

From: [Mark Baumgarten](#)
To: [Will Gibson](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: San Mateo County public hearing - Dec 10th, 2025 - Agenda item #3 - public comment
Date: Friday, December 5, 2025 9:36:58 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.

Hello Planning Commission members and Mr. Wilson,
In regards to agenda item #3, I would like to point out a few issues with the proposed rezoning and use of the property included as El Granada, next to Coral Reef drive.

1. This property has been identified as a sensitive habitat for the endangered SF Garter Snake and the California Red Legged Frog. Both species have been identified and found living on the property included in the proposed rezoning in El Granada for housing. Please consider this information and remove this property from rezoning consideration. Removing it will save the county the expense of the planning process only to subsequently be denied as a violation of the US Endangered Species Act.
2. The property is currently used by the public for hiking and nature walks. The property belongs to the school district and was allocated many years ago to provide additional space for schooling and education. It is now used by the public as a hiking area and is adjacent to the GGNRA Rancho de Coral de Tierra park. The property will eventually be annexed to the GGNRA as a public open space for trails and enjoyment.

Thank you, Mark Baumgarten
Resident El Granada, CA

From: [Jane Praysilver](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Comment on Item #3 (for the Dec 10th Planning and Building Agenda)
Date: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 2:56:55 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.

San Mateo County Planning Commission,
I am resubmitting my comment below (or the Dec 10th SM Planning Commission Meeting) as I inadvertently left out the item #3 in the subject heading as required for cross-referencing to the Agenda.

Thank you,
-Jane

On Dec 9, 2025, at 2:04 PM, Jane Praysilver <silverfyre@icloud.com> wrote:

Dear San Mateo County Planning Department,

I am submitting this comment in regards to the proposed building of higher density housing on the El Granada–Princeton parcels.

Population Trends

Current statewide planning assumptions may not fully account for California's projected population decline. As the baby-boom generation reaches ages 75–80 within the next 10–15 years, a significant number of homes are expected to return to the market for sale or rental. This natural turnover in housing stock will occur well before newly constructed homes reach even the midpoint of a 30-year mortgage, potentially creating an imbalance in supply-and-demand and placing financial risk on future homebuyers.

Additionally, birth rates in California continue to fall, indicating fewer families and fewer future residents who would occupy our housing stock. These demographic trends raise questions about whether large-scale rezoning is necessary or sustainable. It is my option that the state/county is in a rush to overbuild, and not considering the imminent declines in population.

Emergency Preparedness and Public Safety

Insurance providers are already withdrawing coverage from high fire-risk regions across the state, leaving many homeowners with limited or unaffordable insurance options that protect their investment. Additionally, in our area, medical services and evacuation routes are already sparse and gridlocked during emergencies. Increasing population density without proportional investment in emergency infrastructure would heighten risks for both current and future residents.

Environmental Impacts

The parcels under consideration include eucalyptus groves that serve as important wintering habitat for monarch butterflies, a pollinating species of significant

ecological value and concern. Removing these trees would threaten a local monarch population and eliminate one of the mild coastal microhabitats the butterflies depend on during their migration. This represents a meaningful environmental loss that cannot be easily mitigated. Offering to sell the property to the GGNRA would connect it directly to a park with inadequate parking and add better access to that San Mateo valued asset.

Conclusion

For these reasons—demographic uncertainty, inadequate emergency preparedness, and environmental harm—I oppose the use of these sites for higher-density housing.

Thank you for considering my comments.

-Jane Praysilver

El Granada, CA

From: [Haley Peterson](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Will Gibson](#)
Subject: December 10th Meeting Public Comment - Agenda Item 3
Date: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 11:56:51 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.

Agenda Item 3

To the San Mateo County Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, and Cabrillo Unified School District Board,

I write as a concerned resident of the Coastsides to strongly oppose the proposed rezoning of the six CUSD parcels in El Granada for high-density housing, as described in the current County Housing Element Rezoning Program and to stress the importance of a thorough Environmental Impact Report across all seasons.

It is critical that the EIR required for this rezoning be conducted **throughout the entire year**, not just during dry-season site visits. This land undergoes profound seasonal changes, especially during winter storms and atmospheric river events. Only a multi-season study will accurately capture:

- the extent of flooding that occurs across these parcels,
- the saturation levels of the soil,
- the wetland's function as a natural aquifer and storm-water reservoir, and
- the drainage pathways that move water away from homes and roadways.

During atmospheric rivers, this land holds, slows, and absorbs significant volumes of stormwater. Any filling, grading, or disturbance to this wetland aquifer will displace that water into surrounding neighborhoods, dramatically worsening flood frequency and severity. A year-round EIR is the *minimum* level of due diligence required for such a high-risk site.

Environmental and ecological importance of the site.

The parcels under consideration are functioning wetlands that provide essential habitat and hunting grounds for frogs, raptors, snakes, owls, songbirds, and other native wildlife. These wetlands are not only biologically rich - they are key components of the natural hydrology of this part of El Granada.

Insufficient infrastructure and public-service capacity.

The current rezoning proposal would allow "100% residential development by right" at density levels far beyond what existing infrastructure can support. Residents already experience inadequate drainage, frequent power outages, narrow roads, and limited emergency access. Adding hundreds of units without major infrastructure upgrades is simply not safe.

Flooding and drainage - a worsening crisis if wetlands are removed.

The wetland currently functions as a natural flood-mitigation system. Removing it would eliminate the primary mechanism by which this area handles stormwater. With climate change driving more intense winter storms, the decision to fill or develop this wetland is not only environmentally damaging - it is a public-safety hazard.

Public-safety and disaster-evacuation concerns.

High-density housing on these parcels would significantly increase the population in an area with limited evacuation routes. In an earthquake, tsunami, wildfire, or major storm, congestion on the few existing roads would place thousands at heightened risk. This is not compatible with responsible coastal planning.

A call for responsible, balanced planning.

Affordable housing is essential, but it must be placed in locations where infrastructure, hydrology, and safety considerations make sense. These parcels are simply not appropriate for high-density development.

I urge the County and CUSD to reject this rezoning proposal and to ensure that any environmental review - including the EIR - reflects the full seasonal reality of this sensitive, flood-prone site.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Haley Peterson