

From: [Maqda Gonzalez](#)
To: [Kanoa Kelley](#)
Subject: 521 3rd Avenue, North Fair Oaks - Opposition to Subdivision
Date: Thursday, March 26, 2026 12:00:03 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,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced address, as I will not be able to attend the meeting on March 26th. I would appreciate staff reading this comment aloud at the meeting, and making it a part of the formal record.

While I understand and appreciate the need for more housing in the area, I am strongly opposed to this project because of the very negative impacts it will have on parking and traffic in the neighborhood and particularly Third Avenue.

My family has lived on Third Avenue for nearly 60 years so we have seen the changes over time and have tried to adjust to the overcrowding and many vehicles parking in the neighborhood, and major traffic congestion. If you have visited the area, you will clearly and easily see that traffic and parking is a major problem impacting our quality of life.

Over the years, we have purchased our homes on Second, Third and Fourth Avenue to be close to our parents. Collectively, we own six properties on Second, Third and Fourth between Edison Way and Middlefield. Without exception, we are not able to park our own cars in front of our homes. Our children, family members, and medical professionals cannot park in front of our homes, and must park long distances away when they come to visit. One of our homes is on a corner lot and we still are not able to park adjacent to the home. I provide this level of detail so that you can understand the real life experiences of not enough parking.

The entire area is impacted by lack of parking and traffic. We are compressed between all the traffic on Middlefield and Edison on the east and west, and between Second and Fifth Avenues to the south and north. Further, we have other institutions within these few blocks that create a great deal of traffic and parking issues on a daily basis, for example the High School on Fourth Avenue and Sports House on Edison. These blocks have become cut throughs for the larger community. The improvements on Middlefield Road have simply caused more traffic on Middlefield and the surrounding streets - the streets where we live.

Residents that live many houses away do not have room to park in front of their homes, either because they have too many vehicles or because others are parked in front of their homes. There is a significant domino effect on parking. Further, people from other surrounding streets park their cars on Third Avenue and often leave them there for days at a time. Using the parking in front of our homes as if it were long term overnight parking. There are several businesses in the immediate area such as landscaping, restaurants, cleaning service, a residential care facility, the high school, Sports House, all requiring more parking than they have available on their properties. We can rarely park in front of our homes as a result of all of these vehicles, commercial and residential. Some neighbors put out cones or garbage cans in front of their homes so that they can park when they return from an appointment or errand.

We understand the interest of building more housing and we also understand that commercial and light industrial businesses are very close to the residential area. We also recognize that there are multi unit homes in the area. However, there must be a limit to what we as residents of Second, Third and Fourth Avenue should and can shoulder. There are real impacts and consequences to each new project to the residents. In particular, the big concern is parking and traffic. While I am sure the project owner says, they will provide on-site parking, experience has shown that is rarely enough. Most homes have 3-4 vehicles, that would require 12-16 parking spaces on site. I ask if that number of parking spaces is factored into the project. All of these projects, including Sport House's proposed reduction of parking

are impacting our safety, quality of life, and property values.

In short, we are opposed to this project as the parking and traffic impacts will severely and negatively impact us as residents and our daily quality of life and safety.

Thank you,

Magda

From: [Emma Gonzalez-Romero](#)
To: [Kanoa Kelley](#)
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Minor Subdivision – 521 3rd Avenue
Date: Thursday, March 26, 2026 6:11:51 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.

I am writing to express **strong opposition** to the proposed subdivision at 521 3rd Avenue to create four townhouse units on a 10,491 sq. ft. parcel.

I live just a few homes from this property and have been part of this neighborhood for decades. This area is a well-established single-family neighborhood with long-standing residents who have deep roots in North Fair Oaks. This proposal represents a **clear and significant departure** from the existing character of the community.

While I understand and support the need for additional housing, this project is not the right fit for this location.

My concerns are as follows:

- **Incompatibility with neighborhood character:** Four townhouse units on a single parcel in a predominantly single-family area is an over-intensification of use that does not align with the surrounding development pattern.
- **Parking and traffic impacts:** This neighborhood already experiences constrained parking. Increasing density at this scale will exacerbate parking shortages and create additional traffic and safety concerns on local streets.
- **Direct impact on adjacent residents:** The scale and proximity of this development will affect privacy, noise levels, and the overall livability of neighboring homes.
- **Precedent-setting impact:** Approval of this project will set a precedent for similar subdivisions, leading to incremental but permanent changes to the character of this neighborhood.

This proposal is not just about one property, it is about the **cumulative impact of land use decisions** and whether they are consistent with the existing fabric of North Fair Oaks.

Given that this recommendation will move forward to the Planning Commission, and potentially to the Board of Supervisors, I want to be very clear:

This project, as proposed, is not compatible with this neighborhood and should not be supported.

I respectfully urge the Department of Planning to reflect our concerns in its recommendation and consider whether this level of density is appropriate for this location.

Emma and Albert Romero