From:	Janet Brayer
To:	afontaineB@cabrillo.k12.ca.us; miramontesr@cabrillo.k12.ca.us; SMC_SupMueller; Noelia Corzo; CEO_SMCSUPSPEIER; SMC_SupGauthier; David Canepa; Will Gibson; Planning_Commission
Cc:	monarchsite3111@gmail.com; Tony Bayudan; Janet Brayer
Subject:	Rezoning parcels in El Granada and impact on Monarch butterfly
Date:	Friday, October 23, 2026 11:02:00 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 Planning Department, Cabrillo Unified School District Board, Superintendent Miramontes, and the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors:

I live in El Granada and just recently learned about the plan to rezone an area in El Granada below me – on Sevilla.

Please do not rezone this land to multifamily housing.

Please send me any impact report that you have done on the Monarch butterflies that overwinter in this area.

Very few people in the vicinity of the proposed development were aware of the plan to re-zone, and we just recently saw that there has been a lot of removal of habitat/cutting of trees.

Please protect this land and create a Monarch Sanctuary/Nature Preserve.

Please perform additional community outreach and notification of hearings on the re-zoning.

Please vote against rezoning.

This land is not just empty parcels. It is a historical verified documented Monarch butterfly overwintering site by the Xerces Society for decades. It is also a seasonal wetland.

Once the habitat is destroyed, it can not be replaced.

The Seville area is the entryway to Golden Gate National Recreation Area land, and the area must be preserved.

Protecting this land would preserve endangered species habitat, safeguard a seasonal wetland, and create an extraordinary educational opportunity for Coastside students, schools and the community.

Respectfully,

Janet Brayer, El Granada Resident

From: americabliss@icloud.com
To: Will Gibson; Ray Mueller; CEO_BoardFeedback; Planning_Commission
Subject: Formal Opposition to El Granada Rezoning – Environmental, Infrastructure, and Community Impacts
Date: Saturday, November 7, 2026 4:01:47 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 as an El Granada resident to express my strong opposition to the proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 for the six parcels between Coral Reef Avenue and Sevilla Avenue.

The proposal to permit approximately 830 residential units on just 12.45 acres, with buildings potentially reaching 60–70 feet, represents an extraordinary increase in density for a small, established coastal community. I believe this scale of development is fundamentally incompatible with El Granada's infrastructure, environmental conditions, and residential character.

I support the need for housing, including affordable housing. However, meeting housing goals should not come at the expense of environmental protections, public safety, existing residents, or the long-term sustainability of our community.

My concerns include:

1. Environmental destruction and coastal habitat

These parcels are located within the Coastal Zone and contain established vegetation and wildlife habitat. Rezoning to permit intensive development could permanently alter this landscape.

I request that the Environmental Impact Report thoroughly assess impacts on mature trees, monarch butterfly habitat, owls, frogs, birds of prey, wildlife corridors, native vegetation, stormwater drainage, and sensitive coastal ecosystems.

The County must also consider the cumulative environmental consequences of concentrating development of this magnitude in a relatively small area.

2. Serious and documented sewer infrastructure limitations

This is not merely a hypothetical concern. In a December 23, 2025 letter to San Mateo County, the Granada Community Services District explicitly identified potentially inadequate sewer infrastructure serving these parcels.

The district calculated that development at the proposed maximum density could generate approximately 192,602 gallons of additional wastewater per day. For comparison, the district's entire existing service area currently generates an average of approximately 200,000 gallons per day.

In other words, the proposed density could introduce wastewater flows equivalent to approximately 96% of the district's existing average daily flow.

The district also stated that sewer infrastructure adjacent to the parcels is minimal and that existing infrastructure may be insufficient to support future development.

These findings raise serious questions about the scale, cost, feasibility, and environmental consequences of the infrastructure improvements that would be required.

I request that the EIR explicitly address these findings, identify the necessary sewer system upgrades, evaluate their environmental impacts, and determine who would be responsible for financing them.

Existing residents should not be expected to subsidize major infrastructure expansions required to accommodate development of this magnitude.

3. Traffic congestion, public safety, and emergency evacuation

El Granada has limited road access, and Highway 1 is already a critical transportation corridor for residents, commuters, visitors, and emergency responders.

Adding hundreds of residential units will substantially increase traffic on neighborhood streets and surrounding roadways.

Of particular concern is the ability to evacuate residents during wildfires, severe storms, flooding, or other emergencies. I'm part of CERT and our current evacuation plan is "stay in place" because there is no safe way out. Now add hundreds of additional people to that already terrifying scenario…

The EIR must evaluate the cumulative effects of development on traffic,

emergency access, evacuation capacity, and public safety.

4. Incompatible building heights and neighborhood character

Allowing buildings up to 70 feet tall, with significantly reduced setbacks, would fundamentally alter the character of an established neighborhood consisting predominantly of one- and two-story homes.

This is not a modest increase in density. It is a dramatic transformation of the physical environment, with potential consequences for privacy, sunlight, views, noise, and the everyday quality of life of surrounding residents.

The County should not impose urban-scale development standards on an established coastal neighborhood without thoroughly evaluating these impacts and considering substantially less intensive alternatives.

5. Potential financial harm to existing working-class homeowners

I am also deeply concerned about the potential financial consequences for existing homeowners in the surrounding neighborhood.

El Granada is home to working-class families, longtime residents, and people who have invested much of their lives in their homes. For many households, their home is not simply a place to live; it represents their largest financial asset, their retirement security, and the wealth they hope to pass on to their children.

The County should not disregard the possibility that placing substantially taller, denser buildings immediately adjacent to existing homes could negatively affect their desirability, marketability, or value.

While the extent of any impact would need to be established through evidence, the financial risks deserve serious consideration.

It would be particularly troubling if a policy intended to improve housing opportunities inadvertently imposed disproportionate financial burdens on existing working-class residents.

I ask the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to consider these potential consequences and whether appropriate protections for surrounding homeowners are warranted.

6. Inadequate consideration of reasonable alternatives

I urge the County to evaluate substantially lower-density alternatives, including townhomes, smaller multifamily buildings, reduced building heights, greater setbacks, single-family homes, and configurations that preserve existing vegetation and sensitive habitat.

The County should also evaluate whether its housing objectives can be achieved through alternative locations or a more geographically distributed approach, rather than concentrating such an extraordinary amount of development within one established coastal neighborhood.

My request

I strongly urge San Mateo County to reject the proposed rezoning in its current form.

Before proceeding, the County must demonstrate that the maximum development permitted under the proposed zoning can be accommodated without unacceptable environmental impacts, infrastructure deficiencies, public safety risks, or disproportionate harm to the surrounding community.

I request that these comments be included in the official EIR scoping record and considered by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors throughout the rezoning process.

El Granada deserves responsible planning that balances housing needs with environmental stewardship, infrastructure capacity, public safety, and the protection of existing residents.

Sincerely,

America
El Granada, California

From:	DELIA COMITO
To:	Planning_Commission; Will Gibson
Subject:	11/18/26 San Mateo County Planning Commission Special Meeting, Item 3. Scoping Session for an EIR for the SMC Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase II – El Granada
Date:	Sunday, November 8, 2026 1:54:40 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.

The proposed zoning change on the six subject parcels totaling 12.45 acres will require the development of 373.5 living units at minimum, to 871.5 living units at maximum, where currently 99.6 living units at minimum and 211.65 living units at maximum is allowed. Based on the standard 5,000 square foot lot size, we would expect about 108 additional single-family homes to be built on the six subject parcels. The change proposed at minimum will increase the number of living units by **245.8%**, and at the maximum will increase to the number of living units by **706.9%** compared to the number of living units expected on these parcels. This amounts to an assault on the town of El Granada, and certainly a crime against the homeowners adjacent to this area. ***This proposed zoning change should be completely off the table. It is unacceptable.***

If the county must cram additional low-income development within our community to satisfy the state requirements, I suggest finding an alternative location, such as the area of parcels zoned PUD on the ocean-side of Hwy. 1, just north of Frenchmen's Creek.

Respectfully,

DELIA COMITO
462 Coronado Street
PO Box 1953
El Granada, CA 94018

From: Haley Peterson
To: Will Gibson
Subject: NOP Comment – Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2, El Granada
Date: Monday, November 9, 2026 9:21:23 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 Mr. Gibson,

I'm writing to comment on the Notice of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report for the Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 in El Granada. I'm a longtime El Granada resident and CUSD parent, and I live near the Cabrillo Unified School District parcels between Clipper Ridge and Lower El Granada.

I understand the county must plan for more housing. But this land has serious environmental and safety issues, and I'm asking that the EIR look at them fully and honestly. Because this is a Program EIR, future projects may rely on it, so it needs to be thorough now.

1. The habitat as it was before the trees came down
In late October, just as this review was getting started, CUSD cut down many of the eucalyptus trees on the property without notice to neighbors. The EIR should describe the site as it was before that cutting, using aerial photos, neighbor records, and any other available information, so that removing habitat ahead of the review doesn't shrink what gets studied. The EIR should also say which trees were removed, when, and under what permit or exemption.

2. Wetland and wildlife
This property is a wetland, and it is full of life. On the morning of November 9, 2026, I walked the property and identified 23 bird species: Downy Woodpecker, Hairy Woodpecker, Northern Flicker, Lesser Goldfinch, House Finch, Hermit Thrush, American Robin, American Crow, California Scrub-Jay, Song Sparrow, Golden-crowned Sparrow, Dark-eyed Junco, Spotted Towhee, California Towhee, Bewick's Wren, Northern House Wren, Chestnut-backed Chickadee, Ruby-crowned Kinglet, Yellow-rumped Warbler, Townsend's Warbler, Black Phoebe, and Anna's Hummingbird.

That was one walk, on one morning, after much of the tree cover had already been removed. Several of these birds, like the Townsend's Warbler, Hermit Thrush, and Golden-crowned Sparrow, come here specifically to spend the winter. The three woodpecker species depend on mature trees for food and nesting. The site also supports frogs, snakes, herons, owls, and hawks.

The EIR should include:

- A full wetland delineation of the site
- Bird surveys across all seasons, including winter and the spring nesting season
- Surveys for monarch butterflies through the whole overwintering season, not a single visit
- Surveys for raptors, owls, amphibians, reptiles, and any special-status species
- An honest look at whether this site qualifies as environmentally sensitive habitat under

the Coastal Act

3. Flooding and drainage
The wetland soaks up stormwater that would otherwise flow into our streets and homes. Lower El Granada already floods. The EIR should study how paving and building on this land would change runoff and flooding for the surrounding neighborhoods, especially downhill.

4. Evacuation in an emergency
In an earthquake, tsunami, or wildfire, everyone in this area must leave on the same few roads, and those roads back up on an ordinary weekend. The EIR should model how long it would take to evacuate the neighborhoods, Highway 1, and the new housing at full buildout, and whether that's safe.

5. Roads, power, water, and sewer
Our roads, drainage, and power already struggle. Outages are common. The EIR should look at whether existing water, sewer, power, and roads can actually serve this many new homes, and what upgrades would be needed and who would pay for them.

6. All six parcels together
The EIR should look at the combined effect of developing all six El Granada parcels, plus other growth on the Midcoast, not each site on its own.

7. Other options
The EIR should study real alternatives, including leaving the wetland parcel out of the rezoning, lower density, or meeting the housing need on other sites with fewer risks.

Thank you for taking these comments. Please add me to the notification list for this project and let me know when the Draft EIR is released.

Sincerely,

Haley Peterson
El Granada, CA
haleylynnpeterson@gmail.com
310.483.3666

From: Joy Allen
To: Will Gibson
Subject: Housing Element Rezoning Program. El Granada
Date: Monday, November 9, 2026 1:24:00 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.

Dear Mr Gibson And Members Of The Planning Department,

I strongly oppose this proposed rezoning. El Granada is not an appropriate location for this development which would over run all the existing infrastructure. The proposed high density housing will create numerous devastating problems.

The proposed site has no accommodation for all the parking required. The surrounding residential streets will be overwhelmed. It will create congestion, reduced visibility for drivers and pedestrians, and make access mor difficult for emergency vehicles.

The proposed density of 30 to 70 residential units per acre, along with potential building heights of 60 to 70 feet represents a substantial departure from the one and two story single family homes in El Granada.

My husband and I have lived in El Granada for 53 years. We raised our two boys here. The unique beauty and nature surrounding El Granada will be destroyed by creating this wildly inappropriate density.

From: Bill and Patty Gerard
To: Will Gibson
Subject: San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 El Granaa EIR
Date: Monday, November 9, 2026 2:22:48 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.

Dear San Mateo County Planning Department,

As a resident who has lived in our home on Coral Reef Avenue for 44 years, I am writing to submit my formal scoping comments for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) regarding the San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 – El Granada (Cabrillo Unified School District parcels).

Over more than four decades of living directly adjacent to these parcels, I have experienced firsthand the unique environmental and infrastructural constraints of our immediate neighborhood. Introducing a maximum density of up to 60–70 units per acre—totaling up to 832 units on these 12.45 acres—presents unprecedented risks to public safety and environmental stability. I demand that the EIR rigorously analyze, quantify, and mitigate the following hyper-local impacts to my property and the surrounding Midcoast community:

- **Stormwater, Drainage, and Severe Pooling:** The open land less than 40 feet from my property's fence line already experiences exceptionally poor drainage during excessive rainstorms, leading to large areas of heavy water pooling. Having observed this seasonal water flow for 44 years, I know that this open soil acts as a critical absorption buffer. Converting this acreage into high-density impervious surfaces will eliminate this natural drainage capacity and cause catastrophic runoff. The EIR must execute a highly localized hydrological study to analyze exactly how grading, paving, and construction will alter water flow, and how it will prevent severe flooding and soil erosion onto my adjacent property and down Coral Reef Avenue.
- **Biological Resources and Special-Status Wildlife Habitat:** As a 44-year resident, I can personally attest to the rich, active wildlife that relies entirely on these vacant parcels. The high trees on this property are actively used by native hawks and owls
- that nest and hunt here, and the land serves as a vital corridor and habitat for local foxes and coyotes. Furthermore, I routinely have Monarch butterflies in my own backyard, directly utilizing the contiguous habitat these parcels provide. The EIR must conduct thorough, multi-season biological surveys rather than relying on brief or historical data. It must fully assess the destruction of these nesting trees, the displacement of local predatory mammals, and the loss of critical overwintering and foraging habitats for the protected Monarch butterfly.
- **Wildfire Evacuation and Public Safety:** Coral Reef Avenue and Sonora Avenue are narrow residential streets that feed into an already heavily bottlenecked Highway 1 corridor. Over my 44 years here, I have seen traffic conditions steadily deteriorate. The EIR must include a comprehensive dynamic evacuation model analyzing how adding up to 832 units (and over a thousand vehicles) will impact evacuation clearance times for long-term residents along the Midcoast during a catastrophic wildfire event.
- **Local Traffic Circulation and Gridlock:** The EIR must evaluate the direct traffic injection onto Coral Reef Avenue. The study must assess the vehicle capacity limits of turning out of local neighborhood streets onto Highway 1, cumulative weekend tourist traffic, and the structural safety risks of increased vehicle counts on quiet residential streets that completely lack robust sidewalk infrastructure.
- **Coastal Zone and Community Character Constraints:** This site falls under the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Act and the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP). The EIR must analyze the irreconcilable structural conflict between a 70-foot/high-density zoning designation and existing LCP

mandates regarding the preservation of highly scenic coastal corridors, visual resources, and established Midcoast community character.

Please ensure that I am added to the interested parties list for all future public notices, draft EIR releases, and Planning Commission hearing agendas regarding this project.

Thank you for your consideration of these deeply critical issues.

Sincerely,

Bill and Patty Gerard
210 Coral Reef Avenue
El Granada, CA 94018 (mail: Half Moon Bay, CA 94019)

gerardfam@yahoo.com

From: pudsey
To: Will Gibson; Ray Mueller; CEO_BoardFeedback; Planning_Commission
Subject: Opposition to El Granada Rezoning—Highway 1 Vulnerability, Emergency Evacuation, and Infrastructure Capacity
Date: Monday, November 9, 2026 2:44:33 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.

Dear Mr. Gibson, Planning Commissioners, and County Supervisors,

I am writing as an El Granada resident to formally oppose the proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2, which would permit substantially higher-density development on six parcels between Coral Reef Avenue and Sevilla Avenue.

My primary concern is that San Mateo County is proposing a dramatic increase in residential density without first demonstrating that the Coastside's transportation network, emergency evacuation routes, and essential infrastructure can safely accommodate it.

This is not simply a question of whether El Granada should accommodate additional housing. It is a question of whether the County is making responsible land-use decisions in a geographically constrained coastal community facing documented infrastructure and climate-related vulnerabilities.

1. Highway 1 is already a documented infrastructure vulnerability

Caltrans is currently conducting the Surfers Beach Sea Level Rise Adaptation Feasibility Study to address recurring coastal erosion and flooding along Highway 1 near El Granada.

The fact that Caltrans is evaluating options ranging from protecting the existing roadway to potentially relocating it inland should give the County serious pause.

Highway 1 is not merely a commuting route. It is an essential transportation corridor for Coastside communities, emergency vehicles, and evacuation traffic.

How can the County responsibly authorize zoning that could accommodate hundreds of additional households without first understanding the future reliability and capacity of this critical roadway?

I request that the EIR incorporate Caltrans' findings and evaluate scenarios involving partial or complete Highway 1 closures, storm damage, coastal erosion, and prolonged roadway repairs.

2. Emergency evacuation capacity must be demonstrated, not assumed

El Granada has limited routes connecting it to surrounding communities. During a major wildfire, tsunami warning, earthquake, or severe storm, thousands of residents could need to evacuate simultaneously.

Adding hundreds of households to an already constrained transportation network raises serious public-safety questions.

I request that the County conduct a comprehensive, publicly available evacuation analysis,

developed with input from CAL FIRE, the local fire protection district, Caltrans, and emergency management authorities.

That analysis should account for:

- Simultaneous evacuations across multiple Coastside communities.
- Highway 1 lane closures or complete road closures.
- Congestion caused by residents, visitors, and emergency responders using the same routes.
- The cumulative population growth associated with other proposed and approved developments.
- Evacuation needs of older residents, people with disabilities, and households without reliable access to vehicles.
- Worst-case conditions involving nighttime emergencies, severe weather, and limited visibility.

A theoretical traffic study conducted under normal conditions is not a substitute for understanding how this community would function during a genuine emergency.

I also request that the County identify measurable evacuation performance standards and explain what mitigation would be required if those standards cannot be met.

3. Existing wastewater infrastructure may be inadequate

The Granada Community Services District has already raised documented concerns about the proposed rezoning.

In its December 23, 2025 letter to the County, the district estimated that development at the proposed maximum density could generate approximately 192,602 gallons of additional wastewater daily, compared with approximately 200,000 gallons of existing average daily flow.

The district also identified minimal sewer infrastructure adjacent to the parcels and warned that existing infrastructure may be insufficient to accommodate future development.

These are substantial concerns that should be resolved before the County adopts zoning changes intended to facilitate high-density housing.

The EIR should identify the infrastructure upgrades necessary to serve the full development potential, their environmental consequences, their estimated costs, and who would pay for them.

The County must also examine whether wastewater systems would remain reliable during major storms, flooding, and extended power outages.

4. Cumulative impacts cannot be evaluated in isolation

The County should not assess these parcels as though they exist independently of the rest of the Coastside.

Housing growth in neighboring communities, ongoing transportation constraints, school capacity, water availability, emergency response demands, and climate-related infrastructure risks all affect El Granada.

The proposed rezoning could permit buildings reaching 60–70 feet, with densities dramatically exceeding those of the surrounding one- and two-story residential neighborhoods.

The EIR must examine the cumulative effects of this level of development, including the consequences of multiple projects proceeding before necessary infrastructure improvements are completed.

5. Rezoning now could limit meaningful scrutiny later

The County's own project description states that the purpose of these zoning amendments is to streamline the entitlement process for future residential development.

That makes the current environmental review especially consequential.

The County should not approve zoning that permits development of this magnitude while deferring fundamental questions about public safety, infrastructure capacity, and environmental impacts to future individual development applications.

I request that the EIR evaluate the full reasonably foreseeable development potential under the proposed zoning, rather than relying on assumptions about what a future developer might choose to build.

I also request meaningful evaluation of lower-density alternatives that could accommodate additional housing while reducing demands on infrastructure and preserving the established scale of the surrounding neighborhood.

My request

I urge the County to reject the proposed rezoning in its current form.

Before proceeding, San Mateo County should publicly demonstrate that the maximum development potential can be supported by safe evacuation routes, reliable transportation infrastructure, sufficient wastewater capacity, adequate emergency services, and appropriate environmental safeguards.

If those conditions cannot be demonstrated, the proposed density and building heights should be substantially reduced.

I support responsible housing development. I do not support making permanent land-use decisions that could expose existing and future residents to avoidable risks.

Please include these comments in the official EIR scoping record and ensure that the concerns raised receive meaningful consideration throughout the planning and approval process.

Sincerely,

Tony
El Granada, California

From: Jan Mackintosh
To: Planning_Commission
Subject: Formal opposition to proposed high-density rezoning in El Granada
Date: Tuesday, November 10, 2026 9:30:03 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.

Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to San Mateo County's proposed rezoning of six undeveloped parcels totaling approximately 12.45 acres in El Granada, under the Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2.

I have lived in the neighborhood immediately adjacent to these parcels for **46 years**. During that time, I have witnessed the growth and changes in our coastal community, and I am deeply concerned that this proposal represents an unprecedented and potentially irreversible threat to the environment, infrastructure, safety, and rural character of El Granada.

I recognize that San Mateo County faces significant housing challenges. However, addressing those challenges should not come at the expense of established communities whose infrastructure and public services are already stretched to their limits. The proposed density is fundamentally incompatible with the physical limitations and residential character of this location.

1. Irreversible Loss of Wildlife Habitat and Open Space

For decades, these undeveloped parcels have provided habitat and refuge for an extraordinary variety of wildlife. I have personally observed raccoons, foxes, coyotes, skunks, monarch butterflies, bats, and owls in this area.

These animals are not simply occasional visitors. This open space is part of the natural environment that supports their survival, providing habitat, shelter, feeding opportunities, and movement corridors.

Replacing these natural areas with multistory apartment buildings, paved surfaces, parking areas, and associated infrastructure would permanently alter the ecosystem. Increased artificial lighting, noise, traffic, and human activity would further disrupt wildlife behavior and habitat.

I strongly urge the County to require comprehensive biological surveys, including assessments of sensitive species, nesting birds, bats, monarch butterfly habitat, wildlife movement corridors, and the cumulative effects of habitat fragmentation.

Once this land is developed, its ecological value cannot simply be recreated elsewhere.

2. Grossly Inadequate Infrastructure

The possibility of accommodating more than 800 residential units on just 12.45 acres raises serious questions about whether El Granada can realistically support development of this magnitude.

Our community has limited public transportation, constrained water and sewer infrastructure, limited local medical services, and roads that are already heavily congested.

Particularly alarming is the Granada Community Services District's assessment that development at the maximum proposed density could generate approximately 193,000 gallons of additional wastewater daily—nearly equal to the district's current average daily wastewater flow.

The district has also identified minimal existing sewer infrastructure adjacent to the parcels and warned that existing facilities may be insufficient.

These are not hypothetical neighborhood objections. They are documented infrastructure concerns raised by the agency responsible for providing sewer services.

Before considering rezoning, the County must demonstrate through independent, publicly available studies that adequate water, wastewater, drainage, and utility capacity can be provided without compromising service to existing residents or imposing unreasonable financial burdens on the community.

3. Traffic Congestion and Emergency Evacuation

Highway 1 is the principal transportation corridor serving El Granada and the surrounding Coastside. It is already subject to significant congestion, particularly during commuting hours, weekends, and peak visitor periods.

Adding hundreds of households could introduce hundreds of additional vehicles to a transportation network that has few practical alternatives.

Equally concerning is emergency evacuation.

In the event of a wildfire, tsunami, major earthquake, or other disaster, residents depend on a limited number of routes to leave the area. The addition of such a large residential population could significantly increase evacuation times and impede access for firefighters, ambulances, and other emergency responders.

The County must evaluate realistic worst-case evacuation scenarios, including road closures, simultaneous evacuations, and peak traffic conditions—not merely average daily traffic volumes.

Public safety should take precedence over housing density targets.

4. Inadequate Parking and Public Transportation

The proposed zoning changes would allow parking requirements of no more than one space per residential unit.

In a community with limited public transportation, this is unrealistic.

Many households require more than one vehicle for employment, shopping, medical appointments, school transportation, and daily necessities. Unlike urban communities with extensive transit systems, El Granada does not offer residents a practical way to meet many of these needs without a car.

The resulting parking demand could overwhelm surrounding residential streets, create additional traffic hazards, and diminish access for existing residents and emergency vehicles.

The County must evaluate actual household transportation needs rather than assume that urban parking standards are appropriate for a relatively isolated coastal community.

5. Insufficient Schools, Medical Services, and Emergency Resources

Our local schools already face capacity constraints, and the Coastside has limited medical and emergency healthcare facilities.

El Granada has no local hospital or full-service emergency department. Residents frequently must travel considerable distances for emergency

medical treatment and specialized care.

A development capable of housing potentially well over a thousand additional residents would create substantial new demands for schools, emergency medical services, fire protection, law enforcement, and other essential public resources.

The County should not approve zoning changes that permit such dramatic population growth without first demonstrating that these services can adequately support it.

6. Incompatibility With El Granada's Rural Residential Character

El Granada is a distinctive coastal community characterized by relatively low-density residential neighborhoods, natural open spaces, mature trees, and a close relationship with the surrounding environment.

The proposed zoning changes would permit buildings approximately 60 to 70 feet tall, substantially reduced setbacks, and densities far exceeding those of surrounding neighborhoods.

Such development would be dramatically out of scale with the existing one- and two-story homes.

The resulting impacts on privacy, sunlight, neighborhood noise, visual character, and quality of life could be substantial.

These concerns are not simply matters of personal preference. They involve fundamental questions about responsible land-use planning and compatibility with the existing community and its Coastal Zone setting.

The County must evaluate whether the proposed zoning is consistent with the intent and protections of the Local Coastal Program and the Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan.

7. Cumulative Environmental and Community Impacts

I am particularly concerned that the County may evaluate individual impacts without adequately considering their combined effects.

Traffic congestion, wildlife habitat loss, increased noise, artificial lighting, stormwater runoff, pressure on utilities, and demands on public services are interconnected.

Taken together, these changes could fundamentally transform this neighborhood.

The County should also evaluate the effects of additional impervious surfaces on drainage, erosion, flooding, and water quality, particularly given the sensitive coastal environment.

Furthermore, reduced setbacks and substantially increased building heights could intensify impacts on neighboring properties, potentially affecting their enjoyment, desirability, and marketability.

8. The Need for Responsible Alternatives

I understand that California law requires the County to plan for additional housing, including affordable housing. However, fulfilling that obligation should not mean concentrating an extraordinary level of development on six parcels within an established rural residential neighborhood.

I urge the County to seriously examine alternatives that distribute housing opportunities more appropriately, prioritize locations with existing infrastructure and transportation services, reduce permitted density and building heights, and preserve environmentally significant open space.

The Environmental Impact Report should provide a meaningful comparison of these alternatives rather than treating maximum-density development as an inevitable outcome.

My Formal Request

I respectfully request that San Mateo County:

1. Reconsider the proposed high-density rezoning of these six El Granada parcels.
2. Conduct comprehensive biological and environmental studies, including wildlife habitat and movement corridor assessments.
3. Require independent evaluations of water, sewer, transportation, parking, emergency evacuation, school capacity, and public safety impacts.
4. Fully evaluate reasonable alternatives, including substantially reduced density and preservation of environmentally sensitive portions of the property.
5. Ensure meaningful public participation before making decisions that

could permanently alter this community.

I also request that this letter be included in the official public record and considered in determining the scope of the Environmental Impact Report.

After 46 years of living alongside this open space, I have a deep appreciation for the natural environment and unique character of El Granada. I am not opposed to providing housing opportunities for people who need them. I am opposed to development of a scale and density that this particular location cannot responsibly accommodate.

Housing needs must be balanced against environmental protection, infrastructure capacity, public safety, and the rights of existing communities to responsible planning.

The decisions made today will affect El Granada for generations. I urge the County to protect this irreplaceable coastal neighborhood and reject rezoning that would permit development so profoundly incompatible with its surroundings.

Sincerely,

Jan Mackintosh
El Granada, California
Resident for 46 years

Sent from my iPhone

From:	Michelle Bradley
To:	Planning_Commission; Will Gibson
Subject:	RE: Public Comment Opposing the San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase II – El Granada | EIR Scoping Session, November 18, 2026
Date:	Tuesday, November 10, 2026 9:42:29 AM
Attachments:	Public Comment Opposing the San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase II – El Granada (EIR Scoping Session, November 18, 2026).pdf

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 Commissioners:

Please find attached my formal public comment opposing the proposed San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase II – El Granada, submitted in connection with Agenda Item 3, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Scoping Session scheduled for November 18, 2026.

I strongly urge the Commission to give careful consideration to the substantial environmental and community concerns outlined in my letter and to ensure that these issues are thoroughly evaluated and meaningfully addressed throughout the environmental review process.

Along with many fellow Coastside residents, I am firmly opposed to the proposed rezoning and the high-density development it would permit on these environmentally sensitive parcels. **I remain committed to actively participating in this process and advocating vigorously for the preservation of these irreplaceable coastal lands.**

Please include my attached comment in the official administrative record for this proceeding and in the public comments considered during preparation of the EIR.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Dr. Michelle Goldhaber, Ph.D., J.D.
Attorney; Resident of El Granada, California

November 10, 2026

San Mateo County Planning Commission
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
planning_commission@smcgov.org

RE: Public Comment for Agenda Item 3 — Scoping Session for an Environmental Impact Report for the San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase II – El Granada (November 18, 2026)

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am a resident of El Granada, San Mateo County ("County"), California, and I am writing to reiterate and expand upon my previously submitted objections, dated October 22, 2025, to the proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program. Specifically, I strongly oppose Phase II of the program, which would rezone six currently undeveloped parcels totaling approximately 12.45 acres between Coral Reef Avenue and Sevilla Avenue in El Granada.

While I recognize the County's obligation to address regional housing needs under California law, I remain firmly opposed to the proposed high-density rezoning of these parcels. The County's housing obligations should not come at the expense of irreplaceable coastal habitat and the environmental integrity of our community. The County must meaningfully consider whether its housing objectives can be achieved through less environmentally damaging alternatives rather than permanently altering this ecologically significant landscape.

I urge the Planning Commission to ensure that the Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") comprehensively evaluates the following concerns before any decision is made to approve the proposed rezoning.

(i) The proposed rezoning threatens sensitive wildlife habitat and critical ecological connectivity.

The parcels proposed for rezoning are situated within an important area of potential habitat connectivity between the developed community of El Granada and the surrounding natural landscape of Rancho Corral de Tierra and Montara Mountain. These lands may provide important ecological connections between coastal and upland environments, supporting habitat for pollinators, birds, amphibians, and mammals.

Importantly, the County's own October 23, 2026 Notice of Preparation ("NOP") acknowledges that the project area contains potentially sensitive natural communities, suitable overwintering habitat for western monarch butterflies, and suitable upland habitat for the federally and state-listed California red-legged frog. The County has also identified suitable habitat for special-status plants, Crotch's bumble bee, nesting birds, and other wildlife (NOP, p. 4). These preliminary findings reinforce the serious ecological concerns raised in my earlier public comment.

I request that the EIR include appropriately timed biological surveys sufficient to establish the presence or absence of sensitive species and evaluate how the development enabled by the proposed rezoning could affect wildlife movement and habitat connectivity. The analysis should assess not merely the removal of individual trees or vegetation, but the broader ecological consequences of fragmenting this landscape through high-density residential development.

The EIR should further evaluate whether portions of the project area qualify as environmentally sensitive habitat areas under applicable coastal protections and whether the proposed development standards would adequately protect these resources. The presence of suitable habitat should not be dismissed simply because sensitive species have not yet been formally documented through comprehensive surveys.

(ii) High-density development could irreversibly damage wetlands and compromise the area's environmental resilience.

The County's NOP acknowledges that preliminary investigations identified wet soil conditions and wetland vegetation across much of the lower, central, and southwestern portions of the project area, indicating that wetlands may be present (NOP, p. 4). These findings are particularly concerning given the intensity of development contemplated under the proposed rezoning.

I request that the EIR include a formal wetland delineation and a site-specific assessment of how proposed development could alter existing hydrological conditions. The analysis should evaluate the consequences of grading, vegetation removal, and the construction of substantial impervious surfaces, including potential changes to stormwater runoff and the natural movement of water through the landscape.

These undeveloped parcels may also perform important environmental functions through their existing vegetation and soils, including carbon storage and local temperature regulation. The EIR should evaluate whether these functions would be diminished or permanently lost under the proposed development standards.

Where wetlands or other sensitive habitats are confirmed, the County must evaluate alternatives that avoid disturbance and preserve appropriate ecological buffers. The existence of potentially sensitive wetlands warrants careful consideration of whether these parcels are suitable for the proposed intensity of development in the first place.

(iii) The proposed development would place additional strain on El Granada's already constrained infrastructure.

As an El Granada resident, I have experienced firsthand the significant congestion affecting Highway 1 and the surrounding coastal road network, particularly during weekends, holidays, the fall pumpkin season, and periods of high tourism. The increased residential capacity contemplated by the rezoning raises substantial concerns regarding transportation safety and the ability of residents to evacuate during emergencies.

I request that the EIR evaluate vehicle miles traveled and assess whether the existing road network can accommodate reasonably foreseeable development without compromising public safety. Particular attention should be given to emergency evacuation scenarios, including wildfire events in which residents may need to leave the Coastside while emergency personnel attempt to enter the area. The analysis must consider cumulative impacts alongside other existing and reasonably foreseeable development throughout the Midcoast.

The proposed rezoning also raises significant questions regarding wastewater infrastructure. In a December 23, 2025 letter to County Planner Will Gibson, the Granada Community Services District ("GCSD") estimated that development of the six parcels at 70 units per acre could theoretically generate approximately 192,602 additional gallons of wastewater per day—nearly equivalent to the District's then-reported average daily wastewater flow of 200,000 gallons. GCSD further noted that existing sewer infrastructure adjacent to the parcels was minimal and might be insufficient to support future development.

These documented concerns from the agency responsible for providing sewer service demand a substantive response in the EIR. The County should evaluate the capacity of existing infrastructure, identify any necessary improvements, and assess the environmental impacts associated with constructing or expanding wastewater facilities to accommodate the development contemplated by the rezoning.

The EIR should similarly assess water supply and emergency service capacity under a realistic maximum development scenario.

(iv) The proposed rezoning would fundamentally alter the natural character of El Granada's coastal community.

The proposed parcels contribute significantly to the natural character of El Granada and provide connectivity to neighboring streets and the trails and open spaces of Montara Mountain. My husband and I purchased our first home in El Granada in large part because of this exceptional proximity to nature. The surrounding open space is not merely an aesthetic amenity; it is integral to the community's environmental character and recreational opportunities.

The magnitude of the proposed zoning change is significant. According to the County's NOP, the rezoning would increase allowable residential densities from existing maximums of 8 or 17 units per acre to as much as 70 units per acre. The proposal also contemplates substantially reduced setbacks and building heights of 60 to 70 feet, or potentially other heights sufficient to accommodate the increased density, in an area primarily surrounded by one- and two-story residences (NOP, pp. 3–4).

Such a dramatic departure from existing development patterns warrants rigorous environmental review. I request that the EIR evaluate the foreseeable visual impacts of development at the maximum permitted building envelope, including the effects on scenic views, nighttime lighting, and the surrounding coastal landscape. The analysis should also evaluate construction and operational noise, recreational access, and consistency with the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program.

The County must consider the full consequences of the development capacity authorized by the proposed zoning amendments. These impacts should not be minimized simply because the current proposal involves rezoning rather than approval of an individual construction project.

(v) The County must meaningfully evaluate less environmentally damaging alternatives before proceeding with the proposed rezoning.

I urge the County to undertake a meaningful alternatives analysis that evaluates whether its housing objectives can be achieved without rezoning these environmentally sensitive parcels. The EIR should consider retaining the existing zoning, excluding parcels containing sensitive environmental resources, and identifying alternative locations or development configurations that could accommodate housing needs with fewer environmental impacts. The County should also explain how the project would satisfy its housing obligations under each reasonable alternative, rather than assuming that high-density development of these particular parcels is the only viable approach.

Importantly, the EIR must clarify the maximum residential density contemplated by the proposal. The October 2026 NOP describes a maximum density of 70 units per acre, while the November 18 Planning Commission agenda describes densities ranging from 70 to 120 units per acre. This discrepancy is material to the scope of the environmental analysis. The County should reconcile these descriptions and evaluate the environmental consequences of the maximum development capacity that the proposed zoning would actually permit.

Given the proposed streamlined, by-right approval framework, it is particularly important that the County evaluate foreseeable environmental impacts at this stage rather than defer questions that can reasonably be addressed now to subsequent development approvals. The EIR should identify meaningful and enforceable mitigation measures for any potentially significant impacts and disclose those impacts that cannot feasibly be avoided.

Conclusion

El Granada's remaining undeveloped coastal parcels represent a finite and irreplaceable environmental resource. Once these lands are developed, the loss of habitat and ecological connectivity cannot simply be reversed. The County's preliminary identification of potentially sensitive wetlands and wildlife habitat underscores the importance of carefully evaluating whether these parcels should be rezoned for intensive residential development at all.

I urge the Planning Commission to ensure that the EIR thoroughly evaluates the environmental consequences of the proposed rezoning, meaningfully considers less damaging alternatives, and examines long-term conservation measures, including conservation easements where feasible.

I respectfully request that the County remove the six El Granada parcels from the proposed high-density rezoning program and pursue alternative means of satisfying its housing obligations that do not require sacrificing this environmentally sensitive coastal landscape.

Please include these comments in the official administrative record for the EIR scoping process and provide notice when the Draft EIR becomes available for public review.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

/Michelle Goldhaber/
Dr. Michelle Goldhaber, Ph.D., J.D.
Attorney; Resident of El Granada, California