From: Ray Towne < rtowne@fostercity.org > Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2023 5:14 PM
To: Helen Gannon < hgannon@fostercity.org >

**Cc:** Thai-Chau Le < tle@fostercity.org>; Laura Galli < tle@fostercity.org>

Subject: RE: 106 Challenge Court Agreement

Helen,

I think this is a question for the City Attorney. Unfortunately the final map does not show these two lots sharing a "common d/w". It was recorded in 1963 and was in the county and not FC yet so their standards were not as stringent. Since the applicant is willing to dedicate the d/w access easement the adjacent lot is not being inconvenienced and I reviewed the turning movements w/ the civil consultant and they have answered all my previous comments.

Ray

From: Ray Towne < <a href="mailto:rtowne@fostercity.org">rtowne@fostercity.org</a>>
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2023 8:57 AM

To: Laura Galli <lgalli@fostercity.org>; Helen Gannon <hgannon@fostercity.org>; Jen Chen

<jchen@fostercity.org>

**Cc:** Pete Garcia cpgarcia@fostercity.org>; Thai-Chau Le <tle@fostercity.org> **Subject:** RE: 106 Challenge Court Architectural Review Driveway Inquiry

Laura is absolutely correct, the city is not involved w/ the private easement, however, the easement needs to be recorded at the county so any future transaction/sale of the property a title company or individual would "discover" the conditions of the easement. CDD may wish to add a conforming copy of the easement be furnished for proof of recordation.

Ray

From: Laura Galli < <a href="mailto:lgalli@fostercity.org">lgalli@fostercity.org</a> Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2023 6:25 PM

**To:** Ray Towne < <a href="mailto:rtowne@fostercity.org">rtowne@fostercity.org</a>; Helen Gannon < <a href="mailto:hgannon@fostercity.org">hgannon@fostercity.org</a>; Jen Chen

<jchen@fostercity.org>

**Cc:** Pete Garcia cparcia@fostercity.org>; Thai-Chau Le <tle@fostercity.org> **Subject:** RE: 106 Challenge Court Architectural Review Driveway Inquiry

Helen,

To add to Ray's comments, the Easement that the applicant would be acquiring would be negotiated between them and the adjacent property owner. I do not believe the City Council has any interest or say in the extents or terms of any easement on private property for private use. I do not think this type of an easement needs to be considered by the City Council.

The only portion of the driveway that would require an encroachment permit would be for modifications to the driveway approach.

Thanks,

## Laura

From: Ray Towne < <a href="mailto:rtowne@fostercity.org">rtowne@fostercity.org</a> Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2023 5:34 PM

To: Helen Gannon < hgannon@fostercity.org >; Jen Chen < jchen@fostercity.org >; Laura Galli

<lgalli@fostercity.org>

**Cc:** Pete Garcia cparcia@fostercity.org>; Thai-Chau Le <tle@fostercity.org> **Subject:** RE: 106 Challenge Court Architectural Review Driveway Inquiry

All,

The new d/w would involve an encroachment permit.

There appears to be a potential vertical clearance issue as depicted on Sheet No A7 and the roof projection/overhang of the addition into the neighboring d/w (S02-S02). Any type of camper vehicle could be challenged in maneuvering.

Also, the d/w study (1 & 2) is based on a fixed 19' vehicle dimension, what happens if the owner has a different type of vehicle w/ greater turning radius requirements. Bollards should be provided to protect the structure immediately adjacent to/on the addition. Actual turning radius should be shown rather than diagrammatic lines.

The d/w easement may need to be modified.

The impacted d/w homeowner should sign a release to protect the City and applicant acknowledging they understand how they will be affected by the new approach.

Ray