GRANADA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Board of Directors
Barbara Dye, President
Wanda Bowles, Vice President
Matt Allen, Director
Nancy Marsh, Director
Jen Randle, Director

October 27, 2026

Will Gibson, Planner III
Planning & Building Department
455 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063
Email: wgibson@smcgov.org

Re: County of San Mateo Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 – El Granada - NOP for Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Dear Mr. Gibson,

The Granada Community Services District (GCSD) has received the Notice of Preparation for the proposed Environmental Impact Report for the County of San Mateo Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 - El Granada. GCSD is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the sewer collection system, sewer services, and solid waste for a population of approximately 6,000 people, serving over 2,500 homes and businesses in the unincorporated areas of El Granada, Miramar, and Princeton-by-the-Sea, and the northern portion of the City of Half Moon Bay.

The SMC Housing Element Rezoning Program identifies six parcels subject to the Rezoning Plan located between Coral Reef Avenue and Sevilla Avenue in El Granada, totaling 12.45 acres of vacant undeveloped land. The County is proposing a density of 30 to 70 units per acre, which could theoretically result in 373.5 to 871.5 new units. The District uses an equivalent residential use of 221 gallons per day of wastewater per residence to calculate wastewater generation. The additional wastewater generation would therefore be between 82,544 and 192,602 gpd, a substantial increase over the district's current flow.

There is currently minimal sewer infrastructure adjacent to the identified parcels. Additionally, substantial upgrades to the existing collection system and possibly to the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside's (SAM's) pump stations at Princeton and Portola would likely be necessary and should be assessed and studied by the County's consultants as part of the EIR. The cost of studies to determine the needed infrastructure improvements to support the proposed Project as well as the cost of constructing the improvements shall be borne by the proposed Project and not by either GCSD or SAM.

Thank you for including GCSD in the EIR process. Should you have any question regarding this letter, please contact Hope Atmore at hatmore@granada.ca.gov.

Hope Atmore
Assistant General Manager
Granada Community Services District

Cc: Chuck Duffy, General Manager

From: Ariel Moseley
To: Will Gibson
Subject: Sonora Avenue area, El Granada
Date: Tuesday, November 10, 2026 7:38:45 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 M Gibson, I opposed higher density in the Sonora Avenue area southeast of Clipper Ridge property. Firstly, I believe the property is sensitive Monarch habitat and should be protected. Secondly, please research what will happen to Coastside's building permits if another high density project goes through. The county just had a problem with future permitting caused by one high density project. It took creative thinking to use "back fill" permits from previous years to correct this permitting restrictions oversight. The Midcoast is granted 40 permits per year. Lastly, the highway one traffic continues to be ignored, but in reality the area is already a "sitting duck" should there be a dangerous fire. (The poor decision to put dangerous bike lanes along Hwy 1 instead of a third lane for emergency vehicles shows how out of touch agencies are.) Thank you for reading, Ariel Moseley, El Granada.
Sent from my tiny computer

Date: November 6th, 2026
To: San Mateo County Planning and Building Department

Attn: Project Planner for the Housing Element Rezoning Program
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
Attn: Will Gibson
wgibson@smcgov.org

Subject: Public Comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Phase 2 Housing Element Rezoning Program (El Granada Parcels)

To the San Mateo County Planning Commission and Project Planner,

Please accept this written statement into the official public record for the scoping phase of the Phase 2 Housing Element Rezoning Program EIR. As a resident concerned with the ecological integrity of our coastal community, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of the six undeveloped parcels in El Granada for high-density housing. Because I am unable to attend the upcoming Scoping Session on November 18, 2026, in person, I request that the following critical environmental and biological issues be thoroughly analyzed in the upcoming Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

The six parcels under consideration serve as critical, contiguous open space that supports highly sensitive and legally protected wildlife. Specifically, these parcels provide documented habitat, foraging grounds, and migratory corridors for the San Francisco garter snake (Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia), which is listed as both a Federal and State Endangered Species, as well as the Monarch butterfly (Danaus plexippus), a California Species of Special Concern and a candidate for listing under the Federal Endangered Species Act.
Under the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), I request that the Draft EIR explicitly address, investigate, and answer the following questions:

1. Multi-Season Biological Surveys: Will the county mandate comprehensive, multi-season, and multi-year biological field surveys conducted by independent, qualified biologists to accurately map the presence, migration paths, and breeding patterns of the San Francisco garter snake and Monarch butterflies on these specific parcels?

2. Microclimate and Overwintering Disruption: Monarch butterflies rely on specific microclimates, windbreaks, and canopy structures provided by the local groves in El Granada. How will the removal of vegetation, grading of land, and the

introduction of multi-story structures alter the wind, temperature, and sun exposure patterns necessary to sustain these overwintering roosts?

3. Habitat Fragmentation: High-density development will introduce impermeable surfaces, fencing, and roads. How will the EIR evaluate the permanent fragmentation of the upland and wetland habitat corridors that the San Francisco garter snake relies upon for survival and genetic diversity?

4. Secondary Urban Impacts ("Take" Potential): The introduction of high-density residential housing inherently increases localized traffic, stormwater runoff, pesticide/herbicide use, and domestic pets. How will the EIR analyze and mitigate the increased risk of illegal "take" (harassment, harm, or mortality) of the San Francisco garter snake resulting from these secondary, long-term urban pressures?

5. Project Alternatives: Given the high ecological sensitivity of these coastal parcels, the EIR must analyze a robust range of alternatives. I request a detailed evaluation of a "No Project Alternative" and a "Reduced Density/ Alternative Site Location Alternative" that completely removes these six sensitive parcels from the rezoning map to protect these species.

Rezoning these specific parcels conflicts directly with the conservation goals of San Mateo County's Local Coastal Program (LCP) and threatens irreplaceable biodiversity. High-density housing is a critical regional need, but it should not be achieved at the cost of driving endangered species toward localized extinction.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and dedication to protecting our shared environment. I look forward to reviewing the county's findings and responses in the forthcoming Draft EIR.

Sincerely,

Mark Baumgarten
166 Harbour Drive, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Mbaumgar1@gmail.com
650 867-4541

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:	BEVERLY GARRITY
To:	Will Gibson
Cc:	BEVERLY GARRITY
Subject:	Response to El Granada NOP 2
Date:	Sunday, November 8, 2026 12:30:59 PM
Attachments:	BRG.HE11.2.ElGranada.EIR.pages BRG.HE11.2.ElGranada.EIR.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.

TO: Will Gibson, Planner III, SMC Planning & Building Department
FROM: Beverly R Garrity, Coastside Resident, Former CDRC Member
SUBJ: Response to El Granada NOP 2
DATE: November 8, 2026
Comments in red (see attached doc) on:
NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND SCOPING SESSION FOR THE SAN MATEO COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT REZONING PROGRAM PHASE 2 – EL GRANADA Date of Distribution: October 23, 2026
"Housing Element Program HE 11.2 identified 137 parcels to be rezoned in four distinct areas of unincorporated San Mateo County: 1) the Broadmoor area; 2) the Colma area; 3) the Belmont Harbor Industrial area; and 4) the census-designated coastal El Granada community. The first phase of the Rezoning Program included the identified parcels in Broadmoor, Colma, and the Harbor Industrial Area; this phase has been completed. The second phase includes the parcels proposed to be rezoned in the El Granada area. "
There's a legitimate planning distinction between increasing density around an established Bart station - Colma, redeveloping industrial properties in an urban employment center - Harbor Industrial,increasing density in an established residential neighborhood - Broadmoor, and introducing high-density multifamily housing into a small coastal community with different infrastructure and transportation limitations - El Granada.

1. El Granada site lacks water & sewer infrastructure capacity;
2. El Granada site has geotechnical and drainage issues;
3. El Granada site has wildfire exposure and emergency access issues;
4. El Granada site has biological resources and wetlands;
5. El Granada site has limited access to transit, HWY 1and transportation limitations;
6. El Granada is neither suburban (i.e., Broadmoor, Colma) nor urban (i.e., Colma) or industrial/commercial (i.e., Belmont Harbor) in character, rather El Granada is Coastal Residential;
7. El Granada site has significant coastal Environmental constraints

"In adopting Program HE 11.2, the County committed to creating a new set of development and design standards for the El Granada area; these standards must be implemented with the Project. New standards will consider existing conditions, including surrounding uses, densities, infrastructure, and neighborhood character. As enumerated in HE Program 11.2, the amended development standards for the Project area must include:

increasing allowable residential density from a maximum of eight and 17 units per acre to a maximum of 70 units per acre with a minimum of 30 units per acre;

eliminating residential floor area and minimum lot area per unit standards;

reducing minimum front, side, and rear yard setbacks to 10 feet or less;

reducing parking ratios to maximum one space per residential unit;

increasing maximum building height to 60 – 70 feet or other heights sufficient to allow the increase in allowed residential density of a given parcel;

limiting floor area of mixed-use development to maximum 25 percent; and

creating objective, measurable design standards governing building form within the Project area to support streamlined, staff-level review of new multifamily residential development proposals. “

Currently El Granada housing density in the residential zones ranges from 8 to 17 units per acre. The proposed rezoning would quadruple the existing housing density, allowing 30 to 70 unites per acre,. This could result in the development of 373 to 871 units. At this density the El Granada existing conditions, surrounding uses, densities, infrastructure, and neighborhood character would ALL be unreasonably and substantially impacted.

The fact that 70 units per acre may be appropriate in one location does not necessarily establish that it is appropriate in another. A consistent housing policy should consider the carrying capacity of each community, not simply the number of housing units needed to satisfy regional requirements.

“PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND SCOPE OF THE EIR Programmatic EIR: The County of San Mateo has determined that the proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 – El Granada will require preparation of a Program EIR pursuant to CEQA. The Program EIR will evaluate the environmental impacts resulting from the Project and will recommend mitigation measures to avoid or reduce significant impacts, where applicable. The Program EIR also is intended to help the County review future project proposals pursuant to Section 15168 (Program EIR) of the CEQA Guidelines. The following environmental topics will be evaluated in the EIR:

Aesthetics Mineral Resources Agriculture and Forestry Noise Air Quality Population and Housing Biological Resources Public Services Cultural Resources Tribal Cultural Resources Energy Transportation and Circulation Geology and Soils Utilities and Service Systems Greenhous Gas Emissions Wildfire Hazards and Hazardous Materials Cumulative Impacts Hydrology and Water Quality Alternatives Land Use and Planning

For each of these areas, the EIR will identify whether the proposed Project would cause significant or potentially significant impacts. Where impacts are identified, the EIR will recommend feasible mitigation measures designed to avoid, minimize, or offset those impacts. Of the topics listed above, it is anticipated that the Project will have probable environmental impacts on Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biology, Energy/Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Transportation, Utilities, and Wildfire. The alternatives analysis will evaluate a reasonable range of project alternatives that, consistent with CEQA, meet most of the project objectives and reduce or avoid any significant environmental effects of the project, including a required No Project Alternative. The EIR will therefore serve as the primary disclosure document for decision-makers, agencies, and the public, ensuring that environmental considerations are fully integrated into the planning and approval process for the Project. “

Is the entire 12.45 acres in El Granada available for residential density calculations? Will the EIR result in a lower density calculation based on net vs gross acreage, setbacks, environmental restrictions, and other development standards?

I would be an advocate of : a reasonable range of project alternatives that follow the current/existing housing density of 8-17 units per acre, that are consistent with CEQA, meet most of the project objectives and reduce or avoid any significant environmental effects of the project, including a required No Project Alternative.

Thank you for your consideration,

Beverly R Garrity

Coastal Resident
Former CDRC Chair & Member
bnrgarrity@comcast.net

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 9:45:14 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

From: Zenon P
To: Will Gibson
Subject: RE: Opposition to the proposed El Granada rezoning
Date: Saturday, November 7, 2026 9:24:05 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 Commission,

I live at 131 Harbour Drive, close to the properties proposed for rezoning, and I oppose the proposal in its current form. I would be much less opposed to modest single-family homes that fit the surrounding neighborhood.
Please address these four concerns in the Environmental Impact Report:

1. The buildings are too large for this community.
Buildings 60–70 feet tall would be out of scale with established residential neighborhoods in both El Granada and Half Moon Bay. The County's notice describes the surrounding area as primarily one- and two-story homes.

For comparison, Half Moon Bay's standard height limits for multistory homes are 28–40 feet, before exceptions.
Combined with smaller setbacks, buildings this tall would dominate nearby homes. Please compare the proposal with existing neighborhoods in both communities, show realistic images of the potential buildings, and evaluate substantially lower heights, smaller buildings, and greater separation from existing homes.

2. Highway 1 is already heavily impacted by traffic.
Highway 1 largely has one through lane in each direction along the Midcoast and already struggles with commuter and visitor traffic. The County's Get There Together overview acknowledges limited roads, heavy tourism traffic, and reliance on Highways 1 and 92 without functional alternative routes.

Please study the added traffic from development on all six parcels together, including other approved and reasonably expected development. Measure the effects during weekday commutes and busy weekends, including backups at intersections, access to Highway 1, and traffic diverted through neighborhood streets.

The County needs to explain what practical improvements would address this added demand, who would fund them, and when they would happen. Assumptions that residents will drive less need to reflect the transit options actually available here.

3. Drainage, water, and sewer capacity need a closer look.
Please examine how buildings, pavement, and excavation would affect groundwater and runoff onto neighboring properties. The County's vulnerability assessment identifies El Granada as exposed to the risk of groundwater rising toward the surface, making a study of these specific properties important.

Please also obtain current water and sewer capacity assessments covering droughts, heavy rain, and other planned development. If upgrades are needed, explain their cost, funding, and

timing.

4. Smaller-scale alternatives deserve serious consideration. Please compare the proposal with keeping the existing zoning and with fewer homes in substantially smaller buildings, including modest single-family development.
The County's April 21, 2026 staff report calculated capacity for 3,135 homes without the coastal sites, compared with a housing allocation of 2,833. I understand other requirements affect that calculation. Please explain why this level of development is needed here and whether those requirements could be met with a less intensive proposal or additional capacity on other suitable sites.

I am asking the County to substantially reduce the proposed height and density. New development should fit the scale of our coastal neighborhoods and be supported by a realistic plan for traffic, drainage, and infrastructure.

Please include my comment in the official record and keep me informed about the Draft Environmental Impact Report and future meetings.

Thank you,
Zenon Post
131 Harbour Drive
El Granada

Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer

From: j d
To: Will Gibson
Subject: Oppose!
Date: Tuesday, October 27, 2026 7:14:53 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.

Mr. Gibson and Members of the Planning Department,

As a 20 year resident of Montara, homeowner and taxpayer. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2. I have lived in this community for two decades and have a deep appreciation for the character, scale, and quality of life that make the coast such a special place to call home. I do not believe the proposed high-density housing plan is appropriate for this location, and I urge the County to carefully reconsider its approach.

Parking and Traffic Concerns

One of my greatest concerns is the lack of adequate parking. The proposal would allow a maximum of only one parking space per residential unit. In a coastal community where public transportation is not a consistently reliable or practical alternative for many residents, this parking allowance is simply not realistic. Many households rely on their vehicles for commuting, errands, school, and other daily activities.

Without sufficient on-site parking, the surrounding residential streets will likely bear the burden. Additional vehicles parked along neighborhood streets could create congestion, reduce visibility for drivers and pedestrians, and make access more difficult for emergency vehicles. I ask that the Environmental Impact Report thoroughly evaluate realistic vehicle ownership, parking demand, spillover parking, traffic circulation, and emergency access before any rezoning decisions are made.

Compatibility With Existing Neighborhoods

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 predominantly one- and two-story single-family homes that currently surround these properties.

Placing buildings of this scale in the middle of established residential neighborhoods risks fundamentally changing the appearance and character of the area. The visual impact of tall, dense buildings, along with potential loss of privacy, increased shadows, and the loss of the existing natural landscape, deserves serious consideration.

I believe new development should respect the scale and character of the surrounding community. I ask the County to evaluate lower-density alternatives and building designs that are genuinely compatible with the existing neighborhood rather than

imposing a development pattern that could permanently alter its character.

Environmental and Infrastructure Impacts

The County's own notice identifies potential wetlands and sensitive biological resources on the project parcels. It also acknowledges that the project may have environmental impacts involving transportation, aesthetics, hydrology and water quality, utilities, and other areas.

These concerns are particularly important in our coastal community. Before advancing a rezoning plan of this magnitude, the County should fully evaluate the capacity of existing water and sewer infrastructure, stormwater management, potential impacts on wetlands and wildlife habitat, and the cumulative effects of increased development. These issues should be addressed through meaningful environmental analysis and enforceable mitigation measures, not deferred until individual development proposals come forward.

Consideration for the Existing Community

After 20 years in Montara, I believe that thoughtful planning must take into account more than the number of housing units that can fit on a parcel. It must also consider whether the location can support the resulting density, whether the infrastructure is adequate, and whether the development can coexist responsibly with the established neighborhood.

I recognize the importance of addressing housing needs. However, housing goals should not come at the expense of sound planning, environmental protection, public safety, and the livability of existing residential communities. The location and scale of development matter.

I respectfully request that San Mateo County:

- Thoroughly assess parking demand, street congestion, traffic safety, and emergency access. (Look to Moonside Housing in Half Moon Bay as an example of a need for more parking)
- Evaluate the actual availability and reliability of public transportation as an alternative to private vehicles.
- Analyze the visual, privacy, and neighborhood compatibility impacts of buildings up to 60–70 feet tall.
- Fully investigate wetlands, wildlife habitat, stormwater management, and water and sewer capacity.
- Consider lower-density alternatives and other locations that may be more appropriate for high-density housing.
- Avoid advancing zoning changes until the environmental impacts and feasible mitigation measures have been fully evaluated and disclosed to the public.

As a longtime resident who has watched the coast side community evolved over the last 20 years, I am deeply concerned about the lasting consequences of this proposal. I urge the County to listen to the residents who live here and to pursue a plan that respects the community's existing character, environmental setting, and infrastructure limitations.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed rezoning as currently described and ask that the County reconsider whether this is an appropriate location for development of this scale.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Justin D'Orio
Sent from my iPhone

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:	Eric Latona
To:	Will Gibson
Subject:	Fwd: Notice of Preparation of Draft EIR: San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 – El Granada
Date:	Saturday, November 7, 2026 10:26:43 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.

My name is Eric Latona and I'm a resident off of Sonora avenue where the proposal for rezoning seems to be identified. I have many concerns about the rezoning including environmental, evacuation and most importantly the drinking water in which my entire family is using. We are on a water well like many others in the neighborhood. What considerations have been put into place for this. The wetland off of Sonora is essential to all of us and changing the natural flow of water concerns me. Can you send me an environmental report that address this concern? Thanks Eric Latona

elatona@rosendin.com

From: Kristen Kanzler White
To: Will Gibson
Subject: Formal Public Comment on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report — Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2, El Granada
Date: Wednesday, October 28, 2026 8:50:18 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.

Kristen Kanzler White

PO Box 2340/1376 Columbus Street

El Granada, California

October 28, 2026

Will Gibson, Planner III
San Mateo County Planning & Building Department
455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Mail Drop PLN 122
Redwood City, CA 94063

Via email: wgibson@smcgov.org

RE: Formal Public Comment on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report — Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2, El Granada

Dear Mr. Gibson and San Mateo County Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to express my profound concern and strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of six parcels totaling 12.45 acres of undeveloped land in El Granada under the San Mateo County Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2. As a 48-year, lifelong resident and business owner in El Granada, I have a deep and long standing connection to this community, its coastal environment, its character, and the quality of life that makes it a special place to live. I am deeply concerned that the proposed rezoning would fundamentally alter our community while placing additional and potentially unsustainable demands on an area that already faces significant limitations in infrastructure, transportation, public services, and environmental capacity.

I recognize the need for housing in our region, including affordable housing. However, the need for housing does not justify placing high-density development in locations where the existing infrastructure, transportation network, public services, and natural environment may be unable to support it responsibly. Housing policy must account for the realities of a specific location. The proposed rezoning raises serious questions about whether this is an appropriate site for development of the scale contemplated, and I urge the County to conduct a rigorous, comprehensive, and transparent environmental review before taking any further action.

1. Irreplaceable open space and environmental impacts

The proposed project would facilitate a dramatic increase in residential density, from existing

maximum allowances of eight and 17 units per acre to a minimum of 30 and a maximum of 70 units per acre. It would also allow buildings up to 60–70 feet tall, substantially changing the scale and character of development in an area currently surrounded primarily by one- and two-story homes.

This is not simply a question of allowing more homes. It is a question of whether the permanent transformation of this particular parcel of coastal land is appropriate given its environmental characteristics and its place within the larger coastal landscape.

The County's own Notice of Preparation acknowledges that the parcels contain wet soil conditions and vegetation indicative of potential wetlands. It also identifies potential sensitive natural communities and habitat suitable for western monarch butterflies, California red-legged frogs, Crotch's bumble bees, special-status birds, bats, San Francisco dusky-footed woodrats, and numerous rare plant species.

These findings warrant serious concern. The presence of potential wetlands and habitat for sensitive species should not be treated as a minor obstacle to overcome in order to accommodate development. The County must first establish precisely what ecological resources exist, how they function, and how development would affect them, both directly and indirectly.

I request that the EIR include:

- A comprehensive, site-specific biological resources assessment conducted during appropriate seasons, including a thorough wetland delineation before any decisions are made about the suitability of the site for high-density development.
- An assessment of impacts on all potentially affected special-status species, nesting birds, pollinators, wildlife movement, and sensitive natural communities.
- An evaluation of how tree removal, vegetation clearance, grading, construction noise, artificial lighting, human activity, domestic animals, and long-term habitat fragmentation would affect local wildlife.
- A detailed hydrological analysis of wetlands, groundwater, stormwater runoff, drainage patterns, erosion, and water quality, including the cumulative effects of development on surrounding properties and coastal ecosystems.
- An assessment of wildfire risk, evacuation constraints, and the effects of increased development on the surrounding coastal environment.

The County should not assume that environmental impacts can be adequately mitigated simply because mitigation measures can be written into a future development approval. Where sensitive habitat, wetlands, and other ecological resources may be affected, avoidance must be carefully evaluated before mitigation is treated as an adequate solution.

2. The loss of open space and the character of El Granada

El Granada is a coastal community with a distinct identity, shaped by its natural surroundings, relatively low-density residential neighborhoods, and connection to the open spaces of the San Mateo County coast. The proposed rezoning threatens to introduce a scale of development that is fundamentally inconsistent with the existing character of this area.

Allowing buildings of 60–70 feet in height, reducing setbacks to 10 feet or less, eliminating minimum lot-area-per-unit standards, and permitting residential densities as high as 70 units per acre would represent a substantial change from the surrounding neighborhood.

The EIR must evaluate not only the visual effects of these changes, but also their effects on neighborhood character, privacy, sunlight, views, perceived density, and the transition between the proposed development and existing homes. It must also assess the cumulative effects of this rezoning alongside other existing and anticipated development in the coastal region.

Once undeveloped land is transformed into dense residential development, that change is effectively permanent. The County should carefully consider the long-term consequences of sacrificing this open space rather than treating the land as an interchangeable location for housing.

3. Traffic congestion and the limitations of Highway 1

Transportation is one of my greatest concerns. Highway 1 is already a major transportation constraint for residents of El Granada and the surrounding coastal communities. Traffic congestion, limited alternative routes, and the area's dependence on a relatively constrained road network are existing realities.

Adding a substantial number of new residents to this location will inevitably create additional transportation demands. Those demands cannot be evaluated solely by estimating vehicle trips from the proposed parcels in isolation. The EIR must consider how the project would affect existing traffic conditions, intersections, access roads, emergency response, and the broader Highway 1 corridor, including cumulative impacts from other development in the region.

The County must also examine whether the surrounding streets and intersections can safely accommodate increased traffic and whether existing road infrastructure can handle construction activity and the long-term needs of a significantly larger population.

I request that the EIR include realistic traffic modeling for peak commuting periods, weekends, seasonal coastal traffic, and emergency evacuation scenarios. It should assess cumulative traffic impacts and identify feasible measures to address them, rather than relying on assumptions that additional residents can be accommodated without substantial consequences.

4. Parking limitations and the reduction of required parking

The proposed rezoning would reduce parking requirements to a maximum of one space per residential unit. I am concerned that this approach does not adequately account for the transportation realities of El Granada.

This is not a community with the extensive public transportation network found in a major urban center. Many residents depend on personal vehicles to reach employment, medical appointments, schools, shopping, and essential services. A parking standard that may be workable in a densely populated urban neighborhood with frequent transit service may not be appropriate for a coastal community with limited alternatives.

If the development does not provide sufficient parking for residents, visitors, caregivers, and

service providers, vehicles may spill onto surrounding residential streets. This could create additional congestion, reduce access for emergency vehicles, increase competition for existing parking, and negatively affect neighboring residents.

The EIR should evaluate realistic vehicle ownership and parking demand, visitor parking, on-street parking capacity, and the potential for spillover into nearby neighborhoods. It should also examine whether reduced parking requirements would create unintended burdens for existing residents.

Parking demand must be assessed based on the actual transportation options available in El Granada, not on an assumption that residents will be able to rely on public transit that may not adequately serve their daily needs.

5. Overburdened public services and inadequate infrastructure

El Granada and the surrounding coastal communities already face limitations in access to essential services. These limitations must be central to the County's environmental review.

Residents have limited local access to medical services, constrained public transportation options, and existing demands on schools and other public services. Adding a substantial residential population without a clear, funded, and realistic plan for supporting that growth risks placing further pressure on systems that already serve a geographically constrained community.

The County's Notice of Preparation identifies the Coastside County Water District as the water provider and the Granada Community Services District as the sewer provider. The EIR must go beyond identifying these agencies and examine whether their existing infrastructure and planned capacity can support the scale of development that the proposed rezoning would permit.

I request a detailed evaluation of:

- Water supply reliability and demand, particularly during drought conditions and periods of heightened regional demand.
- Sewer capacity, wastewater treatment, and the ability to accommodate peak flows without compromising existing service.
- Stormwater drainage, flooding, and the effects of increased impervious surfaces on surrounding properties and natural drainage systems.
- School capacity and the ability of local educational facilities to accommodate additional students.
- Access to medical care, emergency medical response, fire protection, and other essential services.
- The availability and adequacy of public transportation for residents who cannot or do not drive.
- The costs of required infrastructure improvements, the agencies responsible for delivering them, the funding sources, and the timing of completion.

It is not sufficient to assume that these services can be expanded as needed. The County must identify concrete, feasible solutions and establish whether those solutions can realistically be implemented before the impacts occur.

6. Emergency response, wildfire risk, and evacuation safety

The ability to evacuate safely during a wildfire, major traffic incident, or other emergency is a critical consideration for coastal communities. El Granada's road network and dependence on Highway 1 make this issue particularly important.

A substantial increase in residential density would mean more people needing access to emergency services and potentially evacuating through the same constrained road network. The EIR should analyze evacuation capacity under realistic worst-case conditions, including simultaneous evacuation demands, road closures, congestion, and the effects of other regional development.

It should also assess whether emergency services have the staffing, equipment, access, and response capacity necessary to serve a substantially larger population.

The County should not approve a zoning framework that permits development at this scale without a thorough assessment of whether residents can be protected during emergencies.

7. Cumulative impacts on an already stretched coastal community

The effects of this project cannot be considered in isolation. Residents of El Granada and the broader Coastside already depend on limited transportation routes, public services, infrastructure, and medical resources. Additional development adds to these demands.

Even if individual impacts are determined to be less than significant when examined separately, their combined effects may be substantial. Traffic congestion, parking shortages, infrastructure limitations, habitat loss, water demand, and increased pressure on public services must be considered together.

The EIR should evaluate cumulative impacts from other existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the region. It should also explain how the County will determine whether mitigation measures are actually effective and whether the agencies responsible for implementing them have the funding and capacity to do so.

A community's ability to absorb growth is not unlimited. Responsible planning requires an honest assessment of those limits rather than an assumption that every additional development can be accommodated.

8. Housing should be directed toward locations with the infrastructure to support it

I understand the County's responsibility to address housing needs, including the need for affordable homes. My concern is not with the goal of providing housing. My concern is with the location, scale, and consequences of this particular proposal.

High-density housing is more appropriately directed toward locations where existing infrastructure, roads, public transportation, schools, medical services, and other public resources can support a larger population. Areas with established urban infrastructure and

greater access to essential services should be thoroughly evaluated as alternatives to developing sensitive open space in a coastal community with significant existing constraints.

The EIR must consider a meaningful range of alternatives, including alternatives that would avoid or substantially reduce impacts on wetlands, sensitive habitat, neighborhood character, traffic, and infrastructure. These should include lower-density alternatives and alternative locations or configurations that preserve the most environmentally sensitive portions of the site.

The County should not limit its alternatives analysis to variations that still result in essentially the same environmental and community impacts. The purpose of the EIR is to provide decision-makers and the public with a genuine understanding of the choices available and the consequences of those choices.

9. A request for a thorough, independent, and transparent environmental review

Given the issues identified in the Notice of Preparation, I urge the County to ensure that the EIR is comprehensive, evidence-based, and transparent. The review should not simply establish the environmental consequences of implementing the rezoning; it should meaningfully inform whether the proposed changes are appropriate for this location and whether less damaging alternatives are available.

In particular, I request that the County:

1. Complete all necessary biological and wetland investigations before relying on assumptions about the developability of the parcels.

2. Fully analyze transportation, parking, infrastructure, water, sewer, public services, wildfire, and emergency evacuation impacts.

3. Assess cumulative impacts across El Granada and the broader Coastside.

4. Evaluate the actual feasibility, funding, timing, and effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures.

5. Consider alternatives that preserve open space and sensitive habitat, reduce density and building height, and direct housing toward locations with more adequate infrastructure and transportation.

6. Clearly identify any significant and unavoidable environmental impacts and explain why they could not be avoided through feasible alternatives.

7. Provide meaningful opportunities for public participation and respond substantively to concerns raised by residents and affected agencies.

The County must also ensure that the environmental review reflects the real-world conditions of the coastal community, rather than relying exclusively on generalized planning assumptions or theoretical infrastructure capacity.

Conclusion

As a 48-year, lifelong resident of El Granada, I am deeply concerned about the long-term

consequences of this proposal. I have a personal connection to this community and a profound interest in preserving its environmental integrity, safety, livability, and unique coastal character for future generations.

The proposed rezoning would establish a framework for a dramatic increase in residential density on 12.45 acres of currently undeveloped land, in an area where the County itself has identified potential wetlands, sensitive biological resources, and significant questions regarding transportation, utilities, and other environmental effects. The proposed building heights and density represent a major departure from the surrounding neighborhood, while the community's existing transportation network and access to essential services raise serious questions about its capacity to accommodate this scale of growth.

The need for housing must be balanced with the responsibility to protect the environment and ensure that development occurs in locations where people can live safely and where infrastructure and services can adequately support them. Those responsibilities should not be treated as secondary considerations.

I respectfully but firmly urge San Mateo County to conduct the most rigorous environmental review possible, give serious consideration to alternatives that would preserve this open space, and seriously consider whether this location is appropriate for the intensity of development contemplated by the proposed rezoning.

Please include this letter in the official public record for the Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 – El Granada EIR and ensure that the concerns raised herein are addressed in the Draft EIR.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kristen Kanzler White

48-year, lifelong resident of El Granada, California

From: Morgan Pierce
To: Will Gibson
Subject: Formal Public Comment – Opposition to Proposed El Granada Housing Element Rezoning Phase 2
Date: Friday, November 6, 2026 8:56:23 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 and San Mateo County Planning Commission,

I am a homeowner on Sevilla Avenue in El Granada, and I am writing to formally express my strong concerns and opposition to the proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2.

I understand that San Mateo County has state housing requirements and that providing housing, including affordable housing, is important. However, I do not believe the proposed rezoning of these six parcels, allowing densities of up to 70 units per acre and building heights of 60–70 feet, is appropriate for this location without substantially more environmental review and a serious consideration of the long-term consequences for this community.

This is not simply a question of whether El Granada should accommodate additional housing. It is a question of whether this particular location can responsibly support development of this scale while protecting the environment, infrastructure, safety, and character of our coastal community.

I am asking the County to reconsider the proposed density and height allowances and to evaluate a substantially less intensive alternative before moving forward.

1. Water availability and infrastructure

Water is one of my biggest concerns. Before allowing zoning that could accommodate hundreds of additional residential units, I believe the County must demonstrate that the Coastside County Water District has sufficient reliable water resources and infrastructure to serve this level of development without negatively affecting existing residents.

I would like the EIR to include a detailed analysis of current water supply, drought conditions, future demand, infrastructure limitations, and the cumulative effects of additional development throughout the Coastside.

The same level of scrutiny should apply to sewer capacity through the Granada Community Services District. Has the existing sewer infrastructure been evaluated for the potential number of additional households? What upgrades would be required, who would pay for them, and what impacts could construction and increased wastewater have on the surrounding environment?

2. Wetlands and protection of the natural environment

I am particularly concerned that the County's own Notice of Preparation identifies wet soil conditions and wetland vegetation across substantial portions of the property.

The document also identifies potential habitat for western monarch butterflies, California red-legged frogs, Crotch's bumble bees, rare plants, nesting birds, bats, and other wildlife.

These are not hypothetical concerns invented by residents. They are specifically identified in the County's own preliminary environmental findings.

I am requesting that a complete wetland delineation and comprehensive biological assessment be completed before any rezoning decision is made.

The County should explain exactly how development at the proposed density could occur without destroying or fragmenting sensitive habitat, increasing stormwater runoff, or permanently altering the natural landscape.

If significant wetlands or protected habitat are present, those areas should be protected rather than treated as obstacles to maximizing development capacity.

3. Traffic, road capacity, and public safety

El Granada already has limited road access, and Highway 1 is a major part of daily life for residents.

Adding potentially hundreds of households to this relatively small area raises serious questions about traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, emergency vehicle access, and the ability of the existing road network to handle additional demand.

I am requesting a comprehensive traffic study that examines actual peak-hour conditions, school traffic, neighborhood streets, Highway 1 access, and cumulative development throughout the Coastside.

The study should also evaluate emergency evacuation conditions, not simply ordinary daily traffic.

4. Wildfire risk and emergency evacuation

The County has identified wildfire as an anticipated environmental impact.

I want to understand how the proposed population increase would affect evacuation capacity and emergency response during a wildfire or other emergency.

How many additional residents could be safely evacuated through the existing road network? Can emergency personnel access the neighborhood if roads are congested? Have evacuation scenarios been modeled using realistic population and traffic assumptions?

These questions must be answered before the County increases the allowable density so dramatically.

5. Building heights, neighborhood character, privacy, and visual impacts

The surrounding neighborhood is primarily made up of one- and two-story single-family homes.

Allowing buildings 60–70 feet tall would fundamentally change the scale and appearance of this area.

I am concerned about the impacts on neighboring homes, privacy, sunlight, shadows, views, visual character, and the overall feeling of this coastal residential community.

The County should not assume that development standards designed to accommodate high-density housing elsewhere are automatically appropriate for El Granada.

I am asking for actual visual simulations and neighborhood-scale analysis showing what buildings of the proposed height and density would look like in relation to existing homes.

6. Parking and neighborhood impacts

The proposal would limit parking requirements to a maximum of one space per residential unit.

I am concerned that this will underestimate actual parking demand and result in overflow parking on existing residential streets.

The EIR should evaluate realistic vehicle ownership, visitor parking, service vehicles, deliveries, pedestrian safety, and the cumulative effect on surrounding streets.

7. Coastal resources, drainage, and climate impacts

El Granada is a coastal community, and the environmental characteristics of this location need to be treated as a priority.

I am requesting a thorough evaluation of stormwater drainage, flooding, groundwater, erosion, sea-level rise, water quality, and the cumulative effects of increased impervious surfaces.

The County should also explain how the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Local Coastal Plan and the policies protecting coastal resources.

The California Coastal Commission’s review should be a meaningful part of this process, not simply a final procedural step.

8. A realistic alternative to the proposed density

I am asking the County to evaluate alternatives that preserve the ability to provide appropriate housing while substantially reducing the potential environmental and neighborhood impacts.

Specifically, I would like the EIR to evaluate:

- A substantially lower residential density than the proposed 30–70 units per acre.
- Lower building heights that are more compatible with the surrounding one- and two-story neighborhood.
- Greater setbacks from existing residential properties.
- Preservation of all confirmed wetlands and sensitive habitat.
- Development capacity based on actual water, sewer, transportation, and emergency service capacity rather than theoretical maximum density.
- A site plan that protects existing trees and natural vegetation wherever feasible.

The EIR should not treat the proposed maximum density as the only reasonable way to meet housing objectives.

9. Cumulative impacts on the Coastside

I also want the County to consider the bigger picture.

El Granada does not exist in isolation. Residents share roads, water resources, emergency services, schools, and infrastructure with neighboring Coastside communities.

The EIR should evaluate the cumulative effects of this proposal alongside other existing and reasonably foreseeable development in the area.

It is important that the County look beyond whether these six parcels can theoretically accommodate additional housing and determine whether the surrounding community can realistically support the resulting population.

My request to the County

I respectfully ask San Mateo County to:

1. Reconsider the proposed 30–70 units-per-acre density and 60–70-foot building heights.
2. Evaluate a substantially less intensive alternative that is more appropriate for this coastal residential location.
3. Complete comprehensive environmental, biological, wetlands, water, sewer, traffic, and emergency evacuation studies.
4. Identify and protect sensitive wetlands, wildlife habitat, and existing natural resources.
5. Demonstrate that existing infrastructure and public services can support the proposed development without unacceptable impacts to current residents.
6. Provide meaningful public participation opportunities before any final zoning decisions are made.
7. Ensure that the California Coastal Commission fully evaluates the consistency of the proposed changes with coastal protection policies.

I purchased my home in El Granada because of the qualities that make this community special: its coastal setting, natural surroundings, residential character, and the ability to live in a community where the environment is part of everyday life.

I believe there is room for responsible housing in our community, but that does not mean every available parcel should be rezoned for the highest possible density without first demonstrating that the consequences are acceptable.

Once wetlands, natural habitat, neighborhood character, and infrastructure capacity are compromised, those losses may be difficult or impossible to reverse.

I am asking the County to take these concerns seriously and not move forward with the proposed rezoning at its current scale without fully addressing them.

Please include this letter in the administrative record for the Environmental Impact Report and add me to the interested-party notification list for future project notices, public hearings, and opportunities to comment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A concerned El Granada homeowner
249 Sevilla Avenue
El Granada, CA 94018

From: Kerrie DeMartini
To: Will Gibson
Subject: Formal Opposition to the El Granada Housing Element Rezoning Program – Phase 2
Date: Tuesday, October 27, 2026 9:03:43 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.

Subject: Formal Opposition to the El Granada Housing Element Rezoning Program – Phase 2

To: San Mateo County Planning & Building Department
Attn: Will Gibson, Planner III
Email: wgibson@smcgov.org

Dear Mr. Gibson and Members of the Planning Department,

As a 50-year resident of El Granada (and local teacher), I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2. I have lived in this community for five decades and have a deep appreciation for the character, scale, and quality of life that make El Granada such a special place to call home. I do not believe the proposed high-density housing plan is appropriate for this location, and I urge the County to carefully reconsider its approach.

Parking and Traffic Concerns

One of my greatest concerns is the lack of adequate parking. The proposal would allow a maximum of only one parking space per residential unit. In a coastal community where public transportation is not a consistently reliable or practical alternative for many residents, this parking allowance is simply not realistic. Many households rely on their vehicles for commuting, errands, school, and other daily activities.

Without sufficient on-site parking, the surrounding residential streets will likely bear the burden. Additional vehicles parked along neighborhood streets could create congestion, reduce visibility for drivers and pedestrians, and make access more difficult for emergency vehicles. I ask that the Environmental Impact Report thoroughly evaluate realistic vehicle ownership, parking demand, spillover parking, traffic circulation, and emergency access before any rezoning decisions are made.

Compatibility With Existing Neighborhoods

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 predominantly one- and two-story single-family homes that currently surround these properties.

Placing buildings of this scale in the middle of established residential neighborhoods risks fundamentally changing the appearance and character of the area. The visual

impact of tall, dense buildings, along with potential loss of privacy, increased shadows, and the loss of the existing natural landscape, deserves serious consideration.

I believe new development should respect the scale and character of the surrounding community. I ask the County to evaluate lower-density alternatives and building designs that are genuinely compatible with the existing neighborhood rather than imposing a development pattern that could permanently alter its character.

Environmental and Infrastructure Impacts

The County's own notice identifies potential wetlands and sensitive biological resources on the project parcels. It also acknowledges that the project may have environmental impacts involving transportation, aesthetics, hydrology and water quality, utilities, and other areas.

These concerns are particularly important in our coastal community. Before advancing a rezoning plan of this magnitude, the County should fully evaluate the capacity of existing water and sewer infrastructure, stormwater management, potential impacts on wetlands and wildlife habitat, and the cumulative effects of increased development. These issues should be addressed through meaningful environmental analysis and enforceable mitigation measures, not deferred until individual development proposals come forward.

Consideration for the Existing Community

After 50 years in El Granada, I believe that thoughtful planning must take into account more than the number of housing units that can fit on a parcel. It must also consider whether the location can support the resulting density, whether the infrastructure is adequate, and whether the development can coexist responsibly with the established neighborhood.

I recognize the importance of addressing housing needs. However, housing goals should not come at the expense of sound planning, environmental protection, public safety, and the livability of existing residential communities. The location and scale of development matter.

I respectfully request that San Mateo County:

- Thoroughly assess parking demand, street congestion, traffic safety, and emergency access. (Look to Moonside Housing in Half Moon Bay as an example of a need for more parking)
- Evaluate the actual availability and reliability of public transportation as an alternative to private vehicles.
- Analyze the visual, privacy, and neighborhood compatibility impacts of buildings up to 60–70 feet tall.

Fully investigate wetlands, wildlife habitat, stormwater management, and water and sewer capacity.

- Consider lower-density alternatives and other locations that may be more appropriate for high-density housing.
- Avoid advancing zoning changes until the environmental impacts and feasible mitigation measures have been fully evaluated and disclosed to the public.

As a longtime resident who has watched El Granada evolve over the past 50 years, I am deeply concerned about the lasting consequences of this proposal. I urge the County to listen to the residents who live here and to pursue a plan that respects the community's existing character, environmental setting, and infrastructure limitations.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed rezoning as currently described and ask that the County reconsider whether this is an appropriate location for development of this scale.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Kerrie DeMartini
50-Year Resident of El Granada

From: Jan Mackintosh
To: Will Gibson
Subject: Formal Opposition to Proposed High-Density Rezoning of Six Parcels in El Granada – Housing Element Phase 2
Date: Tuesday, November 10, 2026 9:01:28 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 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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

From:	Jackie Bertoldo
To:	Will Gibson; CEO_BoardFeedback; Ray Mueller
Cc:	Brad Bertoldo
Subject:	Formal Opposition to Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 – El Granada | Request for Comprehensive Environmental Review
Date:	Sunday, November 8, 2026 9:17:55 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 Board of Supervisors, Mr. Mueller, and Mr. Gibson,

I am writing as a resident of El Granada to express my strong opposition to the proposed high-density rezoning of the six parcels between Coral Reef Avenue and Sevilla Avenue under the Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 – El Granada.

I want to emphasize from the outset that I am not opposed to affordable housing or responsible residential development. I recognize the significant need for additional housing in San Mateo County and support thoughtful development that balances housing needs with environmental stewardship, public safety, and the capacity of existing infrastructure. However, the proposal to allow approximately 830 residential units, at densities of up to 70 units per acre and building heights of 60–70 feet, represents a dramatic and potentially dangerous intensification of development in a small coastal community that is not equipped to support it.

My family lives on Coral Reef Avenue, immediately adjacent to the proposed rezoning area. We would experience the impacts of this development firsthand, but my concerns extend far beyond our property. The scale of the proposed rezoning raises serious questions about the safety, environmental integrity, and long-term sustainability of the entire Coastside.

1. Public Safety, Wildfire Risk, and Emergency Evacuation Capacity

My most urgent concern is the potential impact of this rezoning on emergency evacuation and public safety.

El Granada and the surrounding Coastside communities have extremely limited transportation access, with Highway 1 serving as the primary north-south corridor. Existing traffic congestion, coastal erosion, storm-related road closures, and limited alternative routes already create significant vulnerabilities.

Adding hundreds of housing units and potentially thousands of additional residents without first establishing adequate evacuation capacity could place both new and existing residents at greater risk during wildfires, tsunamis, earthquakes, or other emergencies.

The County must not assume that existing evacuation routes can accommodate such a substantial population increase. I request that the EIR include:

- Comprehensive, scenario-based evacuation modeling that accounts for the proposed development alongside existing and reasonably foreseeable development throughout the Coastside.
- Evaluation of wildfire, tsunami, earthquake, and severe storm scenarios, including

simultaneous road closures, traffic congestion, and limited access for emergency responders.

- Assessment of evacuation times and emergency vehicle access under realistic peak population and traffic conditions.
- Formal consultation with CAL FIRE, the local fire protection district, emergency management officials, and relevant transportation agencies.

Public safety must be demonstrated before this level of density is authorized, not treated as an issue to resolve after development is approved.

2. Inadequate Transportation Infrastructure and Automobile Dependence

El Granada is not an urban community with an extensive public transportation network. Public transit options are limited, and residents depend heavily on personal vehicles to access employment, groceries, healthcare, schools, and other essential services.

The proposed parking allowance of no more than one space per residential unit does not reflect these transportation realities. Many households require more than one vehicle, and inadequate parking could create substantial spillover into existing residential streets.

Highway 1 already experiences significant congestion, particularly during commuting periods, weekends, and periods of heavy visitor activity. The proposed development could further burden an already constrained transportation network.

I request that the EIR evaluate cumulative traffic impacts, projected vehicle trips, neighborhood parking demand, pedestrian and bicycle safety, emergency access, and the feasibility of transportation alternatives. The analysis must reflect the actual transportation conditions and limitations of the Coastside rather than assuming that urban transportation strategies will be equally effective in El Granada.

3. Insufficient School Capacity and Community Infrastructure

The proposed density raises serious concerns about the capacity of local schools and essential public services.

El Granada and Montara's elementary schools are already facing space constraints, even following significant investments in school renovations and new facilities. The Cabrillo Unified School District is reportedly considering additional portable classrooms at El Granada Elementary despite the school's recent construction and renovation work.

Introducing hundreds of additional households without adequately evaluating the resulting demand for school facilities, staffing, transportation, and other services is irresponsible.

The EIR and associated planning process should evaluate projected student enrollment, existing school capacity, and the infrastructure investments necessary to accommodate additional residents. The County should also assess the capacity of local water, wastewater, stormwater, emergency response, and healthcare systems.

It is not sufficient to assume that existing services can absorb this level of population growth without substantial investment and long-term planning.

4. Environmental Impacts and Protection of Coastal Habitats

El Granada is a unique coastal community with sensitive natural habitats, open spaces, and important ecological resources. Rezoning these parcels to accommodate high-density development could result in significant environmental impacts, including habitat loss, disruption of wildlife corridors, increased stormwater runoff, and changes to the surrounding landscape.

The proposed reduction in setbacks and allowance for buildings up to 70 feet tall would also fundamentally alter the physical character of the surrounding neighborhood.

I request that the EIR include a thorough assessment of biological resources, habitat connectivity, native vegetation, sensitive species, stormwater impacts, erosion, visual resources, and consistency with applicable Coastal Act and Local Coastal Program requirements.

The County should identify environmentally sensitive areas within the parcels and evaluate development alternatives that preserve these resources rather than maximizing density across the site.

5. Proposed Density Is Disproportionate to the Existing Community

The magnitude of the proposed rezoning is difficult to reconcile with the existing scale and infrastructure of El Granada.

Increasing allowable density from approximately 8–17 units per acre to as many as 70 units per acre, reducing setbacks, and permitting buildings of 60–70 feet represents a fundamental transformation of this neighborhood.

This is not a modest increase in housing capacity. It is a dramatic change in land use that could introduce an entirely different development pattern into an established, predominantly low-rise coastal residential area.

While the need for additional housing is legitimate, that need does not justify treating every available parcel as appropriate for maximum-density development regardless of its location, infrastructure constraints, environmental sensitivity, or surrounding community.

6. A Request to Evaluate Responsible, Lower-Density Development Alternatives

I support exploring housing development on these parcels, including affordable housing. However, the County should evaluate alternatives that are more appropriately scaled to El Granada's infrastructure, environmental constraints, and existing residential character.

These alternatives should include lower-density residential development, townhomes, duplexes, and other appropriately scaled multifamily housing, with meaningful provisions for affordable units and preservation of sensitive natural areas.

I specifically request that the EIR evaluate a reduced-density alternative, a reduced-height alternative, and a clustered-development alternative that protects environmentally sensitive portions of the site.

These alternatives should be compared transparently against the proposed rezoning in terms of housing capacity, affordability, evacuation safety, transportation demand, infrastructure needs, and environmental impacts.

Conclusion and Formal Request

The County has a responsibility to address housing needs, but it has an equally important responsibility to protect the health, safety, and environment of the communities where that housing is proposed.

The proposed rezoning appears to prioritize maximizing theoretical housing capacity without demonstrating that the surrounding community can safely and sustainably accommodate the resulting development.

I respectfully request that the County:

1. Reconsider the proposed high-density rezoning and refrain from approving the proposed density and building heights without comprehensive analysis of public safety, infrastructure, and environmental impacts.

2. Require rigorous cumulative evacuation and transportation assessments that reflect the unique geographic constraints of the Coastside.

3. Evaluate realistic, lower-density and environmentally sensitive housing alternatives.

4. Meaningfully engage El Granada residents, local schools, emergency service providers, and community organizations before making decisions that could permanently transform this community.

El Granada can and should contribute to addressing the region's housing needs, but development must be appropriate for the location and supported by the infrastructure necessary to protect both current and future residents.

I urge the Board of Supervisors and Planning Department to take these concerns seriously and ensure that the environmental review process is comprehensive, transparent, and responsive to the realities of living on the Coastside.

Thank you for your consideration. Please include this letter in the official public record and consider these comments in defining the scope and content of the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Sincerely,

Jackie & Brad Bertoldo
El Granada Residents
220 Coral Reef Avenue, El Granada, CA

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 4:01:46 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: Scott Molton
To: Will Gibson
Subject: Formal Objection and CEQA Scoping Comments — El Granada Rezoning Phase 2, APN 047-049-170
Date: Monday, November 2, 2026 9:22:07 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, San Mateo County Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors:

I am submitting this letter as a formal objection to the proposed Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 in El Granada, specifically the proposed rezoning of APN 047-049-170, which directly adjoins my residential property at 239 Sevilla Avenue.

I request that this letter be included in the official administrative record and considered in preparing the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), evaluating alternatives, and making any subsequent zoning decisions.

1. Fundamentally inconsistent treatment of existing and proposed residential development

My family invested substantial resources in purchasing, permitting, improving, and developing our home in El Granada.

Our project required years of permitting, compliance with applicable lot-area and development standards, coastal review, and significant financial expense. We were required to follow the County's established development regulations.

We complied with those requirements and invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in our property.

Now, the County proposes to change development standards on adjacent land in ways that could permit substantially greater density, building heights, and lot coverage, with setbacks potentially reduced to 10 feet or less and significantly different parking requirements.

I recognize that California has substantial housing needs and that state law imposes housing-planning obligations. However, those obligations do not eliminate the need for thoughtful local planning, meaningful environmental review, or transparent justification of proposed development standards.

I request that the County explain why the development standards imposed upon existing homeowners differ so substantially from those being considered for neighboring parcels.

Specifically, I request a written explanation identifying which existing development restrictions would be eliminated or relaxed, why those changes are necessary, and how the proposed standards can be reconciled with the existing residential and coastal community.

2. The character and established conditions of El Granada

My family chose this location because of its quiet coastal setting, low-density residential environment, open spaces, and neighborhood character.

These qualities were substantial considerations in our decision to purchase and invest in our home.

The proposed rezoning may allow development dramatically different in scale and intensity from the surrounding neighborhood.

The County should not dismiss the effects of that change simply because no specific construction proposal is currently pending.

I request that the EIR evaluate the reasonably foreseeable development that could occur under the proposed zoning, including maximum building envelopes, heights, massing, setbacks, lighting, and the cumulative effects on neighboring properties.

The County should provide visual simulations from existing residential properties, including the Sevilla Avenue homes immediately adjoining APN 047-049-170.

3. Inadequate neighborhood infrastructure

The streets surrounding our property were not designed as a high-density urban road network.

They are narrow residential streets without continuous sidewalks or streetlights, and on-street parking already constrains available roadway width.

Introducing substantially more residential units without a demonstrated infrastructure solution raises serious concerns regarding:

- Emergency vehicle access and fire apparatus clearance.
- Pedestrian safety, particularly for children and families.
- Increased vehicle movements on narrow streets.
- On-street parking displacement and access restrictions.
- Emergency evacuation.
- Construction traffic and heavy-equipment access.
- The costs and feasibility of required street improvements.

The EIR should include measured street widths, parking utilization studies, emergency-access assessments, and realistic scenarios reflecting foreseeable residential occupancy and vehicle ownership.

I request written input from the responsible fire authority regarding whether the maximum foreseeable development could safely be served by the existing street network.

4. Inadequate parking standards

The contemplated parking standards raise serious concerns about overflow parking in a neighborhood with limited roadway capacity.

A residential development with one or fewer required parking spaces per unit does not establish that the development’s actual parking demand will be met.

The County should evaluate realistic household vehicle ownership, visitor parking, delivery vehicles, service access, and accessibility requirements.

I request that the County identify what legally available off-site parking capacity exists, rather than assuming excess demand can be accommodated on surrounding residential streets.

Parking availability, pedestrian safety, and emergency access should be evaluated separately, with applicable environmental and safety requirements clearly identified.

5. Drainage, grading, and flood-related concerns

My home adjoins the lower, open portion of the proposed rezoning area.

The County must evaluate existing drainage patterns and determine whether substantially increased development, grading, pavement, building foundations, retaining walls, or stormwater infrastructure could alter runoff affecting neighboring properties.

I request site-specific hydrological and geotechnical analysis of APN 047-049-170 and adjoining residential parcels.

The EIR should evaluate reasonably foreseeable construction conditions as well as completed development, including cumulative runoff, soil saturation, and stormwater conveyance.

The County should identify necessary drainage improvements, their funding responsibilities, and enforceable measures to protect neighboring properties from increased flooding or runoff.

6. Coastal development requirements and regulatory consistency

My residential improvements were subject to extensive permitting and coastal development requirements.

I request a comprehensive explanation of how the proposed zoning amendments would interact with the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program, California Coastal Act, existing design review standards, and applicable residential building-permit limitations.

The County should identify which coastal protections will remain effective, which will be amended, and whether future projects could receive streamlined approvals that reduce discretionary public review.

Residents deserve to understand how these changes would affect the review process before the zoning is adopted.

7. Property impacts and established residential use

My family’s investment in our property was based in part on its established setting and development constraints.

Potentially permitting substantially taller buildings immediately adjacent to existing residences raises foreseeable concerns regarding privacy, noise, artificial lighting, shading, construction disturbance, and residential use of outdoor space.

I request that the County evaluate these physical impacts where required under applicable environmental law.

I also request that the County acknowledge the substantial reliance interests of existing

homeowners who previously complied with the County's development standards.

Although property values alone are not necessarily an environmental impact under CEQA, the County should not ignore the practical consequences of significant land-use changes for established homeowners.

8. Reasonable alternatives and site-specific development protections

I request that the EIR evaluate feasible alternatives to the proposed zoning intensity, including:

- Lower building heights and reduced building mass adjacent to existing homes.
- Greater transitional setbacks and landscaped buffers.
- Alternative site layouts that concentrate greater intensity away from existing residential boundaries.
- Reduced density where infrastructure limitations support such restrictions.
- Development standards addressing lighting, privacy, drainage, construction activity, and emergency access.
- Alternative locations or combinations of sites capable of meeting applicable housing obligations with reduced environmental impacts.

I understand that the County must comply with state housing law. I am requesting an evidence-based assessment of lawful alternatives—not a categorical rejection of all new housing.

9. Requested information and action

Before adopting zoning amendments for APN 047-049-170, I request that the County:

1. Provide the proposed parcel-specific zoning designation and complete development standards.
2. Identify the maximum reasonably foreseeable building envelope and residential capacity.
3. Provide a visual massing study from the perspective of directly adjoining residences.
4. Conduct site-specific traffic, parking, emergency-access, drainage, and infrastructure evaluations.
5. Identify which coastal development requirements and public review procedures will apply to future projects.
6. Evaluate reasonable alternatives and enforceable measures that would reduce impacts on existing residences.
7. Explain the basis for changing development standards so substantially from those historically applied to neighboring homeowners.
8. Identify the public hearings and decisions at which residents may present objections and request changes.

I request that this correspondence be treated as a formal CEQA scoping comment, incorporated into the project record, and forwarded to the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, and other relevant reviewing agencies.

I also request written confirmation of receipt and information concerning how these issues will be considered as the project proceeds.

My family has made a substantial commitment to living in El Granada. We have respected the rules established to protect this community, invested heavily in our home, and built our lives around the character of this neighborhood.

We are entitled to a transparent, consistent, and legally adequate planning process that fully examines the consequences of changing those rules for the property immediately beside us.

Sincerely,

Scott T. Molton
239 Sevilla Avenue
El Granada, CA 94018

From: wendy woodard
To: Will Gibson
Subject: El Granada building
Date: Sunday, November 8, 2026 8:10:35 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.

I say no. We are already at grid lock, the sea is rising and there are only 2 ways in and out of that area.

Wendy Woodard

From: Analise Heid
To: Ray Mueller
Cc: CEO_BoardFeedback; Will Gibson
Subject: Concerned Resident - El Granada Development
Date: Saturday, November 7, 2026 8:03:23 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.

To Whom it May Concern,
Although I cannot attend the public meeting on 11/18, I did want to clearly state my concern and opposition to the scale of this rezoning project.
I would like to share my comments in hopes that the county will rely on data-driven issues and evidence evaluated under CEQA and the Coastal Act.
I hope you will consider an alternate site for this scale of development for the following reasons:
1) Evacuation and Wildfire safety
2) Protection of coastal resources and public access
3) Infrastructure bottlenecks such as water supply, sewer capacity, and traffic construction that cannot absorb a high density influx
4) Monarch butterfly overwintering habitats

Thank you for your service to our county. I hope you will act in the best interest of our community.
Sincerely,
Analise Heid

From:	Zlatko Unger
To:	Will Gibson
Subject:	CEQA Scoping Comments: Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 – El Granada (APNs 047-048-150, 047-049-170, 047-051-040, 047-052-100, 047-053-130, 047-054-100)
Date:	Saturday, November 7, 2026 10:39:17 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,

I am writing to submit formal scoping comments regarding the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Housing Element Rezoning Program Phase 2 in El Granada (12.45 acres across six parcels along Sonora Avenue).

My home at 231 Avenue Granada directly overlooks these parcels. My family and I use this open space almost daily for running, walking, biking, and spending time outdoors together. Because of our location, we observe firsthand the delicate wetland hydrology, the active wildlife corridors, and the existing bottlenecks on our neighborhood streets and Highway 1.

While I understand the County's mandate to plan for housing, the proposed rezoning to allow up to 70 units per acre, building heights of 60 to 70 feet, and up to 830 residential units introduces critical safety, environmental, and infrastructure impacts that must be rigorously studied in the Draft EIR:

1. Wildfire Risk and Emergency Evacuation Modeling:
   Our neighborhood sits in a designated high fire hazard severity zone with severely limited egress. Highway 1 is a two-lane road that already gridlocks under normal weekend and commuter traffic. The EIR must include quantitative, realistic evacuation modeling that accounts for a simultaneous disaster event (such as a wildfire or coastal flooding near Surfers Beach) and evaluates whether 830 additional households can safely evacuate without trapping existing residents.
2. Biological Resources & Wetland Hydrology:
   Overlooking this parcel daily, I regularly observe seasonal pooling, natural drainage flows, and resident wildlife, including raptors, native amphibians, deer, and monarch butterflies. The EIR must comprehensively survey these Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) and evaluate the permanent loss of functional habitat and natural absorption buffers.
3. Coastal Act Visual and Community Character Consistency:
   Introducing 6- to 7-story (60–70 ft) buildings directly conflicts with California Coastal Act Chapter 3 policies, which mandate the protection of scenic coastal views and require development to maintain compatibility with the scale and character of established coastal communities.
4. Utility Capacity (Water and Sewer):
   The EIR must include verified, binding supply and conveyance analyses from the Coastside County Water District and Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside to prove adequate capacity exists without compromising drought reserves or local service standards.
5. Parking and Transit Reality:
   Reducing parking to a maximum of one space per unit fails to reflect the reality of an unincorporated coastal area lacking high-frequency public transit. The EIR must study

the secondary impacts of vehicle overflow onto narrow neighborhood streets and the resulting Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) increases.

Thank you for including these comments in the official administrative record for the project.

Sincerely,

Zlatko Unger
231 Avenue Granada
El Granada, CA 94018
(404) 425-9686
zlatkounger@gmail.com