

**From:** [Luis Topete](#)  
**To:** [April Bingham](#); [Clinton Miles](#); [James Bennington](#); [John Steadman](#); [Julian Martinez](#); [Mark Dinh](#); [Mark Stegmaier](#); [Moshe Porter](#)  
**Cc:** [Maria Gonzalez](#); [Camille Leung](#); [Olivia Boo](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Coastside Design Review Committee Meeting Item 2 - PLN2014-00490 Plans & ADU (10/10/2024)  
**Date:** Thursday, October 10, 2024 12:05:49 PM

---

Hi CDRC,

This comment was received today for item #2 on the agenda and has not yet been uploaded on the website. Thanks.

**Luis Topete**

Planner III

---

**From:** patricia lynn <patriciaylynn@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 10, 2024 11:26 AM  
**To:** Luis Topete <ltopete@smcgov.org>; Steve Monowitz <smonowitz@smcgov.org>  
**Cc:** Larry Jimenez <larry.jimenez@gmail.com>; John Qaqundah <jjaqundah@gmail.com>; pattyacey@sbcglobal.net; Bryan Jessop <bryan@morchellawildfoods.com>; Alan Haffner <alanhaff@pacbell.net>  
**Subject:** Coastside Design Review Committee Meeting Item 2 - PLN2014-00490 Plans & ADU (10/10/2024)

**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 Coastside Review Design Committee and Steve Monowitz,

The community continues to express concerns about this development. It appears that most of our concerns brought up over time and leading up to the DRC held on Thursday, September 12, 2024 have been minimized or ignored.

I continue to challenge the negative declarations as we've frequently seen endangered species, red legged frogs, garter snakes, fauna, and the roaring riparian corridor and intermittent streams.

The proposed project essentially will bulldoze at least 20 or more significant trees and many are not even on the property. These trees over 75 years old and in good health. We will be losing 2 or more tons of carbon emission sequestration just so 1 house can be built.

I have questions about the legal use of the paper street, East Street, to be used solely for private benefit without the consent of the adjoining property owners and questions about the height, FAR, setback and drainage.

We submitted a certified Biological Report dated March 17, 2015 raised many concerns and negative

impact of this proposed project by on the riparian corridor, buffer zone, wetland, endangered species, significant and heritage trees.” **It would appear that the site due to the existence of riparian corridors, wetlands, endangered species and sensitive habitats would preclude development all together. “**

We presented at the MCC hearing on March 12, 2015 with the community concerns. Midcoast Community Council’s letter to Dennis Aguirre and Steve Monowitz of SMCO on April 8, 2015 also summarized and documented many public and professional concerns about this project and urged the county to explore alternatives other than allowing development on this site.

California Coastal Commission’s letter to SMCO dated June 28, 2016, reiterated many of the same concerns about significant negative impact of this project on riparian corridor, wetland, buffer zone, endangered species, hydrology, significant and heritage trees, along with many other issues.

We question the assessments presented in your INTENT TO ADOPT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION. The report appears to be incomplete as it either ignored or minimize the numerous environmental and code concerns we’ve raised over time.

The proposed project continues to present significant negative environmental impact and safety due to inadequate fire truck access that cannot be mitigated.

The proposed project continues to be in conflict with the San Mateo County zoning regulations, particularly Section 6565.1 Design Review District:

1. 28.1.32 Site Planning and Structural Placement - project shall integrate structures with the natural setting. The goal shall be to disturb as little vegetation as possible. Retain heritage and significant trees. The regulations call for protection and not bulldozing 18+ significant and heritage trees.
2. 28.1.34 Stream and Other Drainage Features - Avoid building near all streams and natural drainage features. The proposed roadway appears to be on top of these features.
3. 28.1.37 Privacy - The proposed structure has negative impact on the adjacent neighbors privacy.

Were there any variances granted by the SMCO on this project and why? If so, please describe what the variances are and why the adjacent neighbors were not notified nor included in making such variance decision.

Thank you for reviewing and mitigating these serious negative issues before SMCO allows this project to proceed.

Sincerely,  
Patricia Lynn

