

From: [Ariel Moseley](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Will Gibson](#)
Subject: Questions about Agenda item 3: Planning and Building, San Mateo County
Date: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 8:19:01 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.

Members of the Planning Commission and project Planner, Will Gibson,

My name is Ariel Moseley and I am a resident of El Granada. I have concerns about infrastructure associated with high density housing as proposed in agenda item 3.

What criteria determined that three parcels should be used in Colma, five in Belmont and **six** on the coast? Is the entire prime peninsula absorbing 8 and the coast 6?

How many units are expected of high density housing on six parcels? Are you averaging four souls per unit and two cars? That seems bare minimum based on other high density/low income housing on the coast.

Will there be a new traffic light at Coral Reef Avenue in El Granada, or a center left turn lane on Hwy 1? In other words, what plans are in place to deal with traffic?

Lastly, I am CERT qualified and have learned about the threat of trying to evacuate the area. Having these six parcels in the middle of the coast with just a two lane highway as the evacuation route is reminiscent of the fire in Lahaina on Maui in 2023. From a disaster preparedness aspect, the peninsula would be safer.

Thank you for reading, Ariel Moseley, El Granada

From: [Doug Tolar](#)
To: [Will Gibson](#); [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [SMC SupMueller](#)
Subject: Agenda Item #3 San Mateo County Planning Commission Public Hearing 12/10/25 - Public Comment on the Scope of EIR
Date: Wednesday, December 10, 2025 3:24:50 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.

Hello,

I am writing to provide written public comments about the subject Agenda Item regarding proposed rezoning and associated General Plan land use designation amendments and adoption of design and development standards (the "proposal"). This proposal would allow high density multi-family residential uses on six Cabrillo Unified School District (CUSD) - owned parcels ("areas") in El Granada, CA. As a 30+ year resident and property owner who lives adjacent to the six parcels described above and one who represents other property owners who live adjacent, I want to convey that we are **strongly opposed** to the "proposal" specifically with respect to the six CUSD parcels due to a variety of adverse environmental impacts. The significant adverse impacts from allowing high density multi-family residential uses on the six CSUD parcels are described below.

Development of Rural Undeveloped Parcels - the non-El Granada parcels identified in the County's Housing Element Rezoning Program (i.e., the entirety of unincorporated Colma, the three parcels in Broadmoor, and the five parcels in the Harbor Industrial Area (unincorporated Belmont)) are more than adequate to meet the County's obligations under its Regional Housing Needs Allocation as required - only some minor allocation changes would be needed. Its an important point because these parcels "over the hill" are in densely populated suburban areas, not in a rural and undeveloped area like the El Granada parcels. These "over the hill" parcels are also adjacent to or nearby high density housing and have good access to public transportation including BART. Conversely, the El Granada parcels are surrounded by low density housing (typically single family dwellings) and narrow streets, and are not at all close to public transportation. As such, the addition of high density housing on the El Granada parcels is not practical or appropriate.

Traffic - increased traffic would only worsen congestion that is already problematic in El Granada. This is critical should there be a need to evacuate the area due to a wildfire, tsunami or other community emergency. Currently, the streets are clogged during commute times, weekend/holiday traffic flow or when there's a special event. Additional traffic caused by the proposal would be troubling and result in further gridlock.

Lack of infrastructure - (1) Streets in the adjacent areas are narrow, inadequate for existing residential parking and vehicular flow and emergency vehicles, and are inadequately maintained by the County as is; (2) Availability of water connections and sewer capacity for the proposed housing is limited at best and/or would take away from in-fill lot property owners who have been waiting for years in some cases; (3) There would be no nearby access to public transportation and should existing bus routes be expanded to the "proposal" areas, there would be adverse impacts

including but not limited to bus traffic, noise and exhaust, and narrow streets that pose hazards to pedestrians.

Lighting - the addition of street lights and high density housing lighting would destroy the darkness that adjacent property owners enjoy and value.

Noise - Increased traffic would cause additional noise as will future residents from high density housing. Local residents enjoyment and "piece of mind" of the quiet open space environment would be diminished if not eliminated.

Air Quality - increased motor vehicle emissions/exhaust (including CO, particulate matter, PM10 and reactive organics) from cars, trucks, buses, commercial vehicles, and similar emissions from residential natural gas fueled appliances (such as furnaces) and from fireplaces would potentially cause adverse public health impacts.

Loss of Views - the proposed high density housing would eliminate adjacent property owner views of the "proposal" areas, which are enjoyed and valued by local residents and visitors alike.

Destruction of Wildlife Habitat - the proposed high density housing would destroy wildlife habitat for deer, racoons, rabbits, coyote, red-tailed hawks, great blue herons, and numerous local finch and sparrow. Also, critically-threatened monarch butterfly habitat would be eliminated or destroyed.

Destruction of Seasonal Wetlands - several lower elevation parcels in the "proposal" areas include seasonal wetlands protected by law. These wetlands would be destroyed by high density housing.

Devaluation of Property Values - the property values of property owners could potentially be decreased due to high density housing being built in the property areas and/or due the prospect of such housing being built due to proposed the zoning changes.

Fire Hazard - The building of high density housing in an area classified as having a high fire hazard is not practical or appropriate. The removal of flammable vegetation in the "proposal" areas would not likely change the current fire hazard classification. As such, any future property owners in the "proposal" areas would have difficulty obtaining or renewing property insurance due to this risk.

Aircraft Flyover Hazards - The building of high density housing in an area having a high aircraft flyover hazard is not practical or appropriate. Numerous aircraft on approach to the HMB airport typically fly right over the "proposal" areas. That risk would only increase should high density housing be built in the "proposal" areas.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide these written public comments and look forward to participating in this public process as it progresses.

Should you have any questions or need any additional information, please don't hesitate contacting me.

Thank you,
Douglas Tolar

From: [Dan Haggerty](#)
To: [Dan Haggerty](#)
Cc: [Dan Haggerty](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 3 Rezoning Program El Granada
Date: Wednesday, December 10, 2025 9:26:19 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,

Thank you for allowing me to comment.

The proposal for rezoning in El Granada is located where there are seasonal wetlands (see attached photos) and Monarch Butterfly habitat. The California red-legged frog, which is also a California species of special concern (SSC), has a population here and a few known satellite populations nearby.

The riparian vegetation (presence of sedges, rushes, other wetland indicators) provides a climatic buffer, and is a carbon sink.

Based on this knowledge the EIR must study in detail and depth these concerns.

Thank you,
Dan Haggerty
El Granada





Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jane Praysilver](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Comment Regarding the El Granada-Princeton parcels for higher density housing
Date: Wednesday, December 10, 2025 7:10:12 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.

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 t 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: [MELINDA MacNaughton](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 3
Date: Wednesday, December 10, 2025 12:57:54 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.

Dear Planning Commission,

My name is **Melinda MacNaughton**, and I am writing as a volunteer with the [Xerces Society](#), sharing information from their scientific database that guides monarch butterfly protection efforts. I am reaching out because the monarch population that relies on **Site 3111—the El Granada 6 parcels—requires urgent and informed protection.**

For decades, monarch butterflies have migrated from the inland western United States to the coast of California, seeking safe overwintering habitat. **Site 3111 has been a documented verified overwintering location since 1988.** Early records from Xerces describe these trees so heavily clustered with monarchs that they appeared **orange**—a striking reminder of what this site once supported.

Each year, monarchs arrive in mid-fall and depend on protective trees to shelter them throughout the winter months of **October through February**. During this time, they mate and disperse inland to lay eggs, rebuilding populations throughout the western United States. These overwintering groves are not optional—they are **essential for the species' survival**. When habitat is removed or altered, monarchs experience stress, starvation, and energy depletion while searching for new refuge, decreasing their already fragile chance of survival.

Monarchs return to the same overwintering spots year after year, guided by topography and weather cues. When a site is protected, they stay, making monitoring reliable and long-term protection efforts highly worthwhile. **Fifty years ago, Site 3111 hosted monarchs in the thousands; today, their numbers are drastically reduced.** The Xerces Society strongly recommends that this site be protected, formally assessed, and enhanced to restore its value to migrating monarchs. Communities that take such action often see overwhelming local support, along with increased ecological and community value. Resources are available to assist with this important work.

Local residents already serve as dedicated community scientists, eagerly watching for the monarchs' return and reporting data that help track their arrival and population trends. Their volunteer participation underscores how deeply this community values the monarchs and how invested we are in safeguarding their future.

Unfortunately, monarch butterflies are now in **serious decline**, threatened by habitat loss and pesticide pollution. Their population has fallen from **millions in the 1980s to fewer than 8,000** along the entire California coast today. With numbers this low, **every single overwintering site is critical**, and the protection of each monarch matters. The species is currently a **candidate for listing under the Endangered Species Act**, and [The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has recommended an Endangered Species designation.](#)

Given this reality, the Xerces Society recommends **deferring any decisions** that may impact Site 3111 until additional monarch-specific input can be gathered. They further

recommend conducting a **biological study** and ensuring that **monarch protection measures** are integrated into any proposed building plans.

I respectfully urge you to consider the gravity of this situation. Protecting Site 3111 is not only a scientifically sound decision—it is a profound opportunity for our community to safeguard an irreplaceable part of El Granada and California's natural heritage. The monarchs have returned to this place for generations. Let us ensure they can continue to do so.

Thank you for your time and for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Melinda MacNaughton

From: [Igor Serikov](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Housing Element Rezoning Program
Date: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 9:52:12 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.

Hi,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of APN 047054100 and the five adjacent parcels in El Granada for high-density residential development.

I am a relatively new resident and currently work remotely. Although I must remain near the Bay Area for now, neither my wife nor I commute daily. By contrast, adding several thousand new residents many of whom will likely need to travel in and out of town multiple times a day would create severe transportation challenges. Highway 1, the only route connecting El Granada with the surrounding region, is already narrow, congested, and prone to accidents, particularly along the winding stretches near Pacifica. Additional traffic would inevitably lead to gridlock.

I understand this risk personally. About a year ago, I experienced a medical emergency and needed to be transported by ambulance to a hospital in Burlingame. I was fortunate that Highway 1 was not blocked that day; otherwise, the outcome could have been far worse.

High-density housing should be concentrated near major transportation hubs or in areas that already have, or are planning to add, significant job centers. El Granada is neither.

One of the primary reasons I chose to move here was the town's peaceful character. The proposed development would fundamentally alter that character. Property values would likely decline, and current residents could find themselves unable to sell and rebuy elsewhere without substantial financial loss.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed rezoning and urge you to reconsider its long-term impact on the community.

Regards,

Igor Serikov

From: [Mariel Smith](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Michael Schaller](#)
Subject: Public comment for Dec 10 meeting
Date: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 9:22:16 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.

Hello,

My name is Mariel and I am a native plant ecologist and resident of El Granada. I am submitting the following comment for item 3 for the 9am meeting on December 10th.

The environmental impact report (EIR) needs to consider the biological and ecological impacts that would result from the rezoning to allow for future development.

The Urban Midcoast parcels are part of an area that can be considered an important wildlife corridor between the developed area of El Granada and Montara Mountain. This land provides habitat for insect pollinators, birds, small mammals, and use by larger mammals such as a resident mountain lion, and raptors. Within a 1-mile radius, there are two California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) occurrences (i.e., populations) of federally threatened species. The monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus* ssp. *plexippus*) has an overwintering population that overlaps the Urban Midcoast parcels. It is well documented that monarch butterflies will use the non-native Eucalyptus trees as habitat (which occurs on these parcels). I have also observed some overwintering monarchs the last 2 months, so they are still present. The California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*), which is also a California species of special concern (SSC), has a population here as well, and a few known satellite populations nearby. While the species is found in wetter parts, the intactness of this land provides a habitat buffer for the species and riparian area nearby. This land also consists of two primary soil types (Tierra Loam and Denison coarse sandy loam). These soil types allow for slow percolation of water (which is important for soil-water retention), is a carbon sink, and provides a climatic buffer. Lastly, its connectivity to neighboring streets and to the Rancho Corral del Tierra trail system of Montara mountain is an important recreational need and should be considered in the EIR. Because of the connectivity to both recreation and wildlife, including an alternative in setting the land aside as a conservation easement to protect this habitat in perpetuity would be helpful. I know this would not address the housing needs, but an existing vacant, paved lot would make more sense to rezone for that purpose. I would really like to see what the true impacts are to opening up these parcels to development would be, knowing full well that re zoning is the first step in allowing proposals to develop to occur in the future.

Thank you,

Mariel

[324 Sequoia Ave](#)