recommend; (2) that the setbacks requested are inconsistent with the Standards and illustrate just how severely the proposed structure does not conform with the other homes and the County's standards for lots in this area; and (3) that there have not been story poles installed to give the neighbors and the public a full perspective of the proposed size of the home.

We understand the need for additional housing in the County, including allowing for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) which are much smaller than the original residential units on their lots. This proposed home is so small that, in other locations, it might even qualify as an ADU. However, this structure is proposed not as an ADU, but as the sole house on the lot. In our view it is inconsistent with the character of the Seal Cove neighborhood and should not be recommended to go forward.

Thank you for your consideration,

TJ Glauthier & Brigid O'Farrell

1001 Ocean Blvd.  
Moss Beach, CA 94038