AGENDA

CITY OF HALF MOON BAY
PLANNING COMMISSION

TUESDAY, JULY 11, 2017
7:00 PM

Emergency Operations Center (EOC)
537 Kelly Avenue
Half Moon Bay, California  94019

Rick Hernandez, Chair
Brian Holt, Vice Chair
John Evans, Planning Commissioner
James Benjamin, Planning Commissioner
Les Deman, Planning Commissioner

This agenda contains a brief description of each item to be considered. Those wishing to address the Planning Commission on any matter not listed on the Agenda, but within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission to resolve, may come forward to the podium during the Public Forum portion of the Agenda and will have a maximum of three minutes to discuss their item. Those wishing to speak on an agenda item are asked to fill out a speaker card. Speaker(s) will be called forward at the appropriate time during the agenda item in consideration.

Please Note: Please Provide a Copy of Prepared Presentations to the Clerk

Copies of written documentation relating to each item of business on the Agenda are on file in the Office of the City Clerk at City Hall and the Half Moon Bay Library where they are available for public inspection. If requested, the agenda shall be available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132.) Information may be obtained by calling 650-726-8271.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, special assistance for participation in this meeting can be obtained by contacting the City Clerk’s Office at 650-726-8271. A 48-hour notification will enable the City to make reasonable accommodations to ensure accessibility to this meeting (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II).

http://hmbcity.com/

MEETING WILL CONCLUDE BY 10:30 PM UNLESS OTHERWISE EXTENDED BY SIMPLE MAJORITY VOTE OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION.
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

DRAFT MINUTES
06.27.2017

PUBLIC FORUM

1. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1.A Project: Construction of a new two-story, 28 feet in height, 7,945 square-foot single-family residence, associated site improvements and conversion of an existing 697 square foot residence to an accessory dwelling unit, on a 66,141 square-foot lot

Requested Permits / Approvals: Coastal Development Permit & Architectural Review
File Number: PDP-15-051
Site Location: 32 Jenna Lane / APN: 056-072-280 and 056-072-120
Applicant: Derek Vinh
Project Planner: Scott Phillips; (650) 726-8299; sphillips@hmbcity.com
Zoning District: PUD, Planned Unit Development (Matteucci).
LCP Land Use Plan Designation: Planned Development District General Plan

RESOLUTION - 32 JENNA LANE

ATTACHMENT 1 - STAFF REPORT SEPT. 16, 2017
ATTACHMENT 2 - CDD Memo to PC
ATTACHMENT 3 - 09.13.2016 Minutes
ATTACHMENT 4 - Letters emails received since 9-13 PC Meeting
ATTACHMENT 5 - 32 Jenna Lane HMB - Plans Total 7-6-17
ATTACHMENT 6 - Letter from Applicant
ATTACHMENT 7 - Subdivision Appeal Agreement
ATTACHMENT 8 - CRB_32Jenna_landscape_letter_final
ATTACHMENT 9 - Response from CCC on revised plans.pdf
ATTACHMENT 10 - 32 Jenna Lane IS MND NOI New Format with track change and Exhibits
1.B LOCAL COASTAL LAND USE PLAN: COASTAL ACCESS AND RECREATION
Continue review of the Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the June 2017 Planning Commission Working Draft Local Land Use (LUP).
STAFF REPORT - Coastal Access 07.11.2017

ATTACHMENT 1 - Coastal Access and Rec Comments_Responses_PC_July 11 2017

ATTACHMENT 2 - PC and BPAC Comments_June 27 2017 JSS

PLANNING MANAGER REPORT

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS

ADJOURNMENT
MINUTES
CITY OF HALF MOON BAY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 2017
EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER (EOC) / 537 KELLY AVENUE

Vice Chair Holt called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

PRESENT: Vice Chair Holt, Commissioners Evans, and Benjamin
ABSENT: Chair Hernandez, Commissioner Deman
BPAC PRESENT: Members Brown, Murray, Dragony, Etherton, Rendon, Gater, Foldernauer.
ABSENT: Deman

PLANNING COMMISSIONER OFF-PREMISES PARTICIPATION - CANCELLED
Chair Rick Hernandez - Teleconference from Hyatt Place 27576 Maecliff Drive; Naperville/Warrenville, IL

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL
Vice Chair Holt led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

III. PLANNING COMMISSION AND BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE JOINT SESSION

1A. LOCAL COASTAL LAND USE PLAN (LCLUP)

Jill Ekas, Planning Manager; Ray Razavi, Traffic Engineer; Dara O’Byrne, Alta Planning and Design opened joint session with a presentation to the Planning Commission and Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT
Walter Sensing, is in favor of launching a comprehensive shuttle bus.
Paulette Eisen, concerned about the Half Moon Bay coastal access agreement with the horse ranch.
Sabrina Brennan, (San Mateo County Harbor Commissioner, speaking as a member of the public) spoke on behalf of the Coastside
Bicycle Coalition. The Coalition would appreciate the Coastal Trail to be better maintained. Does not support widening the trail.

Mike Ferreira, discussed the proposal for a four-lane segment from Magnolia to Kelly.

Sylvie, include Moonridge housing into City, what would be the cost to the city?

Lennie Roberts, supports boulevard concept; consider attractive entrance signs; need solutions to calm traffic, don’t stop it.

Jerry Steinberg, may want to do something, but consider how to do it first.

Greg Jamison, supports some type of parallel transit system along Highway 1.

BPAC & PC Discussion – Included: Retaining walls, definition of bike facility classifications; interruptions along the Naomi Patridge trail; the Coastal Trail is being under-used for commuting, etc. The biggest focus of concern was to figure out how to get people (and pets) safely across Highway 1, creating connectivity throughout the City. Exploration of round-abouts and how to promote trails was also considered. Road diets verses widening roads, as well as the support of a Town Boulevard concept, were conversed and supported.

Motion: Confirmed the General Plan Advisory Committee’s consensus statements:
1) Explore the Town Boulevard concept; with reduced speeds, safe crossings for all modes and improved aesthetic identity. 2) Include the Eastside parallel trail, in the Land Use Plan; Consider or explore other trails that are referenced in the draft Coastal Access document.
M/S: Benjamin/Evans
Motion carried unanimously.

IV. ADJOURNMENT OF JOINT STUDY SESSION

OPENING OF REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Minutes of the June 13, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting.
M/S: Benjamin/Evans
Motion carried unanimously.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

1.A PLANNING COMMISSION BYLAWS:
Jill Ekas, Planning Manager presented draft Bylaws to the Planning Commission, as revised pursuant to Planning Commission direction at their June 13, 2017 session. Planning Commission recommended that the Bylaws be reviewed by the City’s new legal staff and brought back to a Planning Commission at a future session.

VII. PLANNING MANAGER REPORT
Jill Ekas, Planning Manager reported updates to the Planning Commission.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT
None

IX. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS

X. ADJOURNMENT
M/S: Benjamin/Holt
Motion carried unanimously.
Meeting adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted: approved:

Bridget Jett, Planning Analyst
Brian Holt, Vice Chair
RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION P-17-04
PDP-15-051

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HALF MOON BAY ADOPTING THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AND APPROVING A COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, USE PERMIT AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW TWO-STORY, 28 FEET IN HEIGHT, 7,945 SQUARE FOOT RESIDENCE AT 32 JENNA LANE IN THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT ZONING DISTRICT AND THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (APN'S 056-072-280 AND 056-072-120)

WHEREAS, an application was submitted requesting approval of Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit and Architectural Review to allow the construction of a new two-story, 28 feet in height, 7,945 square foot residence at 32 Jenna Lane in the Planned Unit Development Zoning District and the Residential Medium Density General Plan designation (APN's 056-072-280, 056-072-120); and

WHEREAS, the procedures for processing the application have been followed as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on September 13, 2016 and July 11, 2017, at which time all those desiring to be heard on the matter were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission considered all written and oral testimony presented for consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Draft Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program was circulated for 20 days between June 22, 2016 and July 11, 2016 for public review and comments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has determined that the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study are complete and conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission hereby adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program contained in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has made the required findings for approval of the project, set forth in Exhibit B to this resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program contained in Exhibit A and approves PDP-15-051, based upon the Findings contained in Exhibit B and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in Exhibit C.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City of Half Moon Bay Planning Commission at a duly noticed public hearing held July 11, 2017.

AYES, NOES, ABSENT, ABSTAIN,

APPROVED:

_________________________ ______________ ___________
Rick Hernandez, Chair Jill Ekas, Planning Manager
EXHIBIT A
CITY OF HALF MOON BAY
City Hall • 501 Main Street • Half Moon Bay • CA • 94019

MITIGATE NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The Community Development Director has reviewed the proposed project described below to determine whether it could have a significant effect on the environment. Significant effect on the environment means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

NAME OF PROJECT: New Single Family Residence, Remodel of Existing House at 32 Jenna Lane

PROJECT FILE NUMBER: PDP-15-051

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project consists of a Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review and Use Permit to allow the construction of a new two-story 8,290 square-foot single-family residence, including a three-car attached garage, remodel of the existing guesthouse on the site and associated site improvements. The removal of three non-heritage trees on the site is also included with the proposal. The applicant and property owner will implement the project.

PROJECT LOCATION: The project area is located on 32 Jenna Lane (APN 056-072-280), which is at the northern terminus of Jenna Lane at Cypress Avenue, north of Kelly Avenue and approximately 0.20 miles west of Highway 1 (Cabrillo Highway) in the City of Half Moon Bay (Figure 1). The project area encompasses the entirety of APN 056-072-280, measuring approximately 380 feet x 225 feet and is 66,141 square feet, or 1.52 acres in area. The site is within the Kelly Avenue Tract subdivision, which is within the Matteucci Planned Unit Development, with a Planned Development District General Plan / Local Coastal Program designation. The site is within the California Coastal Commission Appeals Jurisdiction.

APPLICANT: Derek Vinh

FINDING: The Community Development Director finds the project described above will not have a significant effect on the environment, in that the attached Initial Study identifies one or more potentially significant effects on the environment, and the project applicant, before public release of this draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, has agreed to include mitigation in the project that clearly reduces the effects of the project to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT:
1. **Aesthetics, Light and Glare.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation required.

   **ALG-MM1:** In order to reduce glare and light impacts on the surrounding properties, all new exterior light fixtures associated with the new residence shall be shielded and facing downward. No flood lights would be allowed with the new improvements on the site.

2. **Agricultural Resources.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation required.

3. **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases.** The project will not have a significant impact and mitigation is not required. The proposed project would be developed in conformance with the standard Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) dust control measures during all phases of construction on the project site. Standard construction Best Management Practices are included in the project to further reduce the project’s less than significant impact.

4. **Biological Resources.** The following mitigation has been included in the project to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

   **BIO-MM1a:** Within two weeks prior to the start of construction, a worker education program shall be presented at the project site by a qualified biologist. Associated written material will be distributed. It shall be the onsite foreman’s responsibility to ensure that all construction personnel and subcontractors receive a copy of the education program. The education program shall include a description of the CRLF and SFGS and their habitat, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act, the necessity of adhering to the Act to avoid penalty, measures implemented to avoid affecting CRLF and SFGS specific to the project and the work boundaries of the project.

   **BIO-MM1b:** Prior to construction, the project disturbance envelope (encompassing all ground disturbance associated with the project, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, and material storage) shall be clearly identified on project site plans, shall be located as far as feasible from the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor, and shall be located outside of the 50-foot ESHA buffer, as well as the wildlife movement corridor extending 25-feet from the ESHA buffer edge (as described in Mitigation Measure 3). Exclusion fencing shall be installed around the entire work area under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Fencing shall be at least 36 inches above ground level and buried at least 6 inches into the ground, and shall have a gate or similar opening to allow access to the work area, but shall remain closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels for snakes. The fencing shall be monitored daily by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist at least once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a
qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project. All ground
disturbance associated with project construction, including grading, trenching,
vegetation removal, staging, material storage, and parking, shall occur within the fenced
area, and no construction equipment or personnel shall enter areas outside of the
fenced area.

**BIO-MM1c**: A qualified biologist shall monitor all removal of vegetation on the project
site. Immediately prior to vegetation removal, the qualified biologist shall survey the
work area for CRLF and SFGS. If CRLF and SFGS are observed in the work area, work shall
cease and the USFWS and CDFW contacted for guidance. If no CRLF or SFGS are
observed during the vegetation removal effort, then no additional biological monitoring
(other than exclusion fence inspections, mentioned above) shall be performed unless a
CRLF or SFGS is subsequently reported by construction personnel or others in the area.
If a CRLF or SFGS is observed on or near the project site, work shall cease and the
USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted immediately, and they may require daily biological
monitoring and other mitigation measures.

**BIO-MM1d**: Exposed trenches resulting from project construction shall be backfilled as
soon as work is complete. Open trenches shall have an escape ramp every 50-feet or
less (composed of earthen material no greater than 45 degrees) installed at each end
before nightfall each work day so that any entrapped wildlife may exit. To reduce
impacts to nocturnal species in the area, construction shall be limited to daylight hours
and no construction lighting shall remain at night.

**BIO-MM2**: If project construction is conducted during the February 1 to August 15
breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction breeding bird
survey throughout area of suitable habitat within 300 feet of the project site within 30
days prior to the onset of any construction activity. If bird nests are observed, an
appropriate buffer zone shall be established around all active nests to protect nesting
adults and their young from construction disturbance. Buffer zones shall be determined
by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW based on the site conditions and the
species potentially impacted. Work within the buffer zone shall be postponed until all
the young are fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.

**BIO-MM3**: Any fencing located within 25-feet of the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer
edge shall be wildlife friendly (such as split rail or other fencing that allows for the
passage of wildlife). No other significant barriers to wildlife movement shall be placed in
this area.

5. **Cultural Resources.** There are no known National Register or California State Historic
Resource properties, California Historical landmarks, California Points of Historic
Interest, or archeologically sensitive areas on the project site or in the project vicinity.
However, in the event that human remains, subsurface historic and/or archeological
remains are discovered, the following mitigation measures would apply.
CR-MM1: Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American(s). If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the permittee shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

CR-MM2: If subsurface historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect archaeological resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.

PALEO-MM1: If subsurface geologic and/or paleontological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist to perform reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect such resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.

6. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity. The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

8. Hydrology and Water Quality. The following mitigation has been included in the project to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

WQ-MM1: Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant will be required to submit plans demonstrating on-site detention limiting storm water discharge from the site to pre-development levels in conformance with City standards. The impact would be less than significant.

WQ-MM2: Compliance with the City’s NPDES (storm water control) requirements and SWRCB’s General Construction Permit for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period will be required throughout the construction process.
9. **Land Use.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

10. **Mineral Resources.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

11. **Noise.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

12. **Populations and Housing.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

13. **Public Services.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

14. **Recreation.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

15. **Transportation.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

16. **Utilities and Service Systems.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

17. **Mandatory Findings of Significance.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

**PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD**

**Before 5:00 p.m. on July 11, 2016, any person may:**
1) Review the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND); and
2) Submit written comments regarding the information, analysis and mitigation. Planning staff will prepare written responses to any comments, and revise the MND, as necessary, before the MND is adopted. All comments will be included in the Final MND.

Circulation period: **June 22, 2016 to July 11, 2016**

_________________________________
Scott Phillips, Associate Planner
## Mitigation Monitoring Program for 32 Jenna Lane (File No. PDP-15-051)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALG-MM1</strong>: In order to reduce glare and light impacts on the surrounding properties, all new exterior light fixtures associated with the new residence shall be shielded and facing downward. No flood lights would be allowed with the new improvements on the site.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM1a</strong>: Within two weeks prior to the start of construction, a worker education program shall be presented at the project site by a qualified biologist. Associated written material will be distributed. It shall be the onsite foreman’s responsibility to ensure that all construction personnel and subcontractors receive a copy of the education program. The education program shall include a description of the CRLF and SFGS and their habitat, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act, the necessity of adhering to the Act to avoid penalty, measures implemented to avoid affecting CRLF and SFGS specific to the project and the work boundaries of the project.</td>
<td>Prior to start of construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, &amp; Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM1b</strong>: Prior to construction, the project disturbance envelope (encompassing all ground disturbance associated with the project, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, and material storage) shall be clearly identified on project site plans, shall be located as far as feasible from the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor, and shall be located outside of the 50-</td>
<td>Prior to start of construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, &amp; Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
foot ESHA buffer, as well as the wildlife movement corridor extending 25-feet from the ESHA buffer edge (as described in Mitigation Measure 3). Exclusion fencing shall be installed around the entire work area under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Fencing shall be at least 36 inches above ground level and buried at least 6 inches into the ground, and shall have a gate or similar opening to allow access to the work area, but shall remain closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels for snakes. The fencing shall be monitored daily by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist at least once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project. All ground disturbance associated with project construction, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, material storage, and parking, shall occur within the fenced area, and no construction equipment or personnel shall enter areas outside of the fenced area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM1c</strong>: A qualified biologist shall monitor all removal of vegetation on the project site. Immediately prior to vegetation removal, the qualified</td>
<td>Prior to removal of vegetation</td>
<td>Project Biologist, &amp; Construction Manager</td>
<td>Project Biologist Log and Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biologist shall survey the work area for CRLF and SFGS. If CRLF and SFGS are observed in the work area, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW contacted for guidance. If no CRLF or SFGS are observed during the vegetation removal effort, then no additional biological monitoring (other than exclusion fence inspections, mentioned above) shall be performed unless a CRLF or SFGS is subsequently reported by construction personnel or others in the area. If a CRLF or SFGS is observed on or near the project site, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted immediately, and they may require daily biological monitoring and other mitigation measures.</td>
<td>and during the removal of vegetation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM1d</strong>: Exposed trenches resulting from project construction shall be backfilled as soon as work is complete. Open trenches shall have an escape ramp every 50-feet or less (composed of earthen material no greater than 45 degrees) installed at each end before nightfall each work day so that any entrapped wildlife may exit. To reduce impacts to nocturnal species in the area, construction shall be limited to daylight hours and no construction lighting shall remain at night.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager, and Project Biologist</td>
<td>Project Biologist Log and Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM2</strong>: If project construction is conducted during the February 1 to August 15 breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Biological Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout area of suitable habitat within 300 feet of the project site within 30 days prior to the onset of any construction activity. If bird nests are observed, an appropriate buffer zone shall be established around all active nests to protect nesting adults and their young from construction disturbance. Buffer zones shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW based on the site conditions and the species potentially impacted. Work within the buffer zone shall be postponed until all the young are fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM3</strong>: Any fencing located within 25-feet of the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge shall be wildlife friendly (such as split rail or other fencing that allows for the passage of wildlife). No other significant barriers to wildlife movement shall be placed in this area.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR-MM1:</strong> Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American(s). If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the permittee shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR-MM2:</strong> If subsurface historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect archaeological resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PALEO-MM1</strong>: If subsurface geologic and/or paleontological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist to perform reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect such resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WQ-MM1</strong>: Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant will be required to submit plans demonstrating on-site detention limiting storm water discharge from the site to pre-development levels in conformance with City standards. The impact would be less than significant.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WQ-MM2</strong>: Compliance with the City’s NPDES (storm water control) requirements and SWRCB’s General Construction Permit for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period will be required throughout the construction process.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coastal Development Permit – Findings for Approval

The required Coastal Development Permit for this project may be approved or conditionally approved only after the approving authority has made the following findings per Municipal Code Section 18.20.070:

1. Local Coastal Program – The development as proposed or as modified by conditions, conforms to the Local Coastal Program.

   Evidence: The project consists of the construction of a new single-family residence, on a partially developed infill site in an existing neighborhood where public services and infrastructure are available and exist to the site. The project conforms to all City requirements, will not impact coastal resources and is consistent with the policies of the City’s Land Use Plan (LUP).

   Coastal Act 30240(b) and Policy 3-3 (b): Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.

   Compliance: The subject site is adjacent to a mapped environmentally sensitive habitat area (Pilarcitos Creek). A biological resource assessment was prepared and circulated for the required 45-days for comments from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Army Crops of Engineers, California Coastal Commission, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. One comment letter was received from the California Coastal Commission. The biologist who wrote the biological resource assessment (Coast Range Biological LLC) provided a response to the Coastal Commission letter, as well as an addendum to the biological report. All mitigation measures recommended by the biologist were then integrated into the Draft Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration. The implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and the riparian buffer zone restoration plan will ensure that any impacts to the environmentally sensitive habitat along Pilarcitos Creek will be avoided.

   Policy 7-1: The City will establish regulations to protect the scenic corridor of Highway 1, including setbacks for new development, screening of commercial parking and landscaping associated with new development. The minimum standards shall include all areas within 200 yards of State Highway 1 which are visible from the road.
Compliance: The subject site is not located within 200 yards of State Highway 1 and Highway 1 is not designated a Scenic Highway within the City limits of Half Moon Bay.

Policy 7-5: All new development, including additions and remodeling, shall be subject to design review.

Compliance: The proposed residence has been subject to design review by the Planning Commission.

Policy 7-11: New development along primary access routes from Highway 1 to the beach, as designated on the Land Use Map, shall be designed and sited so as to maintain and enhance the scenic quality of such routes, including building setbacks, maintenance of low height of structures, and landscaping which establishes a scenic gateway and corridor.

Compliance: The new single-family residence is not located along a primary access route from Highway 1 and will not affect coastal access.

Coastal Act 30244: Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.

Compliance: The new single-family residence is not located at or near identified archaeological or paleontological resources. If cultural resources or paleontological resources are unexpectedly encountered during subsurface excavation, the permit has been conditioned to require that construction halt until the find can be evaluated and appropriate mitigation identified.

2. Growth Management System – The development is consistent with the annual population limitation system established in the Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Evidence: The site has been granted a valid Measure A Certificate for construction of one single-family residence and one accessory dwelling unit. Standard Condition of Approval (#B2) requires a valid Measure A or D Certificate for the new residence prior to the issuance of the building permit. The accessory dwelling unit is exempt from the provisions of the Growth Management System.

3. Zoning Provisions – The development is consistent with the use limitations and property development standards of the base district as well as the other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Evidence: The proposed residence conforms to the requirements of the Matteucci Specific Plan, which allows for residential uses. The proposed setbacks, lot coverage, height, parking and open space meet the requirements of the Planned Unit Development Zoning District and other relevant provisions of the Zoning Code.
4. **Adequate Services** – *The proposed development will be provided with adequate services and infrastructure in a manner that is consistent with the Local Coastal Program.*

   **Evidence:** The partially developed site is located in an existing developed neighborhood where utilities and services are generally available.

5. **California Coastal Act** – *Any development to be located between the sea and the first public road parallel to the sea conforms to the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act.*

   **Evidence:** The project site is located between the sea and the first public road and within the California Coastal Commission Appeal’s Jurisdiction. The project includes the construction of a new residence on partially developed site. The site is currently developed with a small single-family residence.

**Use Permit – Finding for Implementation of a Planned Unit Development Plan**

The required Use Permit for this project may be approved or conditionally approved only after the approving authority has made the following finding per Municipal Code Section 18.22.190(B):

**Use Permit Authorization** – The establishment, maintenance and/or conducting of the use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in said neighborhood.

**Planning Commission Evidence:** The proposed residence and existing accessory dwelling unit is consistent with the development standards associated with the Matteucci Specific Plan for the site and with the uses and pattern of development in the surrounding neighborhood, which consists of existing residential buildings. With approval of this permit, the residential use of the subject property conforms to the requirements of the Zoning Code and Matteucci Specific Plan. As proposed, the site includes adequate parking and other facilities to accommodate the project activities without detriment to the public welfare, property or improvements in the surrounding neighborhood.
Architectural Site and Design Review – Finding

The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the project and all of the following criteria in determining that the following architectural and site design standards have been satisfactorily addressed:

1. Where more than one building or structure will be constructed, the architectural features and landscaping thereof shall be harmonious. Such features include height, elevations, roofs, material, color and appurtenances.

   **Evidence:** The project involves the construction of a new single family residence. The new French Eclectic style of the primary residence would be compatible with the architectural style of the existing guest house.

2. Where more than one sign will be erected or displayed on the site, the signs shall have a common or compatible design and locational positions and shall be harmonious in appearance.

   **Evidence:** The project does not include any signs.

3. The material, textures, colors and details of construction shall be an appropriate expression of its design concept and function, and shall be compatible with the adjacent and neighboring structures and functions. Colors of wall and roofing materials shall blend with the natural landscape and be non-reflective.

   **Evidence:** Colors and materials of the new residence include stucco, stone veneers and synthetic slate tile roof which are similar architectural elements that are found on the smaller house on the site.

4. The design shall be appropriate to the function of the project and express the project’s identity.

   **Evidence:** The site was originally developed with a smaller single story residence. The new residence would be a similar design to the existing accessory dwelling unit on the site.

5. The planning and siting of the various functions and buildings on the site shall create an internal sense of order and provide a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community.

   **Evidence:** By developing the new residence on the site, an internal sense of order would be created between the larger new residence and the smaller accessory dwelling unit and is consistent with similar configurations of accessory dwelling units and residents on other Jenna Lane sites.
6. **Roofing material shall be wood shingles, wood shakes, tile or other materials such as composition as approved by the appropriate design review authority. No mechanical equipment shall be located upon a roof unless it is appropriately screened.**

   **Evidence:** The proposed roofing material is fiberglass composition roof shingles. No mechanical equipment is proposed on the roof.

7. **The proposed development shall be compatible in terms of height, bulk and design with other structures and environment in the immediate area.**

   **Evidence:** The size, height, design and bulk of the new residence is similar to other large single family residences that have been constructed to the south of the subject property.

8. **The proposed design shall be consistent with the applicable elements of the general plan.**

   **Evidence:** The project is consistent with the Land Use Element’s Planned Development District General Plan designation and is consistent with the goals and policies of the Housing Element which encourage provision of high quality housing for a wide range of individuals and household types and which promote infill housing in existing neighborhoods.

9. **If the project site is located in an area considered by the committee as having a unified character or historical character, the design shall be compatible with such character.**

   **Evidence:** The existing accessory dwelling unit and proposed residence is not located on a site or in an area designated as historical by the City’s Historical Resource Inventory. The proposed residence is located in the Kelly Avenue Tract neighborhood which includes a wide range of residential architectural styles.

10. **The design shall promote harmonious transition in scale and character in areas located between different designated land uses.**

    **Evidence:** The site is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD). The adopted specific plan for this PUD allows for single family residential uses. Properties adjacent to the project allow for multi-family uses and contain apartment buildings. The smaller existing residence on the site is located between the proposed larger residence and the apartment building. The deep front (more than 100 feet) between the large new residence and the multifamily buildings to the east creates a harmonious transition in scale and character between the single family Planned Unit Development and the multifamily to the east.

Resolution P-16-11
11. The design shall be compatible with known and approved improvements and/or future construction, both on and off the site.

Evidence: There are no other known improvements pending for this site or the immediate area.

12. Sufficient ancillary functions provided to support the main functions of the project shall be compatible with the project’s design concept.

Evidence: The proposed project consists of constructing a new residence on site that is developed with an existing guest house to be utilized as an accessory dwelling unit to the new larger residence. The overall design concept of the site can accommodate a large single family residence and smaller guesthouse, which was included in the previous approval and allowed by the Matteucci Specific Plan.

13. Access to the property and circulation systems shall be safe and convenient for equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

Evidence: The project will not affect existing access to the site. The site is served by an existing street that accommodates pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

14. The amount and arrangement of open space and landscaping shall be appropriate to the design and the function of the structures.

Evidence: As required by the Matteucci Specific Plan, 80% of the site is required to be open space. The site is currently developed with a single family residence and is landscaped along the southern half of the property. Split rail fencing would be installed as part of the project between the edge of the required riparian buffer and the building footprints. South of the new split rail fence, landscaping has arranged in a hierarchy of plant groupings, enhancing the visual and scenic qualities of the site. Many of the existing trees would be maintained. Standard Condition of Approval #D5 requires protection measures during construction for the trees proposed for preservation. Pervious pavers would utilized for the hard surface connecting the new garage and home entrance to the existing pervious paver driveway. The landscaping, as designed integrates with the project site and creates a pleasing appearance from both the project site and the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor.

15. Landscaping shall be in keeping with the character or design of the building, and preferably clustered in natural appearing groups, as opposed to being placed in rows and regularly spaced.

Evidence: The existing landscaping on the site has been designed in clusters, in compliance with this requirement. For example, the driveway parking and turnaround
area is circular in shape. Landscaping, including small trees and shrubs have been installed in clusters extending out from this circular parking.

16. *Where feasible, natural features shall be appropriately preserved and integrated with the project.*

**Evidence:** Three existing non-heritage trees would be removed from the proposed building footprint location. Besides these three trees, all existing trees and other landscaping will be maintained, preserved and refurbished after construction on the site.

17. *The landscape design concept for the site, as shown by the relationship of plant masses, open space, scale, plant forms and foliage textures and colors, shall create a desirable and functional environment and the landscape concept shall depict an appropriate unity with the various buildings on the site.*

**Evidence:** The applicant proposes to maintain the existing trees outside of the proposed building footprint and keep the riparian buffer area in its natural state. This proposal is appropriate, given the proximity to Pilarcitos Creek and the separation of the subject property from the public right-of-way.

18. *Plant material shall be suitable and adaptable to the site, shall be capable of being properly maintained on the site, and shall be a variety which would tend to be drought-resistant and to reduce consumption of water in its installation and maintenance.*

**Evidence:** North of the new split rail fence, the landscaping will be remain in its natural state. South of the split railed fencing, a variety of drought tolerant and non-invasive plants have been selected for planting. Turf areas have been limited to small patches. Many existing trees are shown on the landscape plan as to be preserved. In order to verify compatibility with the biotics in the area, the submitted landscape plan was peer reviewed by the project biologist (Coast Range Biological) and the biologist provided a letter summarizing his analysis of the landscape plan and recommended changes. In summary, the biologist recommended that one of the plant species be removed from the landscape palette and that staff verify that the new landscaping is outside of the required buffer area. Staff compared the location of the new split rail fencing and verified that both the fencing and new landscaping would be outside of the required riparian buffer. Based on the recommendation on the biologist, the landscape architect revised the landscape palette as is reflected in the plans. With the additional analysis, the landscape plan for the site is drought tolerant and compatible with the surrounding area.

19. *The design shall be energy efficient and incorporate renewable energy design elements including, but not limited to:*
   a. Exterior energy design elements;
   b. Internal lighting service and climatic control systems; and
   c. Building siting and landscape elements.
Evidence: The project will conform to the energy and lighting requirements of the California Building Code and to all relevant requirements of the City’s Water Efficiency in Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 13.04). Additionally, pervious pavers have been selected for the expanded driveway material.
Public Access Trail Dedication Findings

The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the public access easement offer and all of the following required findings as required by Section 18.40.050 of the Municipal Code / Implementation Plan:

A. Required Overall Findings

1. A Statement of the individual and cumulative burdens imposed on public access and recreation opportunities based on applicable factors identified in B, Project Specific Findings.

**Statement:** The subject property is between Jenna Lane and Oak Avenue Park. Given the physical proximity to the denser residential development to the east of the property, public access to a City park and coastal recreation would be diminished if the requested public access dedication were not to take place.

2. An analysis on applicable factors identified in B, Project Specific Findings, of the necessity for requiring public access conditions to find the project consistent with the public access provisions in the Coastal Act.

**Evidence:** As explained in the Project Specific Findings below, the location and site characteristics justify the request for public access, as required by Section 30212 of the Coastal Act.

3. A description of legitimate government interest furthered by any access condition requirement.

**Evidence:** The access condition requirement is a legitimate government interest because the new trail alignment would extend the existing trail network and provide non-motorized travel between Oak Avenue Park, Jenna Lane and eventually the Coastal Trail further to the west. Additionally, the City’s Parks and Recreation Element includes approximate alignment of the Pilarcitos Creek trail. Policy 2.2.8 of this Element states, “Develop linear park pathways along Cañada Verde, Pilarcitos and Frenchman’s Creeks to connect the foothill trail and area east of the highway with the Coastal Trail and areas west of the highway.” The new trail alignment would contribute to meeting this City policy.

4. An explanation of how imposition of an access dedication requirement alleviates the access burdens identified and is reasonably related in nature and extent.

**Evidence:** Given the location and size of the site, the pedestrian connection between Oak Avenue Park, Jenna Lane and eventually the coast that the trail dedication would
provide, reasonably relates to the nature and extent of the proposed intensification of the subject property.

B. Required Project-Specific Findings

1. Project Effects on Demand for Access and Recreation. Identification of existing and open public access and coastal recreation areas and facilities in the regional and local vicinity of the development. Analysis of the project’s effects upon existing public access and recreation opportunities. Analysis of the project’s cumulative effects upon the use and capacity of the identified access and recreation opportunities, including public tidelands and beach resources, and upon the capacity of major coastal roads from subdivision, intensification or cumulative build-out. Projection of the anticipated demand and need for increased coastal access and recreation opportunities for the public. Analysis of the contribution of the project’s cumulative effects to any such projected increase. Description of the physical characteristics of the site and its proximity to the sea, tideland viewing points, upland recreation areas, and trail linkages to tidelands or recreation areas. Analysis of the importance and potential of the site, because of its location or other characteristics, for creating, preserving or enhancing public access to tidelands or public recreation opportunities.

**Evidence:** The site itself is located at the end of Jenna Lane, approximately ¼ mile north of Kelly Avenue and approximately ½ mile east of tidelands. A City park (Oak Avenue Park) is adjacent to the subject property to the east. The closest public access to coastal recreational opportunities to the west is along Kelly Avenue. The project itself, the construction of a new residence, would not place an over burdensome cumulative effect on access and recreational opportunities. However, given the location of the site, the requested public access dedication within the required riparian buffer would provide an access link between Oak Avenue Park, Jenna Lane and eventually to tidelands to the west. The site itself is important for access because it provides a crucial non-motorized intersection between the site and surrounding neighborhood and coastal recreational areas. Additionally, the site is approximately 1 ½ acres in size and is deeded with the contiguous property to the west. Given the large size of the sites, a twenty-foot easement along Pilarcitos Creek and ten-foot easement along the eastern side of the property and existing access easement would not restrict the applicant from developing the property as proposed. Given the location and size of the property, recording the requested public access dedication would enhance public access to recreational opportunities by providing a vital link between Oak Avenue Park, Jenna Lane and eventually to tidelands to the west.

2. Shoreline Processes. Description of the existing shoreline conditions, including beach profile, accessibility and usability of the beach, history of erosion or accretion, character and sources of sand, wave and sand movement, presence of shoreline protective structures, location of the line of mean high tide during the season when the beach is at its narrowest (generally during the late winter) and the proximity of that line to existing
structures, and any other factors which substantially characterize or affect the shoreline processes at the site. Identification of anticipated changes to shoreline processes and beach profile unrelated to the proposed development. Description and analysis of any reasonably likely changes, attributable to the primary and cumulative effects of the project, to: wave and sand movement affecting beaches in the vicinity of the project; the profile of the beach; the character, extent, accessibility and usability of the beach; and any other factors which characterize or affect beaches in the vicinity. Analysis of the effect of any identified changes of the project, alone or in combination with other anticipated changes, will have upon the ability of the public to use public tidelands and shoreline recreation areas.

Evidence: The subject property is approximately ½ mile east of tidelands at Half Moon Bay State Beach. Minimal structures exist between the subject property and bluff edge. Given the distance between the subject property and the closest tidelands, the proposed project would not adversely affect the beach areas to the west.

3. Historic Public Use. Evidence of use of the site by members of the general public for a continuous five-year period (such use may be seasonal). Evidence of the type and character of use made by the public (vertical, lateral, bluff top, etc., and for passive and/or active recreational use, etc.). Identification of any agency (or person) who has maintained and/or improved the area subject to historic public use and the nature of the maintenance performed and improvement made. Identification of the record owner of the area historically used by the public and any attempts by the owner to prohibit public use of the area, including the success or failure of those attempts. Description of the potential for adverse impact on public use of the area from the proposed development (including but not limited to, creation of physical or psychological impediments to public use).

Evidence: The area of the proposed Public Access Trail Easement has not historically been used and/or maintained for public use. The area of the requested public access easement within the riparian buffer on the subject property has historically been used for agricultural purposes. More recently, the site has been developed with one small single family residence.

4. Physical Obstructions. Description of any physical aspects of the development which block or impede the ability of the public to get to or along the tidelands, public recreation areas, or other public coastal resources or to see the shoreline.

Evidence: The site is approximately 1 ½ acres in size. The development standards for the Matteucci Specific Plan limits the size of the building footprint on the site to 20% of the lot size. Given the large size of the lot and the ample space remaining outside of the 20% building footprint for the twenty-foot wide easement within the fifty-foot wide riparian buffer along Pilarcitos Creek riparian vegetation and ten-foot wide easement along the
eastern side of the property and existing access easement, the proposed development would not hinder the ability of the public to access coastal resources.

5. Other Adverse Impacts on Access and Recreation. Description of the development’s physical proximity and relationship to the shoreline and any public recreation area. Analysis of the extent to which buildings, walls, signs, streets or other aspects of the development, individually or cumulatively, are likely to diminish the public’s use of tidelands or lands committed to public recreation. Description of any alteration of the aesthetic, visual or recreational value of public use areas, and of any diminution of the quality or amount of recreational use of public lands which may be attributable to the individual or cumulative effects of the development.

**Evidence:** Oak Avenue Park, a public City park is adjacent to the subject to the east. The requested pedestrian public access dedication along the eastern side property line and access easement would provide vital access to this park from Jenna Lane. The subject property is also between the largest multi-family neighborhood in the City and the beach and Half Moon Bay State Park. The public access dedication would also allow for trail access across the subject property towards the shoreline. Due to the physical proximity to the dense residential development to the east of the property, public access to a City park and coastal recreation would be diminished if the requested public access dedication were not to take place.

**Environmental Review – Finding**

**CEQA** – The project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

**Evidence:** An Initial Study (IS) and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) were prepared for the project in conformance with the requirements of CEQA, and the Draft IS/MND was circulated for a 20-day public review, which ran between June 22, 2016 and July 11, 2016. The Final Draft IS/MND and Draft Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program is included as Attachment 7.
EXHIBIT C
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION P-17-04
PDP-15-051

A. The following Conditions shall apply to the subject site:

1. **CONFORMANCE WITH APPROVED PLANS.** Development of the site shall conform to the approved plans entitled 32 Jenna Lane with a City date stamp of August 16, 2016 and April 6, 2016, except for any revisions required by this permit. The Community Development Director shall review and may approve any deviation from the approved plans that is determined minor in nature. Any other change shall require the submittal of a major modification application and fees and shall be subject to a public hearing as required by Title 18. (Planning)

2. **CONFORMANCE WITH CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.** The permittee shall construct and operate this Project in full conformance with these Conditions of Approval. Any revision of the Conditions of Approval shall require submittal of a major modification subject to a public hearing as required by Title 18. (Planning)

3. **CONFORMANCE WITH THE MUNICIPAL CODE.** No part of this approval shall be construed to permit a violation of any part of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code. (Planning)

4. **MITIGATION MONITORING AND LOG.** This project shall comply with all of the requirements of the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. The mitigation measures within the MMRP include the following:

   **ALG-MM1:** In order to reduce glare and light impacts on the surrounding properties, all new exterior light fixtures associated with the new residence shall be shielded and facing downward. No flood lights would be allowed with the new improvements on the site.

   **BIO-MM1a:** Within two weeks prior to the start of construction, a worker education program shall be presented at the project site by a qualified biologist. Associated written material will be distributed. It shall be the onsite foreman’s responsibility to ensure that all construction personnel and subcontractors receive a copy of the education program. The education program shall include a description of the CRLF and SFGS and their habitat, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act, the necessity of adhering to the Act to avoid penalty, measures implemented to avoid affecting CRLF and SFGS specific to the project and the work boundaries of the project.

   **BIO-MM1b:** Prior to construction, the project disturbance envelope (encompassing all ground disturbance associated with the project, including grading, trenching, vegetation
removal, staging, and material storage) shall be clearly identified on project site plans, shall be located as far as feasible from the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor, and shall be located outside of the 50-foot ESHA buffer, as well as the wildlife movement corridor extending 25-feet from the ESHA buffer edge (as described in Mitigation Measure 3). Exclusion fencing shall be installed around the entire work area under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Fencing shall be at least 36 inches above ground level and buried at least 6 inches into the ground, and shall have a gate or similar opening to allow access to the work area, but shall remain closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels for snakes. The fencing shall be monitored daily by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist at least once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project. All ground disturbance associated with project construction, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, material storage, and parking, shall occur within the fenced area, and no construction equipment or personnel shall enter areas outside of the fenced area.

**BIO-MM1c:** A qualified biologist shall monitor all removal of vegetation on the project site. Immediately prior to vegetation removal, the qualified biologist shall survey the work area for CRLF and SFGS. If CRLF and SFGS are observed in the work area, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW contacted for guidance. If no CRLF or SFGS are observed during the vegetation removal effort, then no additional biological monitoring (other than exclusion fence inspections, mentioned above) shall be performed unless a CRLF or SFGS is subsequently reported by construction personnel or others in the area. If a CRLF or SFGS is observed on or near the project site, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted immediately, and they may require daily biological monitoring and other mitigation measures.

**BIO-MM1d:** Exposed trenches resulting from project construction shall be backfilled as soon as work is complete. Open trenches shall have an escape ramp every 50-feet or less (composed of earthen material no greater than 45 degrees) installed at each end before nightfall each work day so that any entrapped wildlife may exit. To reduce impacts to nocturnal species in the area, construction shall be limited to daylight hours and no construction lighting shall remain at night.

**BIO-MM2:** If project construction is conducted during the February 1 to August 15 breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey throughout area of suitable habitat within 300 feet of the project site within 30 days prior to the onset of any construction activity. If bird nests are observed, an
appropriate buffer zone shall be established around all active nests to protect nesting adults and their young from construction disturbance. Buffer zones shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW based on the site conditions and the species potentially impacted. Work within the buffer zone shall be postponed until all the young are fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.

**BIO-MM3:** Any fencing located within 25-feet of the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge shall be wildlife friendly (such as split rail or other fencing that allows for the passage of wildlife). No other significant barriers to wildlife movement shall be placed in this area.

**CR-MM1:** Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American(s). If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the permittee shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

**CR-MM2:** If subsurface historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect archaeological resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.

**PALEO-MM1:** If subsurface geologic and/or paleontological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist to perform reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect such resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.

**WQ-MM1:** Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant will be required to submit plans demonstrating on-site detention limiting storm water discharge from the site to pre-development levels in conformance with City standards. The impact would be less than significant.
**WQ-MM2:** Compliance with the City’s NPDES (storm water control) requirements and SWRCB’s General Construction Permit for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period will be required throughout the construction process.

The applicant shall maintain an on-site log of all biological mitigation training, monitoring and surveys. The log shall include the date of the training, the contact information of the qualified biologist that conducted the training and the names of all participating workers and contractors. The log shall also include the date, contact information of the qualified biologist and outcome of any biological surveys or inspections that take place on the site. The log shall be available on the site for inspection by City staff. (Planning)

5. **LIGHTING.** All exterior lighting shall be fully shielded so that no light source is visible from outside the property, except as otherwise expressly approved. (Planning)

6. **SIDEWALK MAINTENANCE AND LIABILITY.** It shall be the duty of the Property Owner(s) whose property is adjacent to any portion of a public street or place to maintain any sidewalks along the project frontage in a safe and non-dangerous condition. Sidewalk maintenance shall include removal and replacement of concrete to eliminate tripping hazards; and pruning and trimming of trees, shrubs, ground cover and other landscaping within the public right-of-way. The Property Owner has the primary and exclusive duty to fund and perform such maintenance and repair, whether or not the City has notified the property owner of the need for such maintenance or repairs or has performed similar maintenance or repairs in the past, pursuant to §12.18.020 and §12.18.030 of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code. (Engineering)

7. **LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE.** The applicant/owner shall ensure that all landscaped areas and/or fences are continuously maintained, and all plant material is maintained free of refuse and weeds and in a healthy growing condition and in compliance with the line of site requirement within the zoning code. (Planning)

**B. The following Conditions shall be fulfilled prior to the issuance of building permits:**

1. **SIGNED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.** The applicant/owner shall submit a signed copy of the conditions of approval to the Planning Division prior to issuance of a building permit. (Planning)

2. **RECORDED TRAIL EASEMENT DEDICATION.** The applicant shall provide an updated offer to dedicate a twenty-foot easement within the required 50-foot riparian buffer parallel to Pilarcitos Creek riparian vegetation, outside of poison hemlock (Conium maculatum) area shown on the addendum to the biological report dated April 22, 2016 and a ten-foot easement along the eastern side of the property and existing access easement (APN’s 056-072-280 and 056-072-120). The location and offer language shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director and City Attorney, and recorded at the County of
San Mateo Recorder’s Office. A copy of the recorded dedication shall be provided to the City in conjunction with or prior to the issuance of the building permit. (Planning)

3. **ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT DEED RESTRICTION.** Prior to occupancy of the accessory dwelling unit (ADU), the applicant shall record a deed restriction to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development. The deed restriction will include the following in conformance with the requirements of Zoning Code Section 18.33.050:

   a) The ADU shall not be sold separately.
   
   b) The ADU is restricted to the approved size.
   
   c) The ADU is a permitted use only so long as either the main residence or the ADU is occupied by the owner of record as the principal residence.
   
   d) The above declarations are binding upon any successor in ownership of the property. Lack of compliance will result in the ADU becoming an illegal, nonconforming use subject to the code enforcement and abatement proceedings established by the city of Half Moon Bay Municipal Code.
   
   e) The deed restrictions shall lapse upon removal of the ADU. (Planning)

4. **SHORT TERM RENTAL DEED RESTRICTION.** Prior to occupancy of both the accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and the primary residence, the applicant shall record a deed restriction to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development, prohibiting short term rental (less than 30 days) of the residence and/or ADU. The language of the deed restriction shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Community Development prior to recording this deed restriction at the San Mateo County Recorder’s Office. (Planning)

5. **VALID MEASURE A OR D CERTIFICATE.** No building permit shall be issued unless the Measure D Certificate issued for the property has not expired and remains valid to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. (Planning)

6. **PROJECT BIOLOGIST.** Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit to the Director the name, company affiliation, and contact information of the project biologist who will oversee the construction. The project biologist shall be selected from the City’s List of Pre-approved Biological Consultants to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. The applicant shall notify the Community Development Director in writing within 24 hours of any change in the project biologist. (Planning)

7. **CONSTRUCTION PLANS.** File Number PDP-15-051 and the Conditions of Approval for this project shall be provided on the cover page of the building permit application plan submittal. All plans, specifications, engineering calculations, diagrams, reports, and other data for construction of the building and required improvements shall be submitted with the appropriate permit application to the City’s Building and Engineering Divisions for review and approval. Computations and back-up data will be considered a part of the
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required plans. Structural calculations and engineering calculations shall be prepared, wet-stamped and signed by an engineer or architect licensed by the State of California. The plans must show the location of the sewer connection, and a property line sewer cleanout must be installed prior to Building Permit approval. (Planning)

8. ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING. Per VI D of the Matteucci Specific Plan, details shall be provided on the building permit plans for electric vehicle charging for each of the garage parking stalls. (Planning)

9. WATER CONSERVATION IN LANDSCAPING. If the project includes 1,000 square feet or more of irrigated landscaping (new or rehabilitated) the permittee shall submit landscape and irrigation plans and an Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist that demonstrate compliance with the City’s Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance (Chapter 13.04 of the Municipal Code) prior to issuance of building permits to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. (Planning)

10. SURVEY REQUIRED. Submit a detailed topographic/site boundary survey certified by a licensed surveyor with building application plans. The survey shall include a baseline elevation datum point on, or close to the construction site, indicating existing grade of the datum. This datum point shall be permanent, marked, shall remain fixed in the field, and shall not be disturbed throughout the building process. Examples of datum points include: fire hydrants, manhole covers, survey markers, and street curbs. This datum point shall be shown on all site plans including revised/resubmitted plans. The survey must show the footprint and roof plan of the proposed residence and identify the existing grade elevations at the corners and roof ridgeline of the residence. (Building)

11. EVIDENCE OF WATER CONNECTION CAPACITY. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the permittee shall submit a letter from Coastside County Water District certifying that the subject site has an adequately-sized water connection for this approved project. (Building)

12. EVIDENCE OF SEWER CONNECTION CAPACITY. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the permittee shall demonstrate issuance of a sewer permit from the Sewer Authority Mid-Coast. (Building)

13. CONSTRUCTION PLANS. Construction plans submitted for building permit(s) shall include a plan sheet showing utility connections, trench restoration details, driveway apron (driveway apron width, spacing between driveways, slopes, etc.), and other improvements in the public right-of-way meeting City standards. (Engineering)

14. LOT GRADING, MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT AND VEHICLE STORAGE. No lot site grading, preparation, storage, or placement of construction materials, equipment, or vehicles shall take place prior to issuance of a building permit. Any earth movement on or off the site in excess of 50 cubic yards shall require the submittal of a grading plan for review by the City.
Engineer and issuance of a grading permit. Lot Grading includes, but is not limited to, any leveling, scraping, clearing, or removal of lot surface area. Materials, Equipment, and Vehicles include, but are not limited to:

1. All masonry, wood, and steel construction materials;
2. All construction-related equipment and storage containers; and
3. All construction-related vehicles, including temporary trailers. (Engineering)

15. LOT DRAINAGE PLAN AND ON-SITE DETENTION Construction plans submitted for building permits shall include a Lot Drainage Plan showing how the surface runoff is retained on the site and the remainder is drained to the public right-of-way. Plans shall include design details and supporting calculations for storm water detention on-site for the additional runoff from a ten year frequency storm of two hour duration. Plans shall show how the rear and side yards will properly drain to an approved BMP facility, and how the finished grades on the property relate to the existing grades on adjacent property. The Plan shall include pad elevation, finished floor elevation, site high and low points, drainage swales, area drains, and existing grade at adjacent property. The permittee shall provide appropriate measures to discharge the flood waters from any unfinished floor areas. (Engineering)

16. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT-TREATMENT (FOR NON-REGULATED PROJECTS). Non-regulated projects consist of single-family residences and other small projects that create and/or replace less than 5,000 square feet of impervious surface. Construction plans submitted for building permits shall include a storm water management-treatment plan showing implementation of at least one of the six Low Impact Development (LID) measures listed below:

a. Direct runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use;
b. Direct roof runoff into vegetated areas;
c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios into vegetated areas;
d. Direct runoff from driveways and/or uncovered parking lots into vegetated areas;
e. Construct sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios with permeable surfaces; or
f. Construct bike lanes, driveways, and/or uncovered parking lots with permeable surfaces. (Engineering)

Permittee shall also submit the ‘stormwater checklist for small projects’ with the building plan submittal.

17. COPPER BUILDING ELEMENTS. The building plans shall specify that all copper building elements will be pre-patinated at the factory, or if patination will occur on the site, the
plans shall identify best management practices in conformance with the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program Requirements for Architectural Copper, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. (Engineering)

18. **EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL.** An erosion and sediment control plan shall be submitted that shows effective Best Management Practices (BMP) and erosion and sediment control measures for the site. Construction plans shall also include the “construction best management practices” plan sheet. (Engineering)

19. **UNDERGROUND UTILITIES/SERVICES.** Electric, telecommunication, and cable and utility service to the property shall be through underground service connections only. No overhead utilities are allowed. (Engineering)

20. **STREET/PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY CUTS FOR UTILITY CONNECTIONS.** Street cuts for utility connections that are less than twenty (20) feet apart shall be repaired with a single patch. Asphalt repair and overlay shall be in accordance with the City Standard Details. (Engineering)

21. **SEWER CONNECTION FEE.** The proposed development is subject to a sewer connection fee pursuant to Section 13.36.070 of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code. The fee shall be paid to the City prior to issuance of building permits. (Engineering)

22. **FIRE CLEARANCE REQUIREMENTS.** The permittee shall comply with all applicable fire and building codes and standards relating to fire and panic safety as identified by the Coastside Fire Protection District during the building permit process. (Fire)

23. **FIRE SPRINKLERS AND FIRE DISTRICT REQUIREMENTS.** Pursuant to Fire District ordinance, the permittee shall install an automatic fire sprinkler system throughout the proposed or improved dwelling. All areas that are accessible for storage purposes shall be equipped with fire sprinklers. The plans for this system must be submitted to the City of Half Moon Bay Building Division to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permits. Upon submission of plans, the City will forward a complete set to the Coastside County Fire Protection District for review. Fees for automatic fire sprinkler systems shall be paid to the City prior to plan review. (Fire)

24. **HARD-WIRED SMOKE DETECTORS/ALARMS.** Pursuant to the 2013 California Building and Residential Code, State Fire Marshal regulations and Coastside Fire District Ordinance 2013-03, the permittee shall install smoke detectors which are hard-wired, interconnected and have battery backup in each new or reconditioned sleeping room and at a point centrally located in the corridor or area giving access to each separate sleeping area. A minimum of one detector per floor is required. For alterations: If there is an attic, basement, crawl space or removal of a wall or ceiling that provides access, then all smoke alarms shall be hardwired and interconnected. Building plan submittals shall demonstrate conformance
with these requirements to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permits. (Fire)

25. **FIRE ACCESS ROADS**: The permittee shall provide and maintain an asphalt-surface road for ingress and egress of fire apparatus in conformance with Coastside Fire Protection District Ordinance 2013-03 and the California Fire Code, to the satisfaction of the Fire Marshall. Pursuant to the 2013 California Fire Code (CFC) and Appendix D of 2013 CFC, dead-end roads exceeding 150 feet shall be provided with a turnaround, and road width shall not be less than 20 feet clear exclusive of any on-street parking area. Approved signs and painted curbs or lines shall be provided and maintained to identify fire access roads and state the prohibition on their obstruction. The fire access roads shall be installed prior to storage of combustibles on the project site to the satisfaction of the Fire Marshall. (Fire)

26. **FIRE HYDRANT**. Pursuant to 2013 California Fire Code, Appendix B and C, the permittee shall provide a Fire District approved fire hydrant (CLOW 960) within 250 feet of the proposed single-family dwelling unit measured by way of drivable access prior to issuance of an occupancy permit. If the single-family dwelling is on a dead end street, then the hydrant shall be within 200 feet. The hydrant must produce a minimum fire flow of 1,000 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for 2 hours. Additional fire flow is required for single-family dwellings over 3,600 square feet, and all commercial structures. Contact the Coastside County Fire Protection District for fire flow requirements. Contact Coastside County Water District prior to applying for a building permit to obtain flow data and District specifications and regulations on installing a fire hydrant. (Fire)

27. **COASTSIDE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT - REGULATIONS**. The project shall comply with all applicable regulations and requirements of the Coastside County Water District. Water service shall not be in the same trench as other utilities. (Water District)

C. **The following conditions shall be implemented prior to and during construction:**

1. **ARCHAEOLOGY-DISCOVERY OF HUMAN REMAINS**. Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American(s). If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the permittee shall re-inter the
human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance. (Planning)

2. **ARCHAEOLOGY-DISCOVERY OF RESOURCES.** If subsurface historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect archaeological resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Director. (Building)

3. **CONSTRUCTION TRAILERS.** Temporary construction trailers are permitted as accessory uses in conjunction with the development of this site, subject to the following conditions:
   a. The construction trailer shall be used as a temporary construction office only.
   b. Neither sanitation facilities nor plumbed water is permitted within the trailer.
   c. No overnight inhabitance of the construction trailer is permitted.
   d. No construction trailers are permitted on site prior to building permit issuance.
   e. The construction trailer shall be removed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. (Planning)

4. **AIR QUALITY BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.** The project shall implement the following standard BAAQMD dust control measures during all phases of construction on the project site:
   • All active construction areas shall be watered twice daily or more often if necessary. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles-per-hour.
   • Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads and parking and staging areas at construction sites.
   • Cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, and any other materials that can be windblown. Trucks transporting these materials shall be covered.
   • All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day or as often as necessary to keep them free of dust and debris associated with site construction. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
   • Subsequent to clearing, grading, or excavating, exposed portions of the site shall be watered, landscaped, treated with soil stabilizers, or covered as soon as possible. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas and previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more.
   • Installation of sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
   • Replanting of vegetation in disturbed areas as soon as possible after completion of construction.
• Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
• All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
• Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the City of Half Moon Bay regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

5. **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Any materials deemed hazardous by the San Mateo County Department of Health that are uncovered or discovered during the course of work under this permit shall be disposed in accordance with regulations of the San Mateo County of Health. *(Building)*

6. **COMPLIANCE WITH CBC.** All structures shall be constructed in compliance with the standards of the 2013 California Codes of Regulations Title 24, including Building Code, Residential Code, Administrative Code, Mechanical Code, Plumbing Code, Electrical Code, Energy Code, Fire Code and Green Building Code to the satisfaction of the Building Official. *(Building)*

7. **FIRST FLOOR HEIGHT VERIFICATION.** Prior to below floor framing or concrete slab steel reinforcement inspection, a stamped and signed building height verification letter shall be submitted to the City from a licensed land survey certifying that the first floor height as constructed is equal to (or less than) the elevation specified for the first floor height in the approved plans. *(Building)*

8. **OVERALL PROJECT HEIGHT.** Maximum overall height of the project, including any grading, foundation, pad, and building elevations shall be calculated using the elevation points indicated on the topographic survey map submitted at the time of application. The approved height of all projects developed in the City will be measured from existing grade as indicated on the submitted topographical survey. *(Building)*

9. **COMPLETION OF UTILITIES.** Any public utilities requiring relocation as a result of the construction of the building(s) or improvements under this permit shall be relocated at the owner’s expense. *(Building)*

10. **ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING.** Electric vehicle charging wiring and ports shall be installed for electric vehicle charging for each of the garage parking stalls. *(Planning)*

11. **CONSTRUCTION HOURS.** Construction work shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday; 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Saturdays; and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00
p.m. Sundays and holidays, except as expressly authorized by the City Engineer in conformance with Section 14.40.020 of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code. (Engineering)

12. **NOTICE OF DISRUPTION.** The permittee shall provide written notice to affected property and business owners and a copy of such notice to the City Engineer a minimum of two business days prior to any planned disruption of pedestrian or vehicular traffic, parking, or public service facilities. (Engineering)

13. **CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL STORAGE.** Construction material shall not be stored in the street right-of-way without prior approval from the City Engineer. (Engineering)

14. **ENCROACHMENT PERMIT.** The permittee shall obtain an encroachment permit prior to starting any construction activity within the City right-of-way or affecting City improvements. All improvements constructed within the City right-of-way shall conform to City standards to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. (Engineering)

D. **The following conditions shall be implemented prior to issuance of an occupancy permit:**

1. **EXTERIOR COLORS AND MATERIALS.** Exterior building colors and materials shall be in substantial conformance with those shown on the approved color and materials indicated on the submitted plans date-stamped 04/06/16 to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development. Roof color shall be limited to non-reflective material and color, compatible with the surrounding Cypress trees. (Planning)

2. **TREE INSTALLATION.** 1 minimum 24-inch box size tree shall be installed in the front setback of the property. The tree shall be planted in conformance with the site distance requirements of Section 18.06.040(B)(4) of the Zoning Code and shall not interfere with utility lines. (Planning/Engineering)

3. **DISPLAY OF SINGLE-FAMILY STREET ADDRESS.** Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit, the residential dwelling shall display an internally-illuminated street address number in a prominent location on the dwelling, visible from the street (a minimum of 6 feet above the surface of the driveway), and with contrasting background and letters/numbers that are 4 inches in height with a minimum 3/4–inch stroke. Where a building is set back from the street or otherwise obscured, a street address with 3-inch reflective numbers/letters shall also be provided near the driveway entrance leading to the dwelling. (Fire/Building)

4. **TREE PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS.** The following tree protection measures shall be implemented during construction:
   a) Prior to commencement of construction, construction fencing shall be placed around the drip line of all trees proposed for preservation.
b) No grading or other construction shall occur within the drip line of any tree proposed for preservation except in conformance with a Tree Protection Plan approved by the Community Development Director.

c) No vehicle, equipment or materials shall be parked or stored within the drip line of any tree proposed for preservation. (Planning/Building)

E. **Validity and Expiration of Permits**

1. **EFFECTIVE DATE.** This site is located within the Coastal Appeal Zone. This permit shall take effect after expiration of the Coastal Commission appeal period, or if the permit is appealed to the Coastal Commission during the appeal period, it shall take effect after final Coastal Commission action. (Planning)

2. **ACCURACY OF APPLICATION MATERIALS.** The permittee shall be responsible for the completeness and accuracy of all forms and material submitted for this application. Any errors or discrepancies found therein may be grounds for the revocation or modification of this permit and/or any other City approvals. (Planning)

3. **PERMIT EXPIRATION.** The Coastal Development Permit (CDP), Use Permit and Architectural Review shall expire one year from its date of final approval if development plans for a Building Permit have not been submitted. Once a Building Permit is issued, the CDP shall be deemed in effect. If plans for a Building Permit are submitted within the 1-year expiration period, and a Building Permit is not issued, the expiration of the CDP shall coincide and run concurrently with the Building Permit plan submittal/application as long as due diligence is pursued in the opinion of the Building Official in obtaining the Building Permit.

4. **PERMIT EXTENSION.** The Community Development Director may, at the Director’s discretion, approve a single one-year extension of this permit based on a written request and fee submitted to the Director prior to expiration of the permit. Any other extension shall require approval of a Permit Amendment prior to expiration of the permit. Any Amendment Application to extend the permit shall be filed a minimum of ninety (90) days prior to permit expiration to ensure adequate processing time. (Planning)

5. **PERMIT RUNS WITH THE LAND.** The approval runs with the land and the rights and obligations thereunder, including the responsibility to comply with conditions of approval, shall be binding upon successors in interest in the real property unless or until such permits are expressly abandoned or revoked. (Planning)
6. **HOLD HARMLESS.** The permittee agrees as a condition of approval of this application to indemnify, protect, defend with counsel selected by the City, and hold harmless, the City, and any agency or instrumentality thereof, and its elected and appointed officials, officers, employees and agents, from and against an and all liabilities, claims, actions, causes of action, proceedings, suits, damages, judgments, liens, levies, costs and expenses of whatever nature, including reasonable attorney’s fees and disbursements (collectively, “Claims”) arising out of or in any way relating to the approval of this application, any actions taken by the City related to this entitlement, any review by the California Coastal Commission conducted under the California Coastal Act Public Resources Code Section 30000 et seq., or any environmental review conducted under the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 210000 et seq., for this entitlement and related actions. The indemnification shall include any Claims that may be asserted by any person or entity, including the permittee, arising out of or in connection with the approval of this application, whether or not there is concurrent, passive or active negligence on the part of the City, and any agency or instrumentality thereof, and its elected and appointed officials, officers, employees and agents. The permittee’s duty to defend the City shall not apply in those instances when the permittee has asserted the Claims, although the permittee shall still have a duty to indemnify, protect and hold harmless the City. (City Attorney).

**OWNER’S/PERMITTEE’S CERTIFICATION:**

I have read and understand and hereby accept and agree to implement the foregoing conditions of approval of the Coastal Development Permit.

APPLICANT:

___________________________________  ______________________

(Signature)  (Date)
A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HALF MOON BAY ADOPTING THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM AND APPROVING A COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, USE PERMIT AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW TWO-STORY, 28 FEET IN HEIGHT, 7,945 SQUARE FOOT RESIDENCE AT 32 JENNA LANE IN THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT ZONING DISTRICT AND THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (APN’S 056-072-280 AND 056-072-120)

WHEREAS, an application was submitted requesting approval of Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit and Architectural Review to allow the construction of a new two-story, 28 feet in height, 7,945 square foot residence at 32 Jenna Lane in the Planned Unit Development Zoning District and the Residential Medium Density General Plan designation (APN’s 056-072-280, 056-072-120); and

WHEREAS, the procedures for processing the application have been followed as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on September 13, 2016 and July 11, 2017, at which time all those desiring to be heard on the matter were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission considered all written and oral testimony presented for consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Draft Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program was circulated for 20 days between June 22, 2016 and July 11, 2016 for public review and comments; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has determined that the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study are complete and conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission hereby adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program contained in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has made the required findings for approval of the project, set forth in Exhibit B to this resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program contained in Exhibit A and approves PDP-15-051, based upon the Findings contained in Exhibit B and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in Exhibit C.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City of Half Moon Bay Planning Commission at a duly noticed public hearing held July 11, 2017.

AYES, NOES, ABSENT, ABSTAIN,

APPROVED:

_________________________  _______________
Rick Hernandez, Chair         Jill Ekas, Planning Manager
EXHIBIT A

CITY OF HALF MOON BAY
City Hall • 501 Main Street • Half Moon Bay • CA • 94019

MITIGATE NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The Community Development Director has reviewed the proposed project described below to determine whether it could have a significant effect on the environment. Significant effect on the environment means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

NAME OF PROJECT: New Single Family Residence, Remodel of Existing House at 32 Jenna Lane

PROJECT FILE NUMBER: PDP-15-051

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project consists of a Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review and Use Permit to allow the construction of a new two-story 8,290 square-foot single-family residence, including a three-car attached garage, remodel of the existing guesthouse on the site and associated site improvements. The removal of three non-heritage trees on the site is also included with the proposal. The applicant and property owner will implement the project.

PROJECT LOCATION: The project area is located on 32 Jenna Lane (APN 056-072-280), which is at the northern terminus of Jenna Lane at Cypress Avenue, north of Kelly Avenue and approximately 0.20 miles west of Highway 1 (Cabrillo Highway) in the City of Half Moon Bay (Figure 1). The project area encompasses the entirety of APN 056-072-280, measuring approximately 380 feet x 225 feet and is 66,141 square feet, or 1.52 acres in area. The site is within the Kelly Avenue Tract subdivision, which is within the Matteucci Planned Unit Development, with a Planned Development District General Plan / Local Coastal Program designation. The site is within the California Coastal Commission Appeals Jurisdiction.

APPLICANT: Derek Vinh

FINDING: The Community Development Director finds the project described above will not have a significant effect on the environment, in that the attached Initial Study identifies one or more potentially significant effects on the environment, and the project applicant, before public release of this draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, has agreed to include mitigation in the project that clearly reduces the effects of the project to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURES INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT:
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1. **Aesthetics, Light and Glare.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation required.

**ALG-MM1:** In order to reduce glare and light impacts on the surrounding properties, all new exterior light fixtures associated with the new residence shall be shielded and facing downward. No flood lights would be allowed with the new improvements on the site.

2. **Agricultural Resources.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation required.

3. **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases.** The project will not have a significant impact and mitigation is not required. The proposed project would be developed in conformance with the standard Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) dust control measures during all phases of construction on the project site. Standard construction Best Management Practices are included in the project to further reduce the project’s less than significant impact.

4. **Biological Resources.** The following mitigation has been included in the project to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

**BIO-MM1a:** Within two weeks prior to the start of construction, a worker education program shall be presented at the project site by a qualified biologist. Associated written material will be distributed. It shall be the onsite foreman’s responsibility to ensure that all construction personnel and subcontractors receive a copy of the education program. The education program shall include a description of the CRLF and SFGS and their habitat, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act, the necessity of adhering to the Act to avoid penalty, measures implemented to avoid affecting CRLF and SFGS specific to the project and the work boundaries of the project.

**BIO-MM1b:** Prior to construction, the project disturbance envelope (encompassing all ground disturbance associated with the project, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, and material storage) shall be clearly identified on project site plans, shall be located as far as feasible from the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor, and shall be located outside of the 50-foot ESHA buffer, as well as the wildlife movement corridor extending 25-feet from the ESHA buffer edge (as described in Mitigation Measure 3). Exclusion fencing shall be installed around the entire work area under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Fencing shall be at least 36 inches above ground level and buried at least 6 inches into the ground, and shall have a gate or similar opening to allow access to the work area, but shall remain closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels for snakes. The fencing shall be monitored daily by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist at least once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a
qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project. All ground disturbance associated with project construction, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, material storage, and parking, shall occur within the fenced area, and no construction equipment or personnel shall enter areas outside of the fenced area.

**BIO-MM1c:** A qualified biologist shall monitor all removal of vegetation on the project site. Immediately prior to vegetation removal, the qualified biologist shall survey the work area for CRLF and SFGS. If CRLF and SFGS are observed in the work area, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW contacted for guidance. If no CRLF or SFGS are observed during the vegetation removal effort, then no additional biological monitoring (other than exclusion fence inspections, mentioned above) shall be performed unless a CRLF or SFGS is subsequently reported by construction personnel or others in the area. If a CRLF or SFGS is observed on or near the project site, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted immediately, and they may require daily biological monitoring and other mitigation measures.

**BIO-MM1d:** Exposed trenches resulting from project construction shall be backfilled as soon as work is complete. Open trenches shall have an escape ramp every 50-feet or less (composed of earthen material no greater than 45 degrees) installed at each end before nightfall each work day so that any entrapped wildlife may exit. To reduce impacts to nocturnal species in the area, construction shall be limited to daylight hours and no construction lighting shall remain at night.

**BIO-MM2:** If project construction is conducted during the February 1 to August 15 breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey throughout area of suitable habitat within 300 feet of the project site within 30 days prior to the onset of any construction activity. If bird nests are observed, an appropriate buffer zone shall be established around all active nests to protect nesting adults and their young from construction disturbance. Buffer zones shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW based on the site conditions and the species potentially impacted. Work within the buffer zone shall be postponed until all the young are fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.

**BIO-MM3:** Any fencing located within 25-feet of the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge shall be wildlife friendly (such as split rail or other fencing that allows for the passage of wildlife). No other significant barriers to wildlife movement shall be placed in this area.

5. **Cultural Resources.** There are no known National Register or California State Historic Resource properties, California Historical landmarks, California Points of Historic Interest, or archeologically sensitive areas on the project site or in the project vicinity. However, in the event that human remains, subsurface historic and/or archeological remains are discovered, the following mitigation measures would apply.
CR-MM1: Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American(s). If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the permittee shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

CR-MM2: If subsurface historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect archaeological resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.

PALEO-MM1: If subsurface geologic and/or paleontological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist to perform reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect such resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.

6. **Geology, Soils, and Seismicity.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

7. **Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

8. **Hydrology and Water Quality.** The following mitigation has been included in the project to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

   WQ-MM1: Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant will be required to submit plans demonstrating on-site detention limiting storm water discharge from the site to pre-development levels in conformance with City standards. The impact would be less than significant.

   WQ-MM2: Compliance with the City’s NPDES (storm water control) requirements and SWRCB’s General Construction Permit for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period will be required throughout the construction process.
9. **Land Use.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

10. **Mineral Resources.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

11. **Noise.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

12. **Populations and Housing.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

13. **Public Services.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

14. **Recreation.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

15. **Transportation.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

16. **Utilities and Service Systems.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

17. **Mandatory Findings of Significance.** The project will not have a significant impact; no mitigation is required.

**PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD**

*Before 5:00 p.m. on July 11, 2016, any person may:*

1) Review the Mitigated NegativeDeclaration (MND); and
2) Submit written comments regarding the information, analysis and mitigation. Planning staff will prepare written responses to any comments, and revise the MND, as necessary, before the MND is adopted. All comments will be included in the Final MND.

Circulation period: *June 22, 2016 to July 11, 2016*

________________________________________
Scott Phillips, Associate Planner
# Mitigation Monitoring Program for 32 Jenna Lane (File No. PDP-15-051)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALG-MM1:</strong> In order to reduce glare and light impacts on the surrounding properties, all new exterior light fixtures associated with the new residence shall be shielded and facing downward. No flood lights would be allowed with the new improvements on the site.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM1a:</strong> Within two weeks prior to the start of construction, a worker education program shall be presented at the project site by a qualified biologist. Associated written material will be distributed. It shall be the onsite foreman’s responsibility to ensure that all construction personnel and subcontractors receive a copy of the education program. The education program shall include a description of the CRLF and SFGS and their habitat, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act, the necessity of adhering to the Act to avoid penalty, measures implemented to avoid affecting CRLF and SFGS specific to the project and the work boundaries of the project.</td>
<td>Prior to start of construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, &amp; Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM1b:</strong> Prior to construction, the project disturbance envelope (encompassing all ground disturbance associated with the project, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, and material storage) shall be clearly identified on project site plans, shall be located as far as feasible from the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor, and shall be located outside of the 50-</td>
<td>Prior to start of construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, &amp; Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biological Mitigation Measures | Timing | Implementation | Verification
--- | --- | --- | ---
foot ESHA buffer, as well as the wildlife movement corridor extending 25-feet from the ESHA buffer edge (as described in Mitigation Measure 3). Exclusion fencing shall be installed around the entire work area under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Fencing shall be at least 36 inches above ground level and buried at least 6 inches into the ground, and shall have a gate or similar opening to allow access to the work area, but shall remain closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels for snakes. The fencing shall be monitored daily by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist at least once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project. All ground disturbance associated with project construction, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, material storage, and parking, shall occur within the fenced area, and no construction equipment or personnel shall enter areas outside of the fenced area.

**BIO-MM1c:** A qualified biologist shall monitor all removal of vegetation on the project site. Immediately prior to vegetation removal, the qualified

<p>| Prior to removal of vegetation | Project Biologist, &amp; Construction Manager | Project Biologist Log and Final |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>biologist shall survey the work area for CRLF and SFGS. If CRLF and SFGS are observed in the work area, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW contacted for guidance. If no CRLF or SFGS are observed during the vegetation removal effort, then no additional biological monitoring (other than exclusion fence inspections, mentioned above) shall be performed unless a CRLF or SFGS is subsequently reported by construction personnel or others in the area. If a CRLF or SFGS is observed on or near the project site, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted immediately, and they may require daily biological monitoring and other mitigation measures.</td>
<td>and during the removal of vegetation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM1d</strong>: Exposed trenches resulting from project construction shall be backfilled as soon as work is complete. Open trenches shall have an escape ramp every 50-feet or less (composed of earthen material no greater than 45 degrees) installed at each end before nightfall each work day so that any entrapped wildlife may exit. To reduce impacts to nocturnal species in the area, construction shall be limited to daylight hours and no construction lighting shall remain at night.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager, and Project Biologist</td>
<td>Project Biologist Log and Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM2</strong>: If project construction is conducted during the February 1 to August 15 breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biological Mitigation Measures | Timing | Implementation | Verification
--- | --- | --- | ---
throughout area of suitable habitat within 300 feet of the project site within 30 days prior to the onset of any construction activity. If bird nests are observed, an appropriate buffer zone shall be established around all active nests to protect nesting adults and their young from construction disturbance. Buffer zones shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW based on the site conditions and the species potentially impacted. Work within the buffer zone shall be postponed until all the young are fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.

BIO-MM3: Any fencing located within 25-feet of the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge shall be wildlife friendly (such as split rail or other fencing that allows for the passage of wildlife). No other significant barriers to wildlife movement shall be placed in this area.

| Ongoing | Property Owner, Construction Manager | City Inspector |

Resolution P-16-11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR-MM1:</strong> Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American(s). If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the permittee shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR-MM2:</strong> If subsurface historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect archaeological resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PALEO-MM1</strong>: If subsurface geologic and/or paleontological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist to perform reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect such resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WQ-MM1</strong>: Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant will be required to submit plans demonstrating on-site detention limiting storm water discharge from the site to pre-development levels in conformance with City standards. The impact would be less than significant.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WQ-MM2</strong>: Compliance with the City’s NPDES (storm water control) requirements and SWRCB’s General Construction Permit for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period will be required throughout the construction process.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coastal Development Permit – Findings for Approval

The required Coastal Development Permit for this project may be approved or conditionally approved only after the approving authority has made the following findings per Municipal Code Section 18.20.070:

1. **Local Coastal Program** – *The development as proposed or as modified by conditions, conforms to the Local Coastal Program.*

   **Evidence:** The project consists of the construction of a new single-family residence, on a partially developed infill site in an existing neighborhood where public services and infrastructure are available and exist to the site. The project conforms to all City requirements, will not impact coastal resources and is consistent with the policies of the City’s Land Use Plan (LUP).

   **Coastal Act 30240(b) and Policy 3-3 (b):** *Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.*

   **Compliance:** The subject site is adjacent to a mapped environmentally sensitive habitat area (Pilarcitos Creek). A biological resource assessment was prepared and circulated for the required 45-days for comments from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Army Crops of Engineers, California Coastal Commission, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. One comment letter was received from the California Coastal Commission. The biologist who wrote the biological resource assessment (Coast Range Biological LLC) provided a response to the Coastal Commission letter, as well as an addendum to the biological report. All mitigation measures recommended by the biologist were then integrated into the Draft Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration. The implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and the riparian buffer zone restoration plan will ensure that any impacts to the environmentally sensitive habitat along Pilarcitos Creek will be avoided.

   **Policy 7-1:** *The City will establish regulations to protect the scenic corridor of Highway 1, including setbacks for new development, screening of commercial parking and landscaping associated with new development. The minimum standards shall include all areas within 200 yards of State Highway 1 which are visible from the road.*
**Compliance:** The subject site is not located within 200 yards of State Highway 1 and Highway 1 is not designated a Scenic Highway within the City limits of Half Moon Bay.

**Policy 7-5:** All new development, including additions and remodeling, shall be subject to design review.

**Compliance:** The proposed residence has been subject to design review by the Planning Commission.

**Policy 7-11:** New development along primary access routes from Highway 1 to the beach, as designated on the Land Use Map, shall be designed and sited so as to maintain and enhance the scenic quality of such routes, including building setbacks, maintenance of low height of structures, and landscaping which establishes a scenic gateway and corridor.

**Compliance:** The new single-family residence is not located along a primary access route from Highway 1 and will not affect coastal access.

**Coastal Act 30244:** Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.

**Compliance:** The new single-family residence is not located at or near identified archaeological or paleontological resources. If cultural resources or paleontological resources are unexpectedly encountered during subsurface excavation, the permit has been conditioned to require that construction halt until the find can be evaluated and appropriate mitigation identified.

2. **Growth Management System** – The development is consistent with the annual population limitation system established in the Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

**Evidence:** The site has been granted a valid Measure A Certificate for construction of one single-family residence and one accessory dwelling unit. Standard Condition of Approval (#B2) requires a valid Measure A or D Certificate for the new residence prior to the issuance of the building permit. The accessory dwelling unit is exempt from the provisions of the Growth Management System.

3. **Zoning Provisions** – The development is consistent with the use limitations and property development standards of the base district as well as the other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Evidence:** The proposed residence conforms to the requirements of the Matteucci Specific Plan, which allows for residential uses. The proposed setbacks, lot coverage, height, parking and open space meet the requirements of the Planned Unit Development Zoning District and other relevant provisions of the Zoning Code.
4. **Adequate Services** – *The proposed development will be provided with adequate services and infrastructure in a manner that is consistent with the Local Coastal Program.*

**Evidence:** The partially developed site is located in an existing developed neighborhood where utilities and services are generally available.

5. **California Coastal Act** – *Any development to be located between the sea and the first public road parallel to the sea conforms to the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act.*

**Evidence:** The project site is located between the sea and the first public road and within the California Coastal Commission Appeal’s Jurisdiction. The project includes the construction of a new residence on partially developed site. The site is currently developed with a small single-family residence.

**Use Permit – Finding for Implementation of a Planned Unit Development Plan**

The required Use Permit for this project may be approved or conditionally approved only after the approving authority has made the following finding per Municipal Code Section 18.22.190(B):

**Use Permit Authorization** – The establishment, maintenance and/or conducting of the use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in said neighborhood.

**Planning Commission Evidence:** The proposed residence and existing accessory dwelling unit is consistent with the development standards associated with the Matteucci Specific Plan for the site and with the uses and pattern of development in the surrounding neighborhood, which consists of existing residential buildings. With approval of this permit, the residential use of the subject property conforms to the requirements of the Zoning Code and Matteucci Specific Plan. As proposed, the site includes adequate parking and other facilities to accommodate the project activities without detriment to the public welfare, property or improvements in the surrounding neighborhood.
Architectural Site and Design Review – Finding

The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the project and all of the following criteria in determining that the following architectural and site design standards have been satisfactorily addressed:

1. Where more than one building or structure will be constructed, the architectural features and landscaping thereof shall be harmonious. Such features include height, elevations, roofs, material, color and appurtenances.

   **Evidence:** The project involves the construction of a new single family residence. The new French Eclectic style of the primary residence would be compatible with the architectural style of the existing guest house.

2. Where more than one sign will be erected or displayed on the site, the signs shall have a common or compatible design and locational positions and shall be harmonious in appearance.

   **Evidence:** The project does not include any signs.

3. The material, textures, colors and details of construction shall be an appropriate expression of its design concept and function, and shall be compatible with the adjacent and neighboring structures and functions. Colors of wall and roofing materials shall blend with the natural landscape and be non-reflective.

   **Evidence:** Colors and materials of the new residence include stucco, stone veneers and synthetic slate tile roof which are similar architectural elements that are found on the smaller house on the site.

4. The design shall be appropriate to the function of the project and express the project’s identity.

   **Evidence:** The site was originally developed with a smaller single story residence. The new residence would be a similar design to the existing accessory dwelling unit on the site.

5. The planning and siting of the various functions and buildings on the site shall create an internal sense of order and provide a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community.

   **Evidence:** By developing the new residence on the site, an internal sense of order would be created between the larger new residence and the smaller accessory dwelling unit and is consistent with similar configurations of accessory dwelling units and residents on other Jenna Lane sites.
6. *Roofing material shall be wood shingles, wood shakes, tile or other materials such as composition as approved by the appropriate design review authority. No mechanical equipment shall be located upon a roof unless it is appropriately screened.*

**Evidence:** The proposed roofing material is fiberglass composition roof shingles. No mechanical equipment is proposed on the roof.

7. *The proposed development shall be compatible in terms of height, bulk and design with other structures and environment in the immediate area.*

**Evidence:** The size, height, design and bulk of the new residence is similar to other large single family residences that have been constructed to the south of the subject property.

8. *The proposed design shall be consistent with the applicable elements of the general plan.*

**Evidence:** The project is consistent with the Land Use Element’s Planned Development District General Plan designation and is consistent with the goals and policies of the Housing Element which encourage provision of high quality housing for a wide range of individuals and household types and which promote infill housing in existing neighborhoods.

9. *If the project site is located in an area considered by the committee as having a unified character or historical character, the design shall be compatible with such character.*

**Evidence:** The existing accessory dwelling unit and proposed residence is not located on a site or in an area designated as historical by the City’s Historical Resource Inventory. The proposed residence is located in the Kelly Avenue Tract neighborhood which includes a wide range of residential architectural styles.

10. *The design shall promote harmonious transition in scale and character in areas located between different designated land uses.*

**Evidence:** The site is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD). The adopted specific plan for this PUD allows for single family residential uses. Properties adjacent to the project allow for multi-family uses and contain apartment buildings. The smaller existing residence on the site is located between the proposed larger residence and the apartment building. The deep front (more than 100 feet) between the large new residence and the multifamily buildings to the east creates a harmonious transition in scale and character between the single family Planned Unit Development and the multifamily to the east.
11. *The design shall be compatible with known and approved improvements and/or future construction, both on and off the site.*

**Evidence:** There are no other known improvements pending for this site or the immediate area.

12. *Sufficient ancillary functions provided to support the main functions of the project shall be compatible with the project’s design concept.*

**Evidence:** The proposed project consists of constructing a new residence on site that is developed with an existing guest house to be utilized as an accessory dwelling unit to the new larger residence. The overall design concept of the site can accommodate a large single family residence and smaller guesthouse, which was included in the previous approval and allowed by the Matteucci Specific Plan.

13. Access to the property and circulation systems shall be safe and convenient for equestrians, pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

**Evidence:** The project will not affect existing access to the site. The site is served by an existing street that accommodates pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

14. *The amount and arrangement of open space and landscaping shall be appropriate to the design and the function of the structures.*

**Evidence:** As required by the Matteucci Specific Plan, 80% of the site is required to be open space. The site is currently developed with a single family residence and is landscaped along the southern half of the property. Split rail fencing would be installed as part of the project between the edge of the required riparian buffer and the building footprints. South of the new split rail fence, landscaping has arranged in a hierarchy of plant groupings, enhancing the visual and scenic qualities of the site. Many of the existing trees would be maintained. Standard Condition of Approval #D5 requires protection measures during construction for the trees proposed for preservation. Pervious pavers would utilized for the hard surface connecting the new garage and home entrance to the existing pervious paver driveway. The landscaping, as designed integrates with the project site and creates a pleasing appearance from both the project site and the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor.

15. *Landscaping shall be in keeping with the character or design of the building, and preferably clustered in natural appearing groups, as opposed to being placed in rows and regularly spaced.*

**Evidence:** The existing landscaping on the site has been designed in clusters, in compliance with this requirement. For example, the driveway parking and turnaround
area is circular in shape. Landscaping, including small trees and shrubs have been installed in clusters extending out from this circular parking.

16. **Where feasible, natural features shall be appropriately preserved and integrated with the project.**

**Evidence:** Three existing non-heritage trees would be removed from the proposed building footprint location. Besides these three trees, all existing trees and other landscaping will be maintained, preserved and refurbished after construction on the site.

17. **The landscape design concept for the site, as shown by the relationship of plant masses, open space, scale, plant forms and foliage textures and colors, shall create a desirable and functional environment and the landscape concept shall depict an appropriate unity with the various buildings on the site.**

**Evidence:** The applicant proposes to maintain the existing trees outside of the proposed building footprint and keep the riparian buffer area in its natural state. This proposal is appropriate, given the proximity to Pilarcitos Creek and the separation of the subject property from the public right-of-way.

18. **Plant material shall be suitable and adaptable to the site, shall be capable of being properly maintained on the site, and shall be a variety which would tend to be drought-resistant and to reduce consumption of water in its installation and maintenance.**

**Evidence:** North of the new split rail fence, the landscaping will remain in its natural state. South of the split railed fencing, a variety of drought tolerant and non-invasive plants have been selected for planting. Turf areas have been limited to small patches. Many existing trees are shown on the landscape plan as to be preserved. In order to verify compatibility with the biotics in the area, the submitted landscape plan was peer reviewed by the project biologist (Coast Range Biological) and the biologist provided a letter summarizing his analysis of the landscape plan and recommended changes. In summary, the biologist recommended that one of the plant species be removed from the landscape palette and that staff verify that the new landscaping is outside of the required buffer area. Staff compared the location of the new split rail fencing and verified that both the fencing and new landscaping would be outside of the required riparian buffer. Based on the recommendation on the biologist, the landscape architect revised the landscape palette as is reflected in the plans. With the additional analysis, the landscape plan for the site is drought tolerant and compatible with the surrounding area.

19. **The design shall be energy efficient and incorporate renewable energy design elements including, but not limited to:**
   a. Exterior energy design elements;
   b. Internal lighting service and climatic control systems; and
   c. Building siting and landscape elements.
**Evidence:** The project will conform to the energy and lighting requirements of the California Building Code and to all relevant requirements of the City’s Water Efficiency in Landscaping Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 13.04). Additionally, pervious pavers have been selected for the expanded driveway material.
Public Access Trail Dedication Findings

The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the public access easement offer and all of the following required findings as required by Section 18.40.050 of the Municipal Code / Implementation Plan:

A. Required Overall Findings

1. A Statement of the individual and cumulative burdens imposed on public access and recreation opportunities based on applicable factors identified in B, Project Specific Findings.

**Statement:** The subject property is between Jenna Lane and Oak Avenue Park. Given the physical proximity to the denser residential development to the east of the property, public access to a City park and coastal recreation would be diminished if the requested public access dedication were not to take place.

2. An analysis on applicable factors identified in B, Project Specific Findings, of the necessity for requiring public access conditions to find the project consistent with the public access provisions in the Coastal Act.

**Evidence:** As explained in the Project Specific Findings below, the location and site characteristics justify the request for public access, as required by Section 30212 of the Coastal Act.

3. A description of legitimate government interest furthered by any access condition requirement.

**Evidence:** The access condition requirement is a legitimate government interest because the new trail alignment would extend the existing trail network and provide non-motorized travel between Oak Avenue Park, Jenna Lane and eventually the Coastal Trail further to the west. Additionally, the City’s Parks and Recreation Element includes approximate alignment of the Pilarcitos Creek trail. Policy 2.2.8 of this Element states, “Develop linear park pathways along Cañada Verde, Pilarcitos and Frenchman’s Creeks to connect the foothill trail and area east of the highway with the Coastal Trail and areas west of the highway.” The new trail alignment would contribute to meeting this City policy.

4. An explanation of how imposition of an access dedication requirement alleviates the access burdens identified and is reasonably related in nature and extent.

**Evidence:** Given the location and size of the site, the pedestrian connection between Oak Avenue Park, Jenna Lane and eventually the coast that the trail dedication would
provide, reasonably relates to the nature and extent of the proposed intensification of the subject property.

B. Required Project-Specific Findings

1. Project Effects on Demand for Access and Recreation. Identification of existing and open public access and coastal recreation areas and facilities in the regional and local vicinity of the development. Analysis of the project’s effects upon existing public access and recreation opportunities. Analysis of the project’s cumulative effects upon the use and capacity of the identified access and recreation opportunities, including public tidelands and beach resources, and upon the capacity of major coastal roads from subdivision, intensification or cumulative build-out. Projection of the anticipated demand and need for increased coastal access and recreation opportunities for the public. Analysis of the contribution of the project’s cumulative effects to any such projected increase. Description of the physical characteristics of the site and its proximity to the sea, tideland viewing points, upland recreation areas, and trail linkages to tidelands or recreation areas. Analysis of the importance and potential of the site, because of its location or other characteristics, for creating, preserving or enhancing public access to tidelands or public recreation opportunities.

Evidence: The site itself is located at the end of Jenna Lane, approximately ¼ mile north of Kelly Avenue and approximately ½ mile east of tidelands. A City park (Oak Avenue Park) is adjacent to the subject property to the east. The closest public access to coastal recreational opportunities to the west is along Kelly Avenue. The project itself, the construction of a new residence, would not place an over burdensome cumulative effect on access and recreational opportunities. However, given the location of the site, the requested public access dedication within the required riparian buffer would provide an access link between Oak Avenue Park, Jenna Lane and eventually tidelands to the west. The site itself is important for access because it provides a crucial non-motorized intersection between the site and surrounding neighborhood and coastal recreational areas. Additionally, the site is approximately 1 ½ acres in size and is deeded with the contiguous property to the west. Given the large size of the sites, a twenty-foot easement along Pilarcitos Creek and ten-foot easement along the eastern side of the property and existing access easement would not restrict the applicant from developing the property as proposed. Given the location and size of the property, recording the requested public access dedication would enhance public access to recreational opportunities by providing a vital link between Oak Avenue Park, Jenna Lane and eventually to tidelands to the west.

2. Shoreline Processes. Description of the existing shoreline conditions, including beach profile, accessibility and usability of the beach, history of erosion or accretion, character and sources of sand, wave and sand movement, presence of shoreline protective structures, location of the line of mean high tide during the season when the beach is at its narrowest (generally during the late winter) and the proximity of that line to existing
structures, and any other factors which substantially characterize or affect the shoreline processes at the site. Identification of anticipated changes to shoreline processes and beach profile unrelated to the proposed development. Description and analysis of any reasonably likely changes, attributable to the primary and cumulative effects of the project, to: wave and sand movement affecting beaches in the vicinity of the project; the profile of the beach; the character, extent, accessibility and usability of the beach; and any other factors which characterize or affect beaches in the vicinity. Analysis of the effect of any identified changes of the project, alone or in combination with other anticipated changes, will have upon the ability of the public to use public tidelands and shoreline recreation areas.

**Evidence:** The subject property is approximately ½ mile east of tidelands at Half Moon Bay State Beach. Minimal structures exist between the subject property and bluff edge. Given the distance between the subject property and the closest tidelands, the proposed project would not adversely affect the beach areas to the west.

3. **Historic Public Use.** Evidence of use of the site by members of the general public for a continuous five-year period (such use may be seasonal). Evidence of the type and character of use made by the public (vertical, lateral, bluff top, etc., and for passive and/or active recreational use, etc.). Identification of any agency (or person) who has maintained and/or improved the area subject to historic public use and the nature of the maintenance performed and improvement made. Identification of the record owner of the area historically used by the public and any attempts by the owner to prohibit public use of the area, including the success or failure of those attempts. Description of the potential for adverse impact on public use of the area from the proposed development (including but not limited to, creation of physical or psychological impediments to public use).

**Evidence:** The area of the proposed Public Access Trail Easement has not historically been used and/or maintained for public use. The area of the requested public access easement within the riparian buffer on the subject property has historically been used for agricultural purposes. More recently, the site has been developed with one small single family residence.

4. **Physical Obstructions.** Description of any physical aspects of the development which block or impede the ability of the public to get to or along the tidelands, public recreation areas, or other public coastal resources or to see the shoreline.

**Evidence:** The site is approximately 1 ½ acres in size. The development standards for the Matteucci Specific Plan limits the size of the building footprint on the site to 20% of the lot size. Given the large size of the lot and the ample space remaining outside of the 20% building footprint for the twenty-foot wide easement within the fifty-foot wide riparian buffer along Pilarcitos Creek riparian vegetation and ten-foot wide easement along the
eastern side of the property and existing access easement, the proposed development would not hinder the ability of the public to access coastal resources.

5. Other Adverse Impacts on Access and Recreation. Description of the development’s physical proximity and relationship to the shoreline and any public recreation area. Analysis of the extent to which buildings, walls, signs, streets or other aspects of the development, individually or cumulatively, are likely to diminish the public’s use of tidelands or lands committed to public recreation. Description of any alteration of the aesthetic, visual or recreational value of public use areas, and of any diminution of the quality or amount of recreational use of public lands which may be attributable to the individual or cumulative effects of the development.

Evidence: Oak Avenue Park, a public City park is adjacent to the subject to the east. The requested pedestrian public access dedication along the eastern side property line and access easement would provide vital access to this park from Jenna Lane. The subject property is also between the largest multi-family neighborhood in the City and the beach and Half Moon Bay State Park. The public access dedication would also allow for trail access across the subject property towards the shoreline. Due to the physical proximity to the dense residential development to the east of the property, public access to a City park and coastal recreation would be diminished if the requested public access dedication were not to take place.

Environmental Review – Finding

CEQA – The project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Evidence: An Initial Study (IS) and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) were prepared for the project in conformance with the requirements of CEQA, and the Draft IS/MND was circulated for a 20-day public review, which ran between June 22, 2016 and July 11, 2016. The Final Draft IS/MND and Draft Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program is included as Attachment 7.
A. The following Conditions shall apply to the subject site:

1. **CONFORMANCE WITH APPROVED PLANS.** Development of the site shall conform to the approved plans entitled 32 Jenna Lane with a City date stamp of August 16, 2016 and April 6, 2016, except for any revisions required by this permit. The Community Development Director shall review any deviation from the approved plans that is determined minor in nature. Any other change shall require the submittal of a major modification application and fees and shall be subject to a public hearing as required by Title 18. (Planning)

2. **CONFORMANCE WITH CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.** The permittee shall construct and operate this Project in full conformance with these Conditions of Approval. Any revision of the Conditions of Approval shall require submittal of a major modification subject to a public hearing as required by Title 18. (Planning)

3. **CONFORMANCE WITH THE MUNICIPAL CODE.** No part of this approval shall be construed to permit a violation of any part of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code. (Planning)

4. **MITIGATION MONITORING AND LOG.** This project shall comply with all of the requirements of the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. The mitigation measures within the MMRP include the following:

   **ALG-MM1:** In order to reduce glare and light impacts on the surrounding properties, all new exterior light fixtures associated with the new residence shall be shielded and facing downward. No flood lights would be allowed with the new improvements on the site.

   **BIO-MM1a:** Within two weeks prior to the start of construction, a worker education program shall be presented at the project site by a qualified biologist. Associated written material will be distributed. It shall be the onsite foreman’s responsibility to ensure that all construction personnel and subcontractors receive a copy of the education program. The education program shall include a description of the CRLF and SFGS and their habitat, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act, the necessity of adhering to the Act to avoid penalty, measures implemented to avoid affecting CRLF and SFGS specific to the project and the work boundaries of the project.

   **BIO-MM1b:** Prior to construction, the project disturbance envelope (encompassing all ground disturbance associated with the project, including grading, trenching, vegetation...
removal, staging, and material storage) shall be clearly identified on project site plans, shall be located as far as feasible from the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor, and shall be located outside of the 50-foot ESHA buffer, as well as the wildlife movement corridor extending 25-feet from the ESHA buffer edge (as described in Mitigation Measure 3). Exclusion fencing shall be installed around the entire work area under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Fencing shall be at least 36 inches above ground level and buried at least 6 inches into the ground, and shall have a gate or similar opening to allow access to the work area, but shall remain closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels for snakes. The fencing shall be monitored daily by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist at least once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project. All ground disturbance associated with project construction, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, material storage, and parking, shall occur within the fenced area, and no construction equipment or personnel shall enter areas outside of the fenced area.

**BIO-MM1c:** A qualified biologist shall monitor all removal of vegetation on the project site. Immediately prior to vegetation removal, the qualified biologist shall survey the work area for CRLF and SFGS. If CRLF and SFGS are observed in the work area, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW contacted for guidance. If no CRLF or SFGS are observed during the vegetation removal effort, then no additional biological monitoring (other than exclusion fence inspections, mentioned above) shall be performed unless a CRLF or SFGS is subsequently reported by construction personnel or others in the area. If a CRLF or SFGS is observed on or near the project site, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted immediately, and they may require daily biological monitoring and other mitigation measures.

**BIO-MM1d:** Exposed trenches resulting from project construction shall be backfilled as soon as work is complete. Open trenches shall have an escape ramp every 50-feet or less (composed of earthen material no greater than 45 degrees) installed at each end before nightfall each work day so that any entrapped wildlife may exit. To reduce impacts to nocturnal species in the area, construction shall be limited to daylight hours and no construction lighting shall remain at night.

**BIO-MM2:** If project construction is conducted during the February 1 to August 15 breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey throughout area of suitable habitat within 300 feet of the project site within 30 days prior to the onset of any construction activity. If bird nests are observed, an
appropriate buffer zone shall be established around all active nests to protect nesting adults and their young from construction disturbance. Buffer zones shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW based on the site conditions and the species potentially impacted. Work within the buffer zone shall be postponed until all the young are fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.

**BIO-MM3**: Any fencing located within 25-feet of the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge shall be wildlife friendly (such as split rail or other fencing that allows for the passage of wildlife). No other significant barriers to wildlife movement shall be placed in this area.

**CR-MM1**: Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American(s). If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the permittee shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

**CR-MM2**: If subsurface historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect archaeological resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.

**PALEO-MM1**: If subsurface geologic and/or paleontological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist to perform reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect such resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.

**WQ-MM1**: Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant will be required to submit plans demonstrating on-site detention limiting storm water discharge from the site to pre-development levels in conformance with City standards. The impact would be less than significant.
WQ-MM2: Compliance with the City’s NPDES (storm water control) requirements and SWRCB’s General Construction Permit for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period will be required throughout the construction process.

The applicant shall maintain an on-site log of all biological mitigation training, monitoring and surveys. The log shall include the date of the training, the contact information of the qualified biologist that conducted the training and the names of all participating workers and contractors. The log shall also include the date, contact information of the qualified biologist and outcome of any biological surveys or inspections that take place on the site. The log shall be available on the site for inspection by City staff. (Planning)

5. LIGHTING. All exterior lighting shall be fully shielded so that no light source is visible from outside the property, except as otherwise expressly approved. (Planning)

6. SIDEWALK MAINTENANCE AND LIABILITY. It shall be the duty of the Property Owner(s) whose property is adjacent to any portion of a public street or place to maintain any sidewalks along the project frontage in a safe and non-dangerous condition. Sidewalk maintenance shall include removal and replacement of concrete to eliminate tripping hazards; and pruning and trimming of trees, shrubs, ground cover and other landscaping within the public right-of-way. The Property Owner has the primary and exclusive duty to fund and perform such maintenance and repair, whether or not the City has notified the property owner of the need for such maintenance or repairs or has performed similar maintenance or repairs in the past, pursuant to §12.18.020 and §12.18.030 of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code. (Engineering)

7. LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE. The applicant/owner shall ensure that all landscaped areas and/or fences are continuously maintained, and all plant material is maintained free of refuse and weeds and in a healthy growing condition and in compliance with the line of site requirement within the zoning code. (Planning)

B. The following Conditions shall be fulfilled prior to the issuance of building permits:

1. SIGNED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL. The applicant/owner shall submit a signed copy of the conditions of approval to the Planning Division prior to issuance of a building permit. (Planning)

2. RECORDED TRAIL EASEMENT DEDICATION. The applicant shall provide an updated offer to dedicate a twenty-foot easement within the required 50-foot riparian buffer parallel to Pilarcitos Creek riparian vegetation, outside of poison hemlock (Conium maculatum) area shown on the addendum to the biological report dated April 22, 2016 and a ten-foot easement along the eastern side of the property and existing access easement (APN’s 056-072-280 and 056-072-120). The location and offer language shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director and City Attorney, and recorded at the County of...
San Mateo Recorder’s Office. A copy of the recorded dedication shall be provided to the City in conjunction with or prior to the issuance of the building permit. (Planning)

3. **ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT DEED RESTRICTION.** Prior to occupancy of the accessory dwelling unit (ADU), the applicant shall record a deed restriction to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development. The deed restriction will include the following in conformance with the requirements of Zoning Code Section 18.33.050:

   a) The ADU shall not be sold separately.
   
   b) The ADU is restricted to the approved size.
   
   c) The ADU is a permitted use only so long as either the main residence or the ADU is occupied by the owner of record as the principal residence.
   
   d) The above declarations are binding upon any successor in ownership of the property lack of compliance will result in the ADU becoming an illegal, nonconforming use subject to the code enforcement and abatement proceedings established by the city of Half Moon Bay Municipal Code.
   
   e) The deed restrictions shall lapse upon removal of the ADU. (Planning)

4. **SHORT TERM RENTAL DEED RESTRICTION.** Prior to occupancy of both the accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and the primary residence, the applicant shall record a deed restriction to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development, prohibiting short term rental (less than 30 days) of the residence and/or ADU. The language of the deed restriction shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Community Development prior to recording this deed restriction at the San Mateo County Recorder’s Office. (Planning)

5. **VALID MEASURE A OR D CERTIFICATE.** No building permit shall be issued unless the Measure D Certificate issued for the property has not expired and remains valid to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. (Planning)

6. **PROJECT BIOLOGIST.** Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit to the Director the name, company affiliation, and contact information of the project biologist who will oversee the construction. The project biologist shall be selected from the City’s List of Pre-approved Biological Consultants to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. The applicant shall notify the Community Development Director in writing within 24 hours of any change in the project biologist. (Planning)

7. **CONSTRUCTION PLANS.** File Number PDP-15-051 and the Conditions of Approval for this project shall be provided on the cover page of the building permit application plan submittal. All plans, specifications, engineering calculations, diagrams, reports, and other data for construction of the building and required improvements shall be submitted with the appropriate permit application to the City’s Building and Engineering Divisions for review and approval. Computations and back-up data will be considered a part of the...
required plans. Structural calculations and engineering calculations shall be prepared, wet-stamped and signed by an engineer or architect licensed by the State of California. The plans must show the location of the sewer connection, and a property line sewer cleanout must be installed prior to Building Permit approval. (Planning)

8. ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING. Per VI D of the Matteucci Specific Plan, details shall be provided on the building permit plans for electric vehicle charging for each of the garage parking stalls. (Planning)

9. WATER CONSERVATION IN LANDSCAPING. If the project includes 1,000 square feet or more of irrigated landscaping (new or rehabilitated) the permittee shall submit landscape and irrigation plans and an Outdoor Water Efficiency Checklist that demonstrate compliance with the City’s Water Conservation in Landscaping Ordinance (Chapter 13.04 of the Municipal Code) prior to issuance of building permits to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. (Planning)

10. SURVEY REQUIRED. Submit a detailed topographic/site boundary survey certified by a licensed surveyor with building application plans. The survey shall include a baseline elevation datum point on, or close to the construction site, indicating existing grade of the datum. This datum point shall be permanent, marked, shall remain fixed in the field, and shall not be disturbed throughout the building process. Examples of datum points include: fire hydrants, manhole covers, survey markers, and street curbs. This datum point shall be shown on all site plans including revised/resubmitted plans. The survey must show the footprint and roof plan of the proposed residence and identify the existing grade elevations at the corners and roof ridgeline of the residence. (Building)

11. EVIDENCE OF WATER CONNECTION CAPACITY. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the permittee shall submit a letter from Coastside County Water District certifying that the subject site has an adequately-sized water connection for this approved project. (Building)

12. EVIDENCE OF SEWER CONNECTION CAPACITY. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the permittee shall demonstrate issuance of a sewer permit from the Sewer Authority Mid-Coast. (Building)

13. CONSTRUCTION PLANS. Construction plans submitted for building permit(s) shall include a plan sheet showing utility connections, trench restoration details, driveway apron (driveway apron width, spacing between driveways, slopes, etc.), and other improvements in the public right-of-way meeting City standards. (Engineering)

14. LOT GRADING, MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT AND VEHICLE STORAGE. No lot site grading, preparation, storage, or placement of construction materials, equipment, or vehicles shall take place prior to issuance of a building permit. Any earth movement on or off the site in excess of 50 cubic yards shall require the submittal of a grading plan for review by the City
Engineer and issuance of a grading permit. Lot Grading includes, but is not limited to, any leveling, scraping, clearing, or removal of lot surface area. Materials, Equipment, and Vehicles include, but are not limited to:

1. All masonry, wood, and steel construction materials;
2. All construction-related equipment and storage containers; and
3. All construction-related vehicles, including temporary trailers. (Engineering)

15. LOT DRAINAGE PLAN AND ON-SITE DETENTION
Construction plans submitted for building permits shall include a Lot Drainage Plan showing how the surface runoff is retained on the site and the remainder is drained to the public right-of-way. Plans shall include design details and supporting calculations for storm water detention on-site for the additional run-off from a ten year frequency storm of two hour duration. Plans shall show how the rear and side yards will properly drain to an approved BMP facility, and how the finished grades on the property relate to the existing grades on adjacent property. The Plan shall include pad elevation, finished floor elevation, site high and low points, drainage swales, area drains, and existing grade at adjacent property. The permittee shall provide appropriate measures to discharge the flood waters from any unfinished floor areas. (Engineering)

16. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT-TREATMENT (FOR NON-REGULATED PROJECTS)
Non-regulated projects consist of single-family residences and other small projects that create and/or replace less than 5,000 square feet of impervious surface. Construction plans submitted for building permits shall include a storm water management-treatment plan showing implementation of at least one of the six Low Impact Development (LID) measures listed below:

a. Direct runoff into cisterns or rain barrels and use rainwater for irrigation or other non-potable use;
b. Direct roof runoff into vegetated areas;
c. Direct runoff from sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios into vegetated areas;
d. Direct runoff from driveways and/or uncovered parking lots into vegetated areas;
e. Construct sidewalks, walkways, and/or patios with permeable surfaces; or
f. Construct bike lanes, driveways, and/or uncovered parking lots with permeable surfaces. (Engineering)

Permittee shall also submit the ‘stormwater checklist for small projects’ with the building plan submittal.

17. COPPER BUILDING ELEMENTS
The building plans shall specify that all copper building elements will be pre-patinated at the factory, or if patination will occur on the site, the
plans shall identify best management practices in conformance with the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program Requirements for Architectural Copper, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. (Engineering)

18. **EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL.** An erosion and sediment control plan shall be submitted that shows effective Best Management Practices (BMP) and erosion and sediment control measures for the site. Construction plans shall also include the “construction best management practices” plan sheet. (Engineering)

19. **UNDERGROUND UTILITIES/SERVICES.** Electric, telecommunication, and cable and utility service to the property shall be through underground service connections only. No overhead utilities are allowed. (Engineering)

20. **STREET/PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY CUTS FOR UTILITY CONNECTIONS.** Street cuts for utility connections that are less than twenty (20) feet apart shall be repaired with a single patch. Asphalt repair and overlay shall be in accordance with the City Standard Details. (Engineering)

21. **SEWER CONNECTION FEE.** The proposed development is subject to a sewer connection fee pursuant to Section 13.36.070 of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code. The fee shall be paid to the City prior to issuance of building permits. (Engineering)

22. **FIRE CLEARANCE REQUIREMENTS.** The permittee shall comply with all applicable fire and building codes and standards relating to fire and panic safety as identified by the Coastside Fire Protection District during the building permit process. (Fire)

23. **FIRE SPRINKLERS AND FIRE DISTRICT REQUIREMENTS.** Pursuant to Fire District ordinance, the permittee shall install an automatic fire sprinkler system throughout the proposed or improved dwelling. All areas that are accessible for storage purposes shall be equipped with fire sprinklers. The plans for this system must be submitted to the City of Half Moon Bay Building Division to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permits. Upon submission of plans, the City will forward a complete set to the Coastside County Fire Protection District for review. Fees for automatic fire sprinkler systems shall be paid to the City prior to plan review. (Fire)

24. **HARDWIRED SMOKE DETECTORS/ALARMS.** Pursuant to the 2013 California Building and Residential Code, State Fire Marshal regulations and Coastside Fire District Ordinance 2013-03, the permittee shall install smoke detectors which are hard-wired, interconnected and have battery backup in each new or reconditioned sleeping room and at a point centrally located in the corridor or area giving access to each separate sleeping area. A minimum of one detector per floor is required. For alterations: If there is an attic, basement, crawl space or removal of a wall or ceiling that provides access, then all smoke alarms shall be hardwired and interconnected. Building plan submittals shall demonstrate conformance
with these requirements to the satisfaction of the Building Official prior to issuance of building permits. (Fire)

25. **FIRE ACCESS ROADS**: The permittee shall provide and maintain an asphalt-surface road for ingress and egress of fire apparatus in conformance with Coastside Fire Protection District Ordinance 2013-03 and the California Fire Code, to the satisfaction of the Fire Marshall. Pursuant to the 2013 California Fire Code (CFC) and Appendix D of 2013 CFC, dead-end roads exceeding 150 feet shall be provided with a turnaround, and road width shall not be less than 20 feet clear exclusive of any on-street parking area. Approved signs and painted curbs or lines shall be provided and maintained to identify fire access roads and state the prohibition on their obstruction. The fire access roads shall be installed prior to storage of combustibles on the project site to the satisfaction of the Fire Marshall. (Fire)

26. **FIRE HYDRANT**. Pursuant to 2013 California Fire Code, Appendix B and C, the permittee shall provide a Fire District approved fire hydrant (CLOW 960) within 250 feet of the proposed single-family dwelling unit measured by way of drivable access prior to issuance of an occupancy permit. If the single-family dwelling is on a dead end street, then the hydrant shall be within 200 feet. The hydrant must produce a minimum fire flow of 1,000 gallons per minute at 20 pounds per square inch residual pressure for 2 hours. Additional fire flow is required for single-family dwellings over 3,600 square feet, and all commercial structures. Contact the Coastside County Fire Protection District for fire flow requirements. Contact Coastside County Water District prior to applying for a building permit to obtain flow data and District specifications and regulations on installing a fire hydrant. (Fire)

27. **COASTSIDE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT - REGULATIONS**. The project shall comply with all applicable regulations and requirements of the Coastside County Water District. Water service shall not be in the same trench as other utilities. (Water District)

C. **The following conditions shall be implemented prior to and during construction:**

1. **ARCHAEOLOGY-DISCOVERY OF HUMAN REMAINS**. Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American(s). If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the permittee shall re-inter the
human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance. (Planning)

2. **ARCHAEOLOGY-DISCOVERY OF RESOURCES.** If subsurface historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect archaeological resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Director. (Building)

3. **CONSTRUCTION TRAILERS.** Temporary construction trailers are permitted as accessory uses in conjunction with the development of this site, subject to the following conditions:
   a. The construction trailer shall be used as a temporary construction office only.
   b. Neither sanitation facilities nor plumbed water is permitted within the trailer.
   c. No overnight inhabitance of the construction trailer is permitted.
   d. No construction trailers are permitted on site prior to building permit issuance.
   e. The construction trailer shall be removed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. (Planning)

4. **AIR QUALITY BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.** The project shall implement the following standard BAAQMD dust control measures during all phases of construction on the project site:
   - All active construction areas shall be watered twice daily or more often if necessary. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles-per-hour.
   - Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads and parking and staging areas at construction sites.
   - Cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, and any other materials that can be windblown. Trucks transporting these materials shall be covered.
   - All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day or as often as necessary to keep them free of dust and debris associated with site construction. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
   - Subsequent to clearing, grading, or excavating, exposed portions of the site shall be watered, landscaped, treated with soil stabilizers, or covered as soon as possible. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas and previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more.
   - Installation of sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
   - Replanting of vegetation in disturbed areas as soon as possible after completion of construction.
• Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
• All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
• Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the City of Half Moon Bay regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

5. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Any materials deemed hazardous by the San Mateo County Department of Health that are uncovered or discovered during the course of work under this permit shall be disposed in accordance with regulations of the San Mateo County of Health. (Building)

6. COMPLIANCE WITH CBC. All structures shall be constructed in compliance with the standards of the 2013 California Codes of Regulations Title 24, including Building Code, Residential Code, Administrative Code, Mechanical Code, Plumbing Code, Electrical Code, Energy Code, Fire Code and Green Building Code to the satisfaction of the Building Official. (Building)

7. FIRST FLOOR HEIGHT VERIFICATION. Prior to below floor framing or concrete slab steel reinforcement inspection, a stamped and signed building height verification letter shall be submitted to the City from a licensed land survey certifying that the first floor height as constructed is equal to (or less than) the elevation specified for the first floor height in the approved plans. (Building)

8. OVERALL PROJECT HEIGHT. Maximum overall height of the project, including any grading, foundation, pad, and building elevations shall be calculated using the elevation points indicated on the topographic survey map submitted at the time of application. The approved height of all projects developed in the City will be measured from existing grade as indicated on the submitted topographical survey. (Building)

9. COMPLETION OF UTILITIES. Any public utilities requiring relocation as a result of the construction of the building(s) or improvements under this permit shall be relocated at the owner’s expense. (Building)

10. ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING. Electric vehicle charging wiring and ports shall be installed for electric vehicle charging for each of the garage parking stalls. (Planning)

11. CONSTRUCTION HOURS. Construction work shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday; 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Saturdays; and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00
p.m. Sundays and holidays, except as expressly authorized by the City Engineer in conformance with Section 14.40.020 of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code. (Engineering)

12. NOTICE OF DISRUPTION. The permittee shall provide written notice to affected property and business owners and a copy of such notice to the City Engineer a minimum of two business days prior to any planned disruption of pedestrian or vehicular traffic, parking, or public service facilities. (Engineering)

13. CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL STORAGE. Construction material shall not be stored in the street right-of-way without prior approval from the City Engineer. (Engineering)

14. ENCROACHMENT PERMIT. The permittee shall obtain an encroachment permit prior to starting any construction activity within the City right-of-way or affecting City improvements. All improvements constructed within the City right-of-way shall conform to City standards to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. (Engineering)

D. The following conditions shall be implemented prior to issuance of an occupancy permit:

1. EXTERIOR COLORS AND MATERIALS. Exterior building colors and materials shall be in substantial conformance with those shown on the approved color and materials indicated on the submitted plans date-stamped 04/06/16 to the satisfaction of the Director of Community Development. Roof color shall be limited to non-reflective material and color, compatible with the surrounding Cypress trees. (Planning)

2. TREE INSTALLATION. 1 minimum 24-inch box size tree shall be installed in the front setback of the property. The tree shall be planted in conformance with the site distance requirements of Section 18.06.040(B)(4) of the Zoning Code and shall not interfere with utility lines. (Planning/Engineering)

3. DISPLAY OF SINGLE-FAMILY STREET ADDRESS. Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit, the residential dwelling shall display an internally-illuminated street address number in a prominent location on the dwelling, visible from the street (a minimum of 6 feet above the surface of the driveway), and with contrasting background and letters/numbers that are 4 inches in height with a minimum 3/4–inch stroke. Where a building is set back from the street or otherwise obscured, a street address with 3-inch reflective numbers/letters shall also be provided near the driveway entrance leading to the dwelling. (Fire/Building)

4. TREE PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS. The following tree protection measures shall be implemented during construction:
   a) Prior to commencement of construction, construction fencing shall be placed around the drip line of all trees proposed for preservation.
b) No grading or other construction shall occur within the drip line of any tree proposed for preservation except in conformance with a Tree Protection Plan approved by the Community Development Director.

c) No vehicle, equipment or materials shall be parked or stored within the drip line of any tree proposed for preservation. (Planning/Building)

E. Validity and Expiration of Permits

1. **EFFECTIVE DATE.** This site is located within the Coastal Appeal Zone. This permit shall take effect after expiration of the Coastal Commission appeal period, or if the permit is appealed to the Coastal Commission during the appeal period, it shall take effect after final Coastal Commission action. (Planning)

2. **ACCURACY OF APPLICATION MATERIALS.** The permittee shall be responsible for the completeness and accuracy of all forms and material submitted for this application. Any errors or discrepancies found therein may be grounds for the revocation or modification of this permit and/or any other City approvals. (Planning)

3. **PERMIT EXPIRATION.** The Coastal Development Permit (CDP), Use Permit and Architectural Review shall expire one year from its date of final approval if development plans for a Building Permit have not been submitted. Once a Building Permit is issued, the CDP shall be deemed in effect. If plans for a Building Permit are submitted within the 1-year expiration period, and a Building Permit is not issued, the expiration of the CDP shall coincide and run concurrently with the Building Permit plan submittal/application as long as due diligence is pursued in the opinion of the Building Official in obtaining the Building Permit.

4. **PERMIT EXTENSION.** The Community Development Director may, at the Director’s discretion, approve a single one-year extension of this permit based on a written request and fee submitted to the Director prior to expiration of the permit. Any other extension shall require approval of a Permit Amendment prior to expiration of the permit. Any Amendment Application to extend the permit shall be filed a minimum of ninety (90) days prior to permit expiration to ensure adequate processing time. (Planning)

5. **PERMIT RUNS WITH THE LAND.** The approval runs with the land and the rights and obligations thereunder, including the responsibility to comply with conditions of approval, shall be binding upon successors in interest in the real property unless or until such permits are expressly abandoned or revoked. (Planning)
6. **HOLD HARMLESS.** The permittee agrees as a condition of approval of this application to indemnify, protect, defend with counsel selected by the City, and hold harmless, the City, and any agency or instrumentality thereof, and its elected and appointed officials, officers, employees and agents, from and against any and all liabilities, claims, actions, causes of action, proceedings, suits, damages, judgments, liens, levies, costs and expenses of whatever nature, including reasonable attorney’s fees and disbursements (collectively, “Claims”) arising out of or in any way relating to the approval of this application, any actions taken by the City related to this entitlement, any review by the California Coastal Commission conducted under the California Coastal Act Public Resources Code Section 30000 et seq., or any environmental review conducted under the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 210000 et seq., for this entitlement and related actions. The indemnification shall include any Claims that may be asserted by any person or entity, including the permittee, arising out of or in connection with the approval of this application, whether or not there is concurrent, passive or active negligence on the part of the City, and any agency or instrumentality thereof, and its elected and appointed officials, officers, employees and agents. The permittee’s duty to defend the City shall not apply in those instances when the permittee has asserted the Claims, although the permittee shall still have a duty to indemnify, protect and hold harmless the City. (City Attorney).

**OWNER’S/PERMITTEE’S CERTIFICATION:**

I have read and understand and hereby accept and agree to implement the foregoing conditions of approval of the Coastal Development Permit.

**APPLICANT:**

___________________________________  ____________________
(Signature)                                    (Date)
RECOMMENDATION

Approve by Resolution adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (Exhibit A), and approving PDP-15-051 an application for a Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit and Architectural Review, to allow the construction of a new two-story, 28 feet in height, 8,290 square-foot single-family residence and associated site improvements, on a 66,141 square-foot lot at 32 Jenna Lane located in the PUD, Planned Unit Development Zoning District and the Planned Development District General Plan designation (APN 056-072-280), based upon the Findings and Evidence contained in Exhibit B of the Draft Resolution, and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in Exhibit C.

PROJECT SUMMARY

Owner/Applicant: Yu Xian / Derek Vinh

Project Planner: Scott Phillips, Associate Planner, (650) 726-8299

Requested Permits: Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit, and Architectural Review

Site Location: 32 Jenna Lane, APN 056-072-280

LCP/Zoning: Planned Development District; PUD, Planned Unit Development

CEQA Determination: Mitigated Negative Declaration

Water: The property currently has one installed 3/4 inch water service capacity connection.

Sewer: The property is located within the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (SAM) Sewer District.

Right of Appeal: Any aggrieved person may appeal the decision of the Planning Commission to the City Council within ten (10) working days of the date of the decision. This project is located within the California Coastal Commission appeals jurisdiction. Therefore, final City action is appealable to the California Coastal Commission.
BACKGROUND

Project Description
Included in the project is the construction of a new two-story, 8,290 square-foot residence, conversion of the existing residence to a secondary dwelling unit and associated site improvements on a developed 1.5 acre lot, located at 32 Jenna Lane in the PUD, Planned Unit Development Zoning District, the Planned Development District General Plan designation and the Matteucci Specific Plan. The project plans are included as Attachment 2.

The design of the new residence is Tuscan Mediterranean design, with exterior materials of stucco siding and composition tiles covering the roof. A double sided grand exterior stairway leads to a decorative double door entry, with Tuscan order columns sited along each of the elevations. The location of the building footprint has also been shifted to the south, further away from the riparian corridor along Pilarcitos Creek, compared to the previously approved residence. The new house includes an attached three car garage wired for electric vehicle charging, as required by the Matteucci Specific plan.

Site & Surroundings Properties
The project site consists of a large rectangular lot that is physically separated from the public right-of-way. An access easement across the neighboring property to the south connects the subject property to the corner of Jenna Lane and Cypress Avenue.
Pilarcitos Creek and riparian area borders the site to the north. A large vacant parcel is adjacent to the subject property to the west. The properties to the east and south are both developed. The property is within Kelly Avenue Tract Subdivision, the Matteucci Planned Unit Development, and is identified as a Visual Resource Area as identified in Chapter 18.37 of the Zoning Code. Both the Jenna Lane and Cypress Avenue frontages include curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements consistent with City standards.

Figure 2. Aerial photo, dated 03/18/15, Subject property (in green), approximate location of the new residence (in red), access / utility easement (in blue).

Story Poles
The City Council policy guiding the installation of story poles requires the installation of story poles for any new project within a Visual Resource Area. Due to the PUD zoning designation, the subject property is considered a Visual Resource Area. A copy of the story pole policy is
included as Attachment 3. Story poles were installed in compliance with the City’s Story Pole Policy and the applicant submitted photographs of the installed story poles.

Figure 3. Photograph showing the installed story poles at the location of the new residence, facing southeast from the western side property line.

Permitting History
The Architectural Review Committee approved the Architectural Review Permit for a new 6,932 square foot residence and guest house on June 6, 2001. The Planning Commission then approved the Coastal Development Permit for the new residence and guest house on September 27, 2001. A copy of the signed Planning Commission resolution is included as Attachment 4. The applicant then submitted for a building permit to construct the new residence and guest house. Plan check fees were paid and the building permit was issued on October 8, 2002 for a slightly smaller 5,729 square foot residence and guest house. Revisions to this permit were submitted on May 18, 2004, removing the primary residence from the scope of the work. The remaining 1,241 square foot guest house and two car garage was constructed during that time.

After completion of the guest house, staff issued a letter requesting that the owner formally withdraw the approval of the main house from the project. The owner at the time then submitted a letter requesting withdrawal of the primary residence from the approved project. A copy of this correspondence is included as Attachment 5. A Certificate of Occupancy was then issued for the guest house on May 26, 2004. With the formal withdrawal by the property owner of the main house from the project, the Coastal Development Permit and Architectural Review approvals for the main house are no longer effective.
ANALYSIS

The key issues for this project are conformance with the General Plan and Local Coastal Program, conformance with the Zoning Code, Matteucci Specific Plan and design compatibility. These issues are discussed below.

Conformance with the General Plan, and Local Coastal Program
The project can be found consistent with the Planned Development District General Plan designation, Matteucci Specific Plan and with the Local Coastal Program. The project consists of a new residence on a partially developed infill site in a developed residential neighborhood that has existing utilities, services and infrastructure to the site. The project is consistent with goals and policies of the Housing Element which encourages provision of high quality housing for a wide range of households and will not affect coastal access. The site frontage includes curb, gutter and sidewalk consistent with City standards.

Visual Resource Area
The site is located within a Visual Resource Area. Therefore, compliance with the applicable standards within Chapter 18.37 (Visual Resource Protection Standards) is required. The subject property is at the northerly terminus end of Jenna Lane, with mature landscaping along the southern property line. Given the site location and the dense vegetation, the new home would not be visible from the Public Right-of-Way along Jenna Lane. The new home would be marginally visible from surrounding developed properties. The proposed home is also similar to other homes that have recently been approved and constructed further south along Jenna Lane. The applicant has installed story poles to show that the proposed residence would not block ocean views from the public right-of-way and to reinforce visual compatibility.

The visual resource standards also contain requirements related to landscaping. The applicant is proposing to preserve the existing landscaping and allow for native plants to flourish on the site. With the exception of the small trees within the proposed building footprint, all trees will be preserved on site. Standard Condition of Approval #D5 requires protection measures during construction for the trees proposed for preservation.

Coastal Resource Area
The site abuts an environmentally sensitive habitat area (Pilarcitos Creek) along the rear property line. Pilarcitos Creek is considered a perennial stream and contains riparian vegetation along the banks of the stream. Section 18.38.075(D) of the Coastal Resource Conservation Standards requires that construction be setback 50 feet from the edge of riparian vegetation. The applicant has sited the building footprint of the expanded residence more than 100 feet away from the edge of riparian vegetation. Given the distance and the physical barrier that exists between the sensitive habitat
and the proposed construction, the proposed project would not adversely affect the sensitive resources along Pilarcitos Creek. Additionally, the project construction is located outside of the applicable 50 foot riparian buffer associated with Pilarcitos Creek.

Section 18.38.035 of the Coastal Resource Conservation Standards requires the preparation and circulation of a biological report for any project within 100 feet of sensitive habitat area. A biological report was prepared for the subject property and surrounding area and comments were requested from government agencies for the required 45-day review. Staff received one comment letter from the California Coastal Commission, indicating concerns related to the required buffer requirement and potential wetlands within the vicinity. Staff met with Coastal staff and the project biologist (Coast Range Biological LLC) on site to discuss the concerns raised by the Coastal Commission staff. Coast Range Biological LLC then provided a letter and addendum to the biological report documenting the conclusions from the field meeting. All recommendations from the project biologist were then integrated into the draft Initial Study (IS) / Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). Mitigation measures were included in the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) as well as the Conditions of Approval as required by the Coastal Resource Conservation Standards.

Design Compatibility with the Surrounding Neighborhood

The design of the new residence is of Tuscan style, with exterior materials of stucco siding and composition tiles covering the roof. A double sided grand exterior stairway leads to the double door entry, with Tuscan order columns on the sides. The new house includes an attached three car garage, as required by the Matteucci Specific plan, the garage spaces will be wired for electric vehicle charging.

The site itself is relatively sheltered from view. This is due to the physical separation from Jenna Lane and Cypress Avenue, in combination with dense vegetation that exists along the south and east property lines. Additionally, several large homes exist along Jenna Lane to the south the subject property. The new home would be slightly larger than the other neighboring homes but given the sheltered nature of the site, the additional size would not be out of character.

Staff reviewed the design of the previously approved main residence on the site. The design of the previously approved residence was an extension of the existing Mediterranean style guest house on the site. A copy of Resolution P-44-01 for the previous approval is included as Attachment 4. Although slightly more grandiose, the new design is similar to that of the existing guest house. Given the design compatibility between the guest and the new residence and that the new residence would be completely screened from the public right-of-way, the design is appropriate for the site and in compliance with the City’s Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines.
Conformance with the Zoning Code and the Matteucci Specific Plan

The site is within the Matteucci Planned Unit Development and is subject to the development standards within the Matteucci Specific Plan. The applicant has designed the home to be in compliance with the development standards within the Specific Plan, including setbacks, height, lot coverage and floor area ratio and parking. Since the site is adjacent to Pilarcitos Creek, a minimum 50 foot setback is required from the edge of the riparian vegetation along the creek bank. As indicated on Sheet T1.0 of the planset, the applicant has sited the home more than 100 feet away from the riparian vegetation.

Staff received three e-mails from neighboring residents within the vicinity of the subject property. Copies of the e-mails are included as Attachment 6. Several concerns were expressed in the e-mails in regard to the size of the proposed residence, privacy impacts, that the new home would be used as a commercial short-term rental and that noticing was not sent to the adjacent neighbor. As shown in Table 1, the existing guest house and the proposed residence would be less than the maximum allowed floor area and lot coverage, per the Matteucci Specific Plan. Additionally, Staff checked the mailing list for the required noticing that was sent out advertising for the public hearing for this project. All neighboring property owners indicated on the received e-mails were sent a notice on September 2, 2016.

Short term rentals are currently a prohibited use within all residential neighborhoods in the City. An active code enforcement case is currently underway for a short term rental within the vicinity of the subject property. The City cannot address, “what could happen in regard to uses” with the review of the single family home.
Table 1. Project Conformance with Matteucci Specific Plan Requirements for Lot 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standards</th>
<th>PUD Requirements</th>
<th>Existing Guest House</th>
<th>Proposed Total (Existing Guest House &amp; New Residence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Site Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,141 sq. ft. (existing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Lot Coverage</td>
<td>20% (13,228 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>1.8% (1,241 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>11.4% (7,564 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>35% (23,149 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>1.8% (1,241 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>14.4% (9,531 sq. ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Height</td>
<td>28 ft.</td>
<td>13 ft.</td>
<td>28 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Front Yard</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
<td>28 ft. 5 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Side Yard</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>150 ft. west side 33 ft. east side</td>
<td>22 ft. 6 in. west side 33 ft. east side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Combined Side Yard</td>
<td>15% of Lot Width of 225 ft. (34 ft.)</td>
<td>188 ft.</td>
<td>55 ft. 6 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Rear Yard</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
<td>144 ft.</td>
<td>160 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Riparian Setback</td>
<td>50 ft. from edge of Riparian Vegetation</td>
<td>33 ft. from edge of Riparian Vegetation</td>
<td>130 ft. from edge of Riparian for new residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Minimum 3 car garage and a minimum of six off-street spaces total</td>
<td>2 car garage with a total of 6 off-street spaces</td>
<td>3 car garage and existing 2 car garage with a total of 6 off-street spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use Permit

Section 18.15.045 of the Zoning Code requires the review and approval of a Use Permit to ensure that the development is in conformance with the applicable provisions of the adopted specific plan. In approving a Use Permit, the Planning Commission must find the following:

The establishment, maintenance and/or conducting of the use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in said neighborhood.

The proposed construction of the new residence is consistent with the development standards for the adopted Matteucci Specific Plan, in regard to height, floor area, lot coverage, setback and other applicable standards. The applicant is not proposing any modifications to the approved residential uses on the site. The house, while large, is far less in size than what would be permitted per the Matteucci Specific Plan development standards.
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

An IS/MND and MMRP were prepared for the project in conformance with the requirements of CEQA, and the Draft IS/MND was circulated for a 20-day public review, which ran between June 22, 2016 and July 11, 2016. One comment on the IS/MND were received during the comment period. The Final Draft IS/MND and MMRP is included as Attachment 7 and Response to Comments is included as Attachment 8.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis, staff concludes that the proposed new residence at 32 Jenna Lane is consistent with the Matteucci Specific Plan, General Plan/Local Coastal Program, Single Family Residential Design Guidelines and the Municipal Code; that its design is appropriate to the site and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood; and that the project conforms to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. Staff recommends approval of the project based on the recommended findings and conditions of approval (Exhibits B and C).

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Resolution with the MND and MMRP, Exhibit A, Findings and Evidence, Exhibit B and Conditions of Approval, Exhibit C.
2. Project Plans
3. Story Pole Policy
4. Planning Commission Resolution P-44-01
5. Correspondence on withdraw of the primary residence
6. E-mails from Neighboring Residents, received September 6 & 8, 2016
7. Final Draft IS/MND and MMRP
8. Response to Comments and Comment Letter Received
Resolution No. C- 66 -11

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HALF MOON BAY
AMENDING THE “STORY POLE” POLICY

WHEREAS, on August 6, 2002, the City Council of the City of Half Moon Bay adopted Resolution C-52-02, which rescinded Resolution C-111-97 and established a policy regarding the installation of Story Poles for certain types of development; and

WHEREAS, the City of Half Moon Bay is committed to the maximum public participation and involvement in matters pertaining to its Codes and Regulations; and

WHEREAS, the City Council may review its policies from time to time to determine whether the provisions contained therein are appropriate and applicable; and

WHEREAS, on September 6, 2011, the City Council considered revisions to the Story Pole policy established by Resolution C-51-02 at which time any interested persons were given an opportunity to be heard on the matter.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Half Moon Bay does hereby approve and adopt the Story Pole policy attached hereto.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly passed and adopted on the 6th day of September, 2011, by the City Council of Half Moon Bay by the following vote:

AYES, Councilmembers: Alifano, Fraser, Kowalczyk, Muller & Mayor Patridge

NOES, Councilmembers: __________________________

ABSENT, Councilmembers: __________________________

ABSTAIN, Councilmembers: __________________________

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Siobhan Smith, City Clerk

APPROVED:

[Signature]
Naomi Patridge, Mayor
CITY OF HALF MOON BAY
STORY POLE POLICY

1. Story Poles shall be installed prior to the approval of a Coastal Development Permit for any proposed development that:
   a) requires either an exception or variance; or
   b) is located in an area that is substantially undeveloped; or
   c) is located in an area designated as any of the Visual Resources Areas defined in Chapter 18.37 of the Zoning Code.

2. The applicant shall have Story Poles installed on the site of the proposed development no less than six days prior to the initial public hearing for the project and they shall remain in place until the designated appeal period has expired.

3. The applicant shall ensure that the Story Poles accurately depict the full extent of the proposed structure. The total height of the proposed structure delineated by the Story Poles shall be measured from the existing grade and shall include both the height of the building pad (if possible) and the height of the structure proposed to be constructed on the pad. Netting shall be placed around the perimeter of the proposed building footprint at the elevation of the proposed building pad and shall simulate the proposed roofline as shown in Attachment A.

4. The applicant or an authorized representative shall submit to the Planning Department an affidavit certifying that the Story Poles' depiction of the height, foundation, footprint and location of the proposed structure on the site are true and accurate, together with photographs of the Story Poles once installed.

5. The Planning Director may waive or modify these requirements where the installation of Story Poles would unduly interfere with the use of the property or where other circumstances would render the installation of Story Poles impractical.
Planning Commission Resolution P-44-01
Findings for Approval, PDP-64-01
Coastal Development Permit for a Single-Family Residence on Lot 1 of the Matteucci Specific Plan

WHEREAS, an application was submitted requesting the construction of a two-story, single-family residence on vacant property located on Lot 1 of the Matteucci Specific Plan (APN 056-072-280), on a parcel zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development; and

WHEREAS, the procedures for processing the application have been followed as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Architectural Review Committee of the City of Half Moon Bay reviewed and approved the project design at a duly noticed public meeting on June 6, 2001, at which time all those desiring to be heard on the matter were given the opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the matter on July 26, August 23 and September 27, 2001 at which times all those desiring to be heard on the matter were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission considered all written and oral testimony presented for their consideration; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has determined that the construction of the proposed single-family residence is categorically exempt from CEQA under Section 15303(a); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission hereby adopts the required findings for approval of the project, set forth as Exhibit A to this resolution;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, based upon the Findings in Exhibit A the Planning Commission approves the application (PDP-64-01), subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in Exhibit B.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City of Half Moon Bay Planning Commission on September 27, 2001, by the following vote:

AYES, Commissioners Benjamin, Ream, Hansen, Heinz, King and Chairman Ferreira

NOES, 

ABSENT, Commissioner Poncini

ABSTAIN, 

APPROVED:

[Signature]

Michael Ferreira, Planning Commission Chairman

ATTEST:

[Signature]

Ken Curtis, Planning Director
EXHIBIT A
FINDINGS AND EVIDENCE

Coastal Development Permit - Findings

1. Local Coastal Program- The development as proposed or as modified by conditions, conforms to the Local Coastal Program;

Discussion: The proposed development is consistent with the standards of the Matteucci Specific Plan. The intent of the Specific Plan is to provide for single-family residential development at low overall densities. The project has been reviewed for conformance with all policies of the Coastal Land Use Plan and has been determined to be consistent. The following specific policies are especially noted:

HMB Local Coastal Program Policies and Compliance

Policy 7-1: *The City will establish and map scenic corridors for Highway 1 to guide application of the policies of this chapter. Minimum standards shall include all areas within 200 yards of the State Highway 1 which are visible from the road.*

Compliance: The project is not visible from Highway 1.

Policy 7-4: *Utilities shall continue to be placed underground in all new developments.*

Compliance: The conditions of approval require underground utilities and communications.

Policy 7-13: *The City will establish regulation to protect scenic corridors along all designated primary shoreline access routes where existing permits or development does not exist.*

Compliance: The subject property is 390 feet from Kelly Avenue. All of the lots adjacent to Kelly Avenue are developed or are currently undergoing development, which limits the view of the subject property. The project is a part of the Matteucci Specific Plan and is consistent with all standards for development established therein. Guidelines to protect a scenic corridor from Kelly Avenue were not created as a part of the Specific Plan.

Coastal Act 30250: *New residential, commercial or industrial development except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources.*

Compliance: The project is located within the approved Matteucci Specific Plan.
2. **Growth Management System** - The development is consistent with the annual population limitation system established in the Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance;

**Discussion:** This lot received a 1998 Measure A Certificate (#33 of 113) and is thus in compliance with the Growth Management System.

3. **Zoning Provisions** - The development is consistent with the use limitations and property development standards of the base district as well as the other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance;

**Discussion:** The project site is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD) and is subject to the development standards of the Matteucci Specific Plan. Development standards such as floor to area ratio, lot coverage and setbacks are consistent with the limitation of the Specific Plan.

4. **Adequate Services** - Evidence has been submitted with the permit application that the proposed development will be provided with adequate services and infrastructure at the time of occupancy in a manner that is consistent with the Local Coastal Program;

**Discussion:** The project is located within a new subdivision, and the installation of the necessary infrastructure, including street, curb, gutter and sidewalks, is a condition of approval prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Based on the distribution of sewer assessments to the new lot configuration, equalization to two benefits units may need to be made prior to the issuance of building permits. Properties in the Matteucci Specific Plan area have thirteen (13) 5/8-inch water connections assigned.

5. **California Coastal Act** - Any development located between the sea and the first public road conforms with the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act.

**Discussion:** The project will not interfere with the public’s access to the sea.

**Architectural Review – Findings**

6. **Architectural Review** - The project will not hinder the orderly and harmonious development of the City, nor will it impair the desirability or opportunity to attain the optimum use and value of the land and the improvements, nor will it impair the desirability of living and working conditions in the same or adjacent areas, nor will it otherwise adversely affect the general prosperity and welfare.

**Discussion:** The project was reviewed and approved by the Architectural Review Committee at the meeting of June 6, 2001.

**Environmental Review – Findings**

The project is categorically exempt per California Administrative Code 15303(a) - new construction of single-family residences. The City previously approved a Mitigated Negative Declaration with the Specific Plan that considered the construction of 12 new single-family dwellings; the current project is consistent with the Specific Plan.
EXHIBIT B
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

PDP-64-01, Coastal Development Permit
for a Single-Family Residence on Lot 1 of the Matteucci Specific Plan

Authorization: This Coastal Development Permit authorizes development of a two-
story single-family dwelling of approximately 6,932 square feet as shown on plans with
City date stamp of July 18, 2001, except as modified by the conditions of approval set
forth herein.

A. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:

1. CONFORMANCE WITH APPROVED PLANS. Development shall be in substantial
conformance with the approved site plan, floor plans, and elevations dated July 19,
2001, except for any changes that may be required by these conditions of
approval. The Planning Director shall review and approve any deviation from the
approved plans. In the event that the Planning Director determines that any
proposed changes warrant further Planning Commission review and approval, the
applicant shall submit the revised plans for consideration at a public hearing before
the Planning Commission. _____

2. CONSTRUCTION PLANS. All plans, specifications, engineering calculations,
diagrams, reports, and other data for construction of the building and required
improvements shall be submitted with the appropriate permit application to the
Building Department for review and approval. Computations and back-up data will
be considered a part of the required plans. Structural calculations, engineering
calculations, or both shall be prepared, wet stamped, and signed by an engineer or
architect licensed by the State of California. A geotechnical report, if required, shall
be prepared, wet stamped, and signed by an engineer licensed by the State of
California. _____

3. COMPLIANCE WITH UBC. The structure shall be constructed in compliance with
the standards of the Uniform Building Code Regulations for building and structure
earthquake safety as required by Title 24 of the California Administrative Code. __

4. BUILDING STANDARDS. All buildings, structures, and improvements shall be
designed and constructed in accordance with Chapter 14.04 of the Half Moon Bay
Municipal Code (Building Code, Administrative Code, Mechanical Code, Building
Code Standards, Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings, Plumbing Code,
Electrical Code) and with the Half Moon Bay Standard Details. The minimum basic
wind speed for determining design wind pressure shall be 80 miles per hour. The
exposure assigned for the subject site, for which a building or structure is to be
designed in accordance with Section 2311c of the Uniform Building Code (latest
version adopted by the City of Half Moon Bay), shall be Exposure B. _____

5. NOISE STANDARDS. The residential dwelling shall be designed in such a manner
that the ambient noise level within the structures shall meet a Sound Transmission
Class (STC) of 50 (45 if field tested). _____
6. EVIDENCE OF ADEQUATE WATER CONNECTION. The applicant shall submit a letter from CCWD certifying that the specific plan for this project has an adequately sized water connection with the building permit application. No building permit application shall be accepted without such a letter. 

7. EVIDENCE OF SEWER CONNECTION. The applicant shall purchase adequate sewer capacity and demonstrate the issuance of sewer permit from the City of Half Moon Bay. 

8. LOT DRAINAGE PLAN. A Lot Drainage Plan must be submitted for City Engineer review showing how the surface runoff is carried off-site and how the finished grades on the property relate to the existing grades on adjacent property. The Plan shall include pad elevation, finish floor elevation, site high and low points, drainage swale, area drain, existing grade at adjacent property, etc. for City Engineer approval. The location of the sewer connection and a property line sewer cleanout must be indicated. No overland drainage that flows over the creek bank shall be allowed. 

9. RIGHT TO FARM. The applicant shall record a "right-to-farm" deed restriction, to be approved by the City Attorney. 

10. FOUNDATION TYPE. The applicant shall use pier and grade beam foundations if test bores indicate the existence of sandy soils or other conditions that warrant this approach. During the drilling and pouring of all pier and grade beam foundations, the geotechnical engineer will be on site and determine the depth and location of the piers. 

11. PAD ABOVE FLOOD ELEVATION. All finish pads for home construction shall be one foot above the 100-year surface elevation in Pilarcitos Creek. 

12. JENNA LANE IMPROVEMENT PLANS. The applicant shall provide frontage improvements on Jenna Lane adjacent to the project area. These improvements shall include, but not be limited to, vertical curb, gutter, sidewalk, wheelchair ramps and paving according to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The applicant shall submit improvement plans to the City Engineer for review and approval. 

13. DOUBLE PARK FEES. The applicant shall pay all applicable fees required. The applicable "in-lieu" facilities' fee for City parks is doubled as a condition of approval for the Specific Plan. 

14. VALID MEASURE A CERTIFICATE. The Planning Department shall verify the Measure A certificate assigned to the property has not expired and is valid. 

15. CREEK EASEMENT. The owner/applicant shall provide an offer to dedicate a twenty-foot easement along Pilarcitos Creek and an easement along the eastern property boundary in perpetuity. Said offer shall not be contingent upon provisions of a similar offer on adjacent properties. 

16. SITE SELECTION. The structure shall be located on the site to minimize the amount of cut and fill material necessary.
17. LOCATION OF STRUCTURE ON LOT. The structures shall be moved 46 feet north and 8 feet west from submitted plans with a City date stamp of July 18, 2001.

18. HEIGHT OF BUILDING. The maximum height of all structures on the property shall be 22 feet.

19. GUESTHOUSE. The second story of the guesthouse as shown on plans with a City date stamp of July 18, 2001 shall be removed from building plans.

20. RIPARIAN BUFFER ZONE DISTRUBANCE. The applicant shall submit a restoration plan of the riparian buffer zone for the review and approval by the City. The plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of a building permit. The Planning Commission shall receive timely copies of the administrative decision to approve the restoration plan.

B. During any grading/construction phase of the project:

1. SITE PREPARATION. No interior lot site preparation or construction of lot improvements shall occur until an all-weather surface (not less than six inches of compacted Class II Aggregate Base) is complete and in place.

2. STORMWATER MANAGEMENT / EROSION CONTROL. The applicant shall minimize the transport and discharge of stormwater from the project site by incorporation of the following measures into the construction site practices:

   - Use silt fence barrier, straw bale barrier, sand bags, brush or rock filter or other appropriate measures, as necessary to minimize the quantity of sediment laden runoff from the site.

   - Stabilize any areas that have been stripped of vegetation, and maintain erosion control measures between October 15 and April 15.

   - Ensure that erosion control by revegetation is performed just prior to the rainy season unless on site irrigation is provided. Select seed to minimize fertilizer and water use. Limit watering to the amount and frequency, which can be absorbed on site.

   - Avoid stockpiling of soils or materials, when rain is forecast. Cover with a waterproof tarp during periods of rainy weather to control runoff. Monitor the site for minimization of erosion and sediment runoff every 24 hours during and after every storm event.

   - Avoid cleaning, fueling, or maintaining vehicles on site, except in an area designated to contain and treat runoff.

3. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES. If historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during grading activities, all work shall stop and the applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist or cultural resource specialist. At the applicant's
expense the qualified archaeologist will perform an archaeological reconnaissance and develop mitigation measures to protect archaeological resources.

4. HOURS OF OPERATION. Pursuant to Chapter 14.40 of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code, the hours of construction operation shall be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Saturday, and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Sundays and Holidays.

5. NOISE PREVENTION. The applicant shall ensure that the project contractor places all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from residential property to the south and east of the site. All internal combustion engine-driven construction equipment shall be fitted with mufflers that are in good condition. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with this condition to the satisfaction of the Planning Director on demand.

C. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy:

1. COMPLETION OF FIRE DISTRICT REQUIREMENTS. All requirements of the Half Moon Bay Fire Protection District shall be met.

2. COMPLETION OF DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS. All surface and subsurface storm drainage facilities necessary for the development of this parcel shall be constructed. Runoff from and to adjacent properties must be considered in the proposed plans. All roof drainage shall be collected and conveyed directly to the storm drainage system.

3. COMPLETION OF SEWER FACILITIES. The sanitary sewer line and lateral facilities for complete and adequate service shall be connected to the public sewer lines.

4. RELOCATION OF UTILITIES. Any public utilities requiring relocation as a result of the construction of the building(s) or improvements under this permit shall be relocated at the owner’s expense.

5. UNDERGROUNDING OF UTILITIES. All utilities for energy and communications shall be installed underground.

6. COMPLETION OF WATER FACILITIES. The applicant shall construct domestic water line facilities and appurtenances for service from the water utility. Water service from any interim well shall not be permitted. Low flow plumbing fixtures shall be used throughout the proposed project.

7. STREET TREE INSTALLATION. Two street trees shall be provided in the front yard adjacent to the street right-of-way. All trees shall be selected from the approved street tree list found in the City of Half Moon Bay Master Tree Plan dated December 1996. Water efficient landscaping shall be used in conformance with City Ordinances.
8. NO PARKING ON STREET. The applicant shall install proper signage along the street stating no on-street parking is allowed. A sign or sign plan shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval.

9. KELLY AVENUE / HIGHWAY 1 IMPROVEMENTS. The applicant shall contribute a fair share toward the project share of the Kelly Avenue and Highway 1 traffic improvements that are specified in the Half Moon Bay Circulation Element as described in the Engineering Estimate for the project. The total for all units in the Matteucci Specific Plan has been calculated at $42,000.

10. JENNA LANE IMPROVEMENTS. The applicant shall install complete infrastructure improvements, including but not limited to drainage, street improvements, sewer, water, and utilities along Jenna Lane.

D. The project is subject to the following permanent Conditions:

1. DISPLAY OF STREET ADDRESS. The residential dwelling shall display a lighted street address number in a prominent location on the street side of the residence in such a position that the number is easily visible to approaching emergency vehicles. The numerals shall be no less than four inches in height and shall be a contrasting color to the background.

2. LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE. The applicant/owner shall ensure that all landscaped areas and/or fences shall be continuously maintained, and all plant material shall be continuously maintained in a litter-free, weed-free, healthy, growing condition.

3. ENCROACHMENTS NOT AUTHORIZED. The property owner shall ensure that landscaping does not encroach into the right-of-way or any public easements, except for any street trees authorized by this permit.

4. BUFFER AREA. The owner/applicant shall maintain a 100-foot buffer from the edge of riparian vegetation.

5. FENCING. Fencing in the front yard shall be limited to four feet in height and be of open design. Fencing in the rear and side yards shall be of open design and limited to no more than six feet in height.

6. DISKING WITHIN BUFFER AREA. The area of the expanded riparian buffer area, including the adjacent property to the west, shall not be disked for any reason including farming activities.

E. Validity and Expiration of Permits

1. EFFECTIVE DATE. The Coastal Development Permit shall take effect 10 working days after receipt of the Notice of Final Action by the Coastal Commission and upon the applicant/owner's submittal of a signed copy of these conditions of approval to the Planning Department, unless an appeal is filed.
2. **ACCURACY OF APPLICATION MATERIALS.** The applicant shall be responsible for the completeness and accuracy of all forms and material submitted for this application. Any errors or discrepancies found therein may be grounds for the revocation or modification of this permit and/or any other City approvals.

3. **EXPIRATION.** The Coastal Development Permit shall expire one year from the date from Planning Commission approval unless an appeal is filed or construction of the project has commenced.

4. **HOLD HARMLESS.** In the event that this approval is legally challenged, the City will promptly notify the applicant of any claim or action and will cooperate fully in the defense of the matter. Once notified, the applicant agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City, its officers, agents and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City of Half Moon Bay. The applicant further agrees to reimburse the City any costs and attorney’s fees which the City may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action, but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his or her obligation under this condition.

5. **PERMIT RUNS WITH THE LAND.** The Coastal Development Permit runs with the land and the rights and obligations thereunder, including the responsibility to comply with conditions of approval, shall be binding upon successors in interest in the real property unless or until such permits are expressly abandoned.

**OWNER’S/PERMITTEE’S CERTIFICATION:**

I have read and understand and hereby accept and agree to implement the foregoing conditions of approval of the Coastal Development Permit.

OWNER(S) / APPLICANT(S):

_________________________________________  ______________________
(Signature)  (Date)
May 30, 2003

RE: PDP-64-01 - 32 Jenna Lane

Dear Mr. Williamson:

In response to your question recently at the front counter about this site:

If you prefer to revise your building plans indicating your desire not to construct the primary residence on this site, planning and building will issue a Certificate of Occupancy based upon the completion of the accessory structure (guest house) per approved plans. We would require the following:

1. A letter to the Planning and Building departments of the City indicating this desire.

2. Before issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for accessory structure (guest house), proof of recordation of a Deed Restriction with the County of San Mateo on this parcel must be submitted to the City, indicating that:
   - Any future development on this site will require a Coastal Development Permit from the City as required by Title 18.
   - The previously approved building plans for the 6,000 sq ft primary structure on this parcel have been stricken and will be considered null and void.

The City will draft a Deed Restriction for you to file with the County of San Mateo if you agree to this revision to your building application for this parcel.

Sincerely,

Don Dakins
Senior Planner
Bob Williamson
780 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

May 6, 2004

RE: PDP-64-01 – 32 Jenna Lane Guest House Building Plan Revision
Assessors Parcel Number 056-072-280
Building Department Permit No. A22970

Dear Mr. Williamson:

The Planning Department has reviewed the building plan revisions submitted on April 23, 2004, for the Guest House structure located at 32 Jenna Lane.

The five (5) revisions indicated on the textual description of the application and on the accompanying revised Floor Plans and Framing Plans are deemed consistent by planning staff with regard to size, setback, and height limitations of the Matteucci Specific Plan as well as with the original Coastal Development Plans for this Guest House - approved by the Planning Commission on September 27, 2001. This revision has been forwarded back to the building department.

Please be aware that the Coastal Development Permit on file for this site allows for the construction of a single-story primary residence with a total floor area of 7,000 square feet including garage and an accessory residence (Guest House) with a total floor area of 1,280 square feet including garage.

An inspection of the site performed on May 5, 2004, by planning staff indicates that while the accessory residence (Guest House) appears to be nearing completion, no construction of the primary residence permitted by this Coastal Development Permit has commenced.

The City responded to an inquiry made in May of 2003 regarding the possibility of deleting the construction of the primary residence from this project approval. A copy of that letter is attached for your reference.

If it is your intention to revise this building application further, including the deletion of the primary residence from the approved plans, that revision should be made prior to the expiration of the current building permit for this site. Contact the building department to obtain the expiration information regarding this building permit.

Most Sincerely,

Don Dakins, Senior Planner
May 7, 2004

Don Dakins, Senior Planner
City of Half Moon Bay
501 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Re: 32 Jenna Lane

Dear Mr. Dakins,

It is my desire to obtain a Certificate of Occupancy based upon the completion of the accessory structure (guest house) per approved plans.

In doing so I accept that;

- any future development will require a Coastal Development Permit from the City as required by Title 18.

- the previously approved building plans for the 6,000 sq ft primary structure on this parcel will be stricken and will be considered null and void.

I understand that this letter is required for the City to draft a Deed Restriction for me to file with the County of San Mateo.

Sincerely,

Robert Williamson
To whom it may concern,

It has been brought to my attention that an over 8000+ sq.' home is to be built and the current structure is to be restructured on 32 Jenna Lane. My neighbor and I strenuously object to construction of this magnitude and extreme height at the dead end of Jenna Lane. In addition, we are very concerned that this site be used as a single family residence and not become a commercially used short term sub-leased vacation rental or rentals as has happened at 16 Jenna Lane.

The needs and planning for this area of Half Moon Bay seems to be overlooked when the city issued the building permit for such an immense structure. To my knowledge, this area is zoned for multi-family residences such as my condo building, Daisyview Condominiums, which houses 10 individual residences as well as single family homes. However, we are concerned that the zoning of the area as residential is not being protected. If one building has managed to slip under the radar to become a commercialized psuedo-motel, what will stop the builders of this mega-mansion from turning it into another sub-leased short term rental vacation site. Our community deserves the same zoning protection that is accorded to other communities of Half Moon Bay.

I have already turned in a complaint via paper copy hand delivered to City Hall the last week of August regarding 16 Jenna Lane. 32 Jenna Lane is a different issue, but zoning concerns and environmental footprints need to be reviewed.

Susan F. Hatfield
Secretary, Daisyview Condominiums
650 726-7282
sfhatfield@yahoo.com
450 Cypress Ave.
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Sue,

I will go to the Sep 13 Tuesday City meeting Tuesday.

Neighbors, with 8,250 sq Madison to be built, I totally agree with Sue's concern, in fact, someone whom I know and knows the owner of 32 Jenna in person told me that 32 can build rooms and convert to B&b use catered to Chinese market such as 16 Jenna under the radar. We want this illegal, tax evasion practice to be banned from our neighborhood, not to mention perhaps 18 months of heavy dust and loud noise in our neighborhood.

Please join me to vote "minimum construction allowed on 32 Jenna , and No for any non- residential use.

Sandy
440 Cypress

On Sep 5, 2016, at 3:02 PM, Sue Hatfield <sfhatfield@yahoo.com> wrote:

To whom it may concern,

It has been brought to my attention that an over 8000+ sq.' home is to be built and the current structure is to be restructured on 32 Jenna Lane. My neighbor and I strenuously object to construction of this magnitude and extreme height at the dead end of Jenna Lane. In addition, we are very concerned that this site be used as a single family residence and not become a commercially used short term sub-leased vacation rental or rentals as has happened at 16 Jenna Lane.

The needs and planning for this area of Half Moon Bay seems to be overlooked when the city issued the building permit for such an immense structure. To my knowledge, this area is zoned for multi-family residences such as my condo building, Daisyview Condominiums, which houses 10 individual residences as well as single family homes. However, we are concerned that the zoning of the area as residential is not being protected. If one building has managed to slip under the radar to become a commercialized pseudo-motel, what will stop the builders of this mega-mansion from turning it into another sub-leased short term rental vacation site. Our community deserves
the same zoning protection that is accorded to other communities of Half Moon Bay.

I have already turned in a complaint via paper copy hand delivered to City Hall the last week of August regarding 16 Jenna Lane. 32 Jenna Lane is a different issue, but zoning concerns and environmental footprints need to be reviewed.

Susan F. Hatfield
Secretary, Daisyview Condominiums
650 726-7282
sfhatfield@yahoo.com
450 Cypress Ave.
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Dear Scott:

This is to inform you that we wish to exercise our right to file a formal complaint about the 32 Jenna Ln. construction.

On Sept. 4th, 2016, a neighbor brought us attention the "Notice of Public Hearing" posted on the front fence of 32 Jenna Ln property. We never received the notice in mail for such a serious alteration. On the same day we saw the poles were erected on 32 Jenna Ln, which shows an immensely big building seemingly blocking the big part of the sky and the mountain beyond.

We are concerned about the new construction and ask the City to re-evaluate the new proposed big building, its intended usage and the environmental impact to the nature habitat, and the neighborhood privacy.

Here are the reasons which support our objections to such a big property:

1. The proposed 8290 sf. property is almost 80% larger than the average size of similar homes on Jenna Ln, and 130% larger than our home on 28 Jenna Ln.

From the roof-line poles erected on Sept 4th 2016, the huge-sized building is placed very close to our home. Its size and height would block the nature light from west. The new house would have close, direct view to our entire home and backyard, and part of the 24 Jenna Ln’s backyard as well. Even tall trees would not be able to provide screening.

2. We'd like City to look into the purpose of this residence. It is a known fact that the owner(s) are from China, live in China. When they bought the property in 2014, the building permit was for a 4900 sf. a main house, located far away from our property, with appropriate distance for the privacy of both ours and theirs. It clearly meant for a primary home back then.

Now the new owner(s) requested the replacement permit for a 8290 sf. house, with a location change which totally destroys the privacy for both theirs and ours. The owners won't care because they don't live here. It is hardly to believe that such a big mansion is going to be their main home when their primary home is in China. We are concerned (according to sources we know), the property will be turned into
a short-term rental property, targeting Chinese market. That would explain why they want the replacement permit with a huge size and height increase, with a change of property location. They wanted to build the home as large as possible to maximize business profit.

We are concerned about the safety of our home and the neighborhood. Strangers that have no interest in our city's development, schools, and no appreciations to the beauty of our unique environment - creeks nearby, wild animals in the bushes - would come and go with no trace of records. The owners don't even live here!

Please re-evaluate the significant impact of this likely one of the largest properties in the City and put safe-guard measures towards its future mis-use. We'd accept reasonable, compatible sized home and are willing to work with the owner, the builder, and the City to have a balanced solution for all involved.

Attachments:

* Public Hearing Notification.
* Roof-line that shows direct impact to 28 Jenna Ln: Taller than 28 Jenna Ln. Potentially blocking nature light, intrusion to neighbor's privacy, significantly changes the characters of the sites and surroundings.
* Coyote family in the nearby field that will be driven away with such large constructions.

We will attend the Sept. 13's public hearing in person, but please let us if you have any questions before the hearing.

Sincerely,

Xueshan Feng, Xu Wang
28 Jenna Ln. Half-moon Bay

650 720 5880

This Request was received on the ____ day of __________________, 20___, by ____________________________.
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Half Moon Bay
Tuesday, September 13, 1016 – 7:00 PM
www.hmbcity.com

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Planning Commission of the City of Half Moon Bay will hold a public hearing at 7:00 PM on September 13, 2016, in the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Adjacent to the Sheriff’s Substation 537 Kelly Avenue, to consider the following:

**Item:** Modification of Previously Approved Residence

**City File:** PDP-15-051

**Location:** 32 Jenna Lane

**APN:** 056-072-280

**Applicant:** Derek Vinh

**Description:** Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit and Architectural Review to allow the modification to a previously approved 6,932 square foot residence to an 8,296 square foot residence and conversion of the existing residence to a secondary dwelling unit, on a 65,141 square foot lot within the Matteucci Planned Unit Development.

**For More Information:** More information is on file at City Hall, 501 Main Street, and may be examined during regular business hours. Please send comments to: Scott Phillips, Associate Planner, 650-726-8299, sphilips@hmbcity.com City of Half Moon Bay Planning Division, 501 Main Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019.

**Right of Appeal:** Any aggrieved person may appeal the decision of the Planning Commission to the City Council within ten (10) working days of the date of the decision. This project is located within the California Coastal Commission appeals jurisdiction. Therefore, final City action is appealable to the California Coastal Commission.
Response to Comments
for the
New Single Family Residence at 32 Jenna Lane

City of Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, California

City File No. PDP-15-051

Prepared by: City of Half Moon Bay

City of Half Moon Bay
Planning Division
501 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Contact: Scott Phillips, Associate Planner

September, 2016
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Appendix A: Comment Letters A
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

The Notice of Intent was distributed in compliance with California Administrative Code, Section 15072, advertising the public comment period from June 22, 2016 to July 11, 2016, requesting comments on the adequacy of the Draft Initial Study (IS) /Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). One comment e-mail was received during this comment period.

One comment e-mail was received during the statutory comment period under CEQA. This Response to Comments document lists the individual who provided comments on the Draft IS / MND during the Notice of Intent public comment period. The City of Half Moon Bay, the lead Agency for this project, has responded to the comments received on the adequacy of the Draft IS / MND and other concerns related to the project.

SECTION 2: LIST OF COMMENTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Matt Berman</td>
<td>July 11, 2016</td>
<td>July 8, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 3: RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

The City is providing this response to comments as a courtesy and in hopes that the responses resolve the questions posed. A comment number that corresponds to the letter and specific comment the response addresses identifies all responses. The comment letters are provided in Appendix A.

Response to Comment Letter A: California Coastal Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>This comment states that an existing hedge and trees along the eastern property line and driveway easement is overgrown and out of compliance with applicable zoning regulations. A request is also indicated within the comment letter, requesting that all of the vegetation along the eastern side of the subject property and access easement be removed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This comment is not related to the adequacy of the draft CEQA document but expresses concerns related to the overgrown hedge and trees along the eastern property line and eastern side of the access easement. Trimming of the hedge along the corner of the easement will be required prior to the final inspection for the project. Standard Condition of Approval #A7 requires that landscaping comply with the Line of Site requirement at all times.

The comment also references an agreement that was discussed during the City Council review of an appeal of the Planning Commission’s decision to approve a new residence along Jenna Lane. The agreement was between the developer and appellants. The appealed projects along Jenna Lane included new residences at 12 and 28 Jenna Lane and not the subject property. The appeal was withdrawn without the referenced agreement added as an additional Condition of Approval or recorded at the County Recorder’s Office. Therefore, the City does not have the authority to enforce such agreement.
Dear Mr. Phillips and Members of the City Council,

This letter is in response to File No. PDP-15-051. Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit and Architectural Review to allow the construction of a new two-story 8,290 square-foot single-family residence, including a three-car attached garage, remodel of the existing guesthouse on the site and associated site improvements. The project area is located on 32 Jenna Lane (APN 056-072-280), which is at the northern terminus of Jenna Lane at Cypress Avenue, north of Kelly Avenue and approximately 0.20 miles west of Highway 1 (Cabrillo Highway) in the City of Half Moon Bay. The project area encompasses the entirety of APN 056-072-280.

I’d like to point out several problems with this project and this property, aside from the glaringly obvious point that the mammoth size of this project is wildly out of any pretense of scale with the neighborhood.

First, this property currently is, and has been for some time, in violation of numerous Zoning Codes, the city’s LCP, California Civil Code, HMB Municipal Code, San Mateo County Code, and the Specific Plan (see below for details on all of these). An escallonia hedge, that grows to 30 ft. tall, and a row of fast-growing evergreen trees, have been planted along the east property line of 32 Jenna Lane, and along the east side of their driveway easement, in violation of the codes cited below.

Second, an agreement was reached before the City Council on September 18, 2001, between the neighbors of Pilarcitos Park and Bob Williamson, the developer who wanted to build houses on the Matteucci Tract. The agreement, made at the urging of the Council and with the participation of its members, including the Mayor, and read into the minutes of the Council meeting, was made in good faith by all parties, and was to be attached to the property folder in the City records, be provided in the disclosure packet with each property going forward, and travel with the property to each successive owner. As each of the Jenna Lane houses went up for sale I checked with the listing agents to make sure the agreement was in the disclosure packets. It was. As I got to know each new Jenna Lane neighbor I asked if they were aware of it. They were. City Staff reports stated that the agreement is valid and must be enforced. The hedge runs right down the middle of the easement granted to the city in that agreement.

I request, before the approval is granted, that the hedge along the east side of the property, and the row of trees behind it, be removed, and that the project be adjusted to conform to all of the codes and CDP below, and to the Matteucci Agreement.

Sincerely,

Matt Berman
445A Cypress Ave.
Half Moon Bay, California

The original CDP contained 2 conditions for approval:

1. FENCING. All fencing in and around the property shall be of open design. Fencing in the front yard setback shall be limited to four feet in height.

2. LANDSCAPING / VIEW CORRIDOR. No landscaping over seven feet in height shall be permitted between the subject building and the adjacent houses to preserve a view corridor between buildings.

The specific zoning codes involved are:

18.06.040.B.4. - Within the Sight Distance of any corner ... shrubs must be trimmed to a maximum height of three feet.
2. Driveway Gates. Decorative gates may extend up to one foot higher than the fence height permitted that location.

2. Maximum Height. The maximum height of a solid fence, wall or hedge shall be as follows:

• Front Limited Height. Fences, walls, and hedges located within a required front yard setback area within the site distance area as defined herein shall be limited to a maximum height of three feet.

• Rear Limited Height. Fences, walls, and hedges located to the rear of the required front yard setback area shall be limited to a maximum height of six feet, unless this area is also within the site distance area as defined herein, in which case the maximum height shall not exceed three feet in the site distance area.

• Trellis or Rails. An additional one foot of fence or wall height is permitted on front yard, rear yard and interior side yard fences, only if the added fencing has openings comprising at least fifty percent of the added area (such as lath trellis or rails).

• Retaining Wall Fence. Where a retaining wall protects a cut below existing grade or contains a fill above the existing grade and is located on the line separating lots, such retaining wall may be topped by a fence, wall or hedge with the maximum total height not to exceed six feet.
(1) Within the triangular area of private property formed by the extension of intersection curb lines, or pavement edge where no curb exists, and the diagonal line connecting the point on each of the two streets at a distance of forty-five (45) feet back from the intersection, as illustrated hereafter, or
(2) Within the triangular area of private property formed by lines ten (10) feet in length from the point of intersection of the edge of driveways on the subject property or adjacent properties and the edge of the sidewalk closest to the private property, as illustrated hereafter.
(c) Side and Rear Property Line Fences. The maximum height along interior side or rear property line outside of required front or street side yards shall be eight (8) feet provided that:
(1) A building permit, applied for by all property owners abutting the property line fence, is issued pursuant to Title 23, and
(2) Fifty (50%) percent of the fence above six (6) feet in height shall be open.

From the Matteucci Agreement:
9. No trees or shrubs to exceed 7 feet in height in view corridor between any of the houses.
12. Delineate and dedicate a multi-use path easement in perpetuity along the east side of #1 as mentioned in version of the PUD. Both easements shall not have perimeter fencing and/or hedges that block views.

From the Matteucci Specific Plan
IV. J. Fencing. A fencing plan for the individual parcels must be approved by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit to ensure that all urban uses are maintained on the subject parcel. Side yard fences shall meet the standards set forth in Chapter 18.06.
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning Commission

From: Scott Phillips, Associate Planner

Date: September 13, 2016

Subject: Letters Received Prior to Planning Commission Hearing (File No. PDP-15-051)

This memo transmits two letters and one e-mail that were received by Staff prior to the Planning Commission meeting. Copies of the letters received are included as Attachments 1, 2 and 3.

In regard to the comment letter received from the Committee For Green Foothills, comment 1A states that there is no analysis showing that the project is in compliance with the Matteucci Specific Plan, a copy of the development standards are attached to this memorandum as Attachment 4. The proposed project as designed complies with these standards. Comment 1B requests that a specific plan be prepared for the entire Planned Unit Development. A Specific Plan has been prepared and adopted and is attached as Attachment 4. In regard to comment 1C, the attached specific plan requires a minimum of 10 feet from the adjacent property. The applicant is providing 20 feet. Comment 1D requests that a Right-to-Farm deed restriction be recorded. This document has already been recorded against the property in perpetuity. A copy of the recorded document is included as Attachment 5. In regard to comment 1E, the referenced Policy 9.3.12(c) was superseded by the adoption of the Matteucci Specific Plan. Coastside County Water District has confirmed that sufficient water rights have been assigned to the property to allow for the proposed development. Comment 1F requests that a deed restriction be recorded requiring that 80% of the property be set aside as open space. This request would be redundant, given that this is already a requirement of the Matteucci Specific Plan. Comment 1G expresses concerns that the property would be used as short term rental. Short term vacation rental is currently prohibited in all residential neighborhoods in the City, including within the Matteucci Specific Plan.
Comment 1H references private agreement document between the previous developer and neighbors to the subject property. This agreement was not approved by the City Council and therefore not an enforceable document by the City. A copy of this agreement is attached to this memorandum as Attachment 6. Comment 1I, the last paragraph within the letter from the Committee for Green Foothills identifies a Condition of Approval from the previous approval requiring the offer to dedicate a trail easement across the eastern side of the subject property and along the edge of the riparian area along Pilarcitos Creek. This easement offer was never recorded and a copy of this document is attached to this memorandum. Staff is recommending an additional Condition of Approval (B-1) requiring the applicant to update and record the trail easement offer prior to the issuance of the building permit for the main residence. The recommended language for the additional Condition of Approval includes the following:

**B1 RECORDED TRAIL EASEMENT.** Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the new residence, the applicant shall provide an updated offer to dedicate a twenty-foot easement along Pilarcitos Creek and ten-foot easement along the eastern side of the property and existing access easement, to be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director. The approved trail easement offer will then be recorded at the County of San Mateo Recorders Office.

A letter, included as Attachment 2, was submitted from the Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter. Comment 2A expressed concerns that ample photographs were not provided in the staff report. Along with the aerial and oblique photographs included in the staff report, the applicant provided photographs within the full size plan set. Additionally, the Planning Commission is encouraged to visit the site and surrounding area prior to the public hearing. The combination of the photographs and site inspections is sufficient to inform the Commission of the proposal. Comment 2B references the previously required trail easement offer. Staff is recommending an additional Condition of Approval (B-1) as noted above. Comment 2C objects to the size of the proposed home. As noted in the staff report, the home is smaller than what is allowed by the Matteucci Specific Plan, given the size and location of the subject property.

Staff received an e-mail from a resident stating several concerns with the project and a copy of the e-mail and attachment is included as Attachment 3. Comment 3A references a biological study that was conducted on a City owned property more than 1 mile away from the subject property and that the project does not adequately identify ESHA on the subject property. As stated in the staff report, a biological resource evaluation was prepared for the subject property and surrounding area. The biologist that conducted the study recommended mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to sensitive habitat to less than significant level. The recommended mitigation measures have been integrated into the Draft Conditions of Approval and Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program. Comment 3B recommends certain buffer areas to protect ESHA. The City’s Zoning Code
requires a minimum of 50 feet buffer from the edge of the riparian vegetation. The project
as designed more than doubles the buffer distance. Comment 3C states that applicable
wetland buffers have not been respected. As stated in the staff report, Staff met with
Coastal Commission Staff and the project biologist on site to discuss this concern. The
areas of concern were mapped and the project designed to comply with the request.
Comment 3D requests that split rail fencing be constructed along the edge of the riparian
buffer area. Staff could add an additional Condition of Approval requiring this construction
if the Planning Commission feels this should be a requirement. Comment 3E expresses
concerns that the size of the house is out of compliance with applicable Visual Resource
Standards. Given the separation of the subject property from the Public Right-of-Way and
the dense vegetation along the southern portion of the property, the new home would not
be visible from the Public Right-of-Way along Jenna Lane. Comment 3F requests that a
Right-to-Farm deed restriction be recorded. This document has already been recorded
against the property in perpetuity. A copy of the recorded document is included as
Attachment 5.

Attachments:
1. Letter from Committee for Green Foothills, received September 13, 2016
2. Letter from Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter, received September 13, 2016
3. E-mail from Jimmy Benjamin, received September 13, 2016
4. Matteucci Specific Plan Development Standards and Map
5. Right to Farm Recorded Deed Restriction
6. Subdivision Appeal Agreement
7. Previous Trail Easement Offer
September 13, 2016

Half Moon Bay Planning Commission
City Hall
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Attention: Scott Phillips, Associate Planner

Re: September 13, 2016 Agenda Item #3, PDP-15-051: Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit and Architectural Review for a new two-story 8,290 square-foot single-family residence, on a 66,141 sq. ft. parcel, at 32 Jenna Lane, located in the PUD Planned Unit Development Zoning District.

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am unable to attend your meeting tonight. On behalf of Committee for Green Foothills, I respectfully request that you do not approve the CDP for this proposed residence, as it is missing important background information, and as such, is inconsistent with the Half Moon Bay certified LCP and the Matteucci Specific Plan.

Our specific concerns include:

First, the Staff Report states on page 5 that “the project can be found consistent with the Planned Development District General Plan designation, Matteucci Specific Plan and with the Local Coastal Program”. There is no analysis of the requirements of the Matteucci Specific Plan, and whether this project complies. Absent such analysis, the conclusion has no factual basis.

LCP Policy 9.3.12 (a) (Matteucci) states: “A Specific Plan shall be prepared for the entire area which incorporates all of the conditions listed below and conforms to all other policies of the Land Use Plan. The Specific Plan shall show the locations of roads and structures, and indicate the amount and locations of open space, public recreation, and commercial recreation. The Specific Plan shall be subject to environmental review and City CEQA guidelines”. (emphasis added). There is no analysis of compliance with the Specific Plan, nor is it included in the Staff Report. Without this information, the public cannot adequately evaluate the project. Please provide CGF with a copy of the approved Specific Plan for the entire Matteucci Planned Development area, and relevant environmental review document(s).

Second, LCP Policy 9.3.12(b) (Matteucci) states: “If development occurs during the existence of the Pilarcitos West Urban Reserve...the development shall include all necessary buffer improvements (including but not limited to such techniques as setbacks and fences) to confine urban impacts to the development site and avoid conflicts with permanent agricultural use of the adjacent lands.” (emphasis added). There are no Conditions of
Approval requiring adequate setbacks, or other measures to ensure that there will not be conflicts with the adjacent farm operations.

CGF suggests that a new Condition of Approval be added which requires a statement to be recorded on the deed of the property that puts future owners on notice that adjacent agricultural uses with the Urban Reserve district must be protected: “This property is adjacent to property utilized for agricultural purposes. Residents or visitors to the property may be subject to inconvenience or discomfort arising from the use of agricultural chemicals, including herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers, and from the pursuit of agricultural operations, including plowing, spraying, pruning and harvesting, which occasionally generate dust, smoke, noise, and odor. Agriculture is a permitted use in the adjacent Urban Reserve zoning district and the City wishes to avoid conflicts between this priority use under the Coastal Act and adjacent residential, non-priority uses.”

Third, LCP Policy 9.3.12(c) (Matteucci) states: “All water rights on the Matteucci parcel shall be preserved for adjacent lands either by dedication, or creation of an undevelopable parcel along the Pilarcitos Creek frontage that retains riparian rights, or some similar technique.” The subject parcel is adjacent to Pilarcitos Creek, and therefore this requirement of the LCP must be complied with. CGF could not find any information as to compliance.

Finding 14 is inadequate. If 80% of the site is required to be open space, per the cited Matteucci Specific Plan (which is not included in the Staff Report and therefore CGF has not had an opportunity to review), then there must an enforceable deed restriction or other mechanism to ensure that this requirement is met. Such enforceable agreement is particularly important in this sensitive location adjacent to Pilarcitos Creek, which includes the identified on-site riparian area, the riparian buffer, and wetland ESHA based on the presence of hydrophytic vegetation (Conium maculatum). It is also an identified movement corridor for native wildlife including coyotes and bobcats. To adequately protect wildlife and the ESHA areas, no alteration of the land, removal of sensitive habitat vegetation, or fencing within the deed restricted and open space/protected area should be allowed.

All of the analysis of this project under CEQA and the LCP is based on the assumption that the project will remain a Single Family Residence. However, the size of the structure and building plans (which are largely unreadable so CGF has been unable to determine the interior details including the number of bedrooms and bathrooms) appear to be designed to allow conversion into more than one residential unit, or a multiple unit vacation rental/ small hotel. This would be inconsistent with the Matteucci Specific Plan. A Condition of Approval should be added that limits the use to a Single Family Residence.

CGF supports the concerns of neighbors regarding the previous Agreement that was the subject of the Appeal by Fayden Holmboe and Tim Shockey of PDP-09-01 regarding this property. The Agreement was unanimously approved (4-0) by the City Council on September 18, 2001, and the Appeal was withdrawn based on the Agreement.
CGF particularly notes that Condition 12 of the Agreement requires the dedication of “a trail easement in the riparian setback westward through the full extent of property in Matteucci PUD and the Williamson property to the west zoned urban Reserve, in perpetuity and without conditions. Delineate and dedicate a multi-use path easement in perpetuity along the east side of #1 as mentioned in versions of the PUD.” To CGF’s knowledge, Condition 12 has not been complied with.

Thank you for consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Lennie Roberts, Legislative Advocate
September 13, 2016

Half Moon Bay Planning Commission
City Hall, 501 Main Street
EOC Meeting Place, 537 Kelly Avenue
Half Moon Bay, Ca 94019

To: Scott Phillips
Cc: Bruce Ambo

Re: Meeting of September 13, 2016, Agenda Item #3, PDP-15-051: Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit and Architectural Review for a new two-story 8,290 square-foot single-family residence, on a 66,141 sq. ft. parcel, at 32 Jenna Lane, located in the PUD Planned Unit Development Zoning District.

Dear Planning Commissioners,

The Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter herein incorporates by reference the concerns expressed by the Committee for Green Foothills in their letter of September 13, 2016, regarding this project. (Please see additional attached letter.)

We additionally comment that the photograph of the story poles in the staff report appears to have been taken from a position rarely occupied by humans and we think the Commission would be much better informed if you were to be provided photos taken from various positions on the neighboring streets of Jenna and Cypress.

In the overhead picture of the site we do not see the trail easement at the edge of the southern buffer zone of Pilarcitos Creek that was a condition imposed during the original Planning Commission hearings for the project.

We do not find the conclusion in the staff report that “the additional size would not be out of character” to be an appropriate assessment. At the original Commission hearings there was considerable discussion among the Commissioners about the propriety of the house sizes and the size that was eventually permitted was considered to be at the limit of acceptability. Increasing the size from the 6,932 square feet originally approved and the 5,729 square feet subsequently approved to 8,290 square feet as now proposed is neither trivial nor in character. Size matters. This is a characteristic for which the Commission has broad discretionary power.
and we believe the community’s interests would not be well served if this project is not brought back to its prior dimension(s).

Thank you for providing the opportunity to provide public comment.

Ken King

Chair of the Conservation Sub-Committee on Coastal Issues
Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

Cc: James Eggers, Chapter Executive Director

Chapter Conservation Committee - All Members
Scott Phillips

From: Jimmy Benjamin <jamben@pacbell.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2016 3:36 PM
To: Scott Phillips
Cc: Lennie Roberts; Harvey Rarback; ‘Brian Holt’; Matt Berman; Fayden Holmboe; Dana Kimsey; ‘Goude, Leif’; Suzanne Deleon; ‘Foster, Patrick@Coastal’; Stephanie.Rexing@coastal.ca.gov

Subject: PDP-15-051 32 Jenna Lane
Attachments: 2016 06 10 Jennings report.pdf

Half Moon Bay Planning Commission
City of Half Moon Bay
501 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Attn: Mr. Scott Phillips, Associate Planner

Honorable Members of the Planning Commission:

Over the weekend I received a copy of the staff report and attachments for the referenced project. I apologize for not being able to attend your meeting this evening, and I respect the rights of this property owner to make use of his or her land, provided it adequately protects visual and environmental resources, and does not adversely affect nearby property owner’s ability to enjoy their own land. Unfortunately, the proposed project does not meet that standard. The staff report provides ample evidence that the project as proposed cannot be found consistent with the Half Moon Bay certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) and its certified Implementation Plan (LCP/IP). In particular:

- The biological report creates the impression that their habitat of the California red-legged frog (CRLF) and San Francisco garter snake (SFGS) is limited to the creek and riparian corridor, and to a dispersal corridor 25’ wider than the riparian corridor, when in fact these animals can use upland areas further outside of the riparian corridor for foraging, estivation, thermoregulation, breeding, and refuge from rising waters. This has been repeatedly acknowledged in biological assessments throughout the City, most recently on the City property near the SAM Plant (see attached). Therefore the project as presented does not adequately identify ESHA that is habitat for rare, endangered, threatened and unique species as required by LCP Chapter 3 policies and chapter 38 of the LCP implementation plan. A wider area should be identified, and would not impact the owner’s property rights.

- The LCP specifically adopts Coastal Act policies and additional policies and implementation plan ordinance which require development in or adjacent to ESHA’s, including the just-mentioned habitat for CRLF and SFGS, to avoid disruption of ESHA biological productivity. Once the listed species habitat outside of the riparian corridor is identified, a buffer area should be defined in which lawns, hardscape, sheds and other disruptive uses are prohibited.

- The proposed conditions do not respond to the comments received from the Coastal Commission’s biologist with respect to wetlands. Regardless of the point from which wetland buffers are measured, the LCP and it LCP/IP require preservation of our wetlands, just we do with other wet areas. There is no conditions or other evidence in the record to support the finding that these wetlands will function well if the proposed development were implemented. Please identify a buffer that will provide this protection.

- The Coastal Commission biologist also recommended the establishment of a fence to discourage unpermitted uses in buffer areas. Once the boundary of ESHA along with an adequate buffer has been identified, please add a condition to the project requiring a permanent fence be maintained to prevent significant adverse impacts in the buffer area.
I appreciate the recognition that the PDD area is a visual resource. This parcel is also subject to the visual resource standards by virtue of its adjacency to Pilarcitos Creek. One of the goals of the specific plan was to maintain the view corridors looking down the streets perpendicular to Jenna Lane. The size of the proposed house makes siting to preserve the view shed very difficult. I hope that you consider approving a smaller design that is consistent with the original approval, and require a location that does not impact the view corridor looking down of The riparian buffer fence should be designed to avoid impacting the views of the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor from Jenna Lane or from adjacent public streets.

If it is not provided for in our ordinance, please add a right-to-farm condition to prevent future owners or occupants from objecting to nearby agricultural uses.

The biological consultant explicitly deferred to the City and the jurisdictional regulatory agencies for the determination of these ESHAs. Without additional conditions the project is likely to be the subject of an appeal to more accurately identify those areas, and to ensure that adjacent activities will not result in a take or other significant adverse impact.

Thank you for considering my written comments.

Respectfully,

Jimmy Benjamin

Cc: Suzanne Deleon, California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Patrick Foster, California Coastal Commission
Leif Goude, US Fish and Wildlife Service
James Benjamin  
400 Pilarcitos Avenue  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019-1475  

Subject: Habitat assessment of lands to the south and north of the SAM Plant, Half Moon Bay.

Dear Jimmy:

This letter is in regards to my recent California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*; CRLF) and San Francisco gartersnake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrateenia*; SFGS) habitat assessment of lands in the vicinity of the SAM Plant and the neighborhood of Casa del Mar, Half Moon Bay. On June 04, 2016, I conducted a site visit of the area to assess the extent to which these lands contain or support rare, endangered, threatened or unique species under the City of Half Moon Bay’s certified Local Coastal Program. The properties observed include:

A pond created as part of a 1996 Caltrans mitigation project.

The Landstra Property (along the northern edge of the Kehoe watercourse) that is owned by the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside (APN 048-240-040).

The City of Half Moon Bay lands just south of the Landstra Property (APN 048-270-070 and APN 048-270-080). The aforementioned pond is contained within the latter parcel.

The Coastside Lutheran Church Property (APN 048-270-060), which is currently farmed and is located to the east of the previously mentioned City-owned lots.

The Magri Property located adjacent to the previously stated lot (APN 048-270-010).

I also examined the State Beach lands immediately west of the Casa del Mar neighborhood and the area between Venice Boulevard (to the north) and the Casa del Mar neighborhood (to the south). This will be referred to as the "Venice Beach Parcels." Additional observations were made along the horse trail that bisects the State Beach property located to the north of the mouth of Pilarcitos Creek.

Based on my site visit, both the pond on the parcel with APN 048-270-080 and the lagoon and marshlands at the mouth of Pilarcitos Creek provide breeding habitat for CRLF. The former is known to have had successful CRLF reproduction during the past several years (Richard Vonarb, Caltrans Biologist, pers. comm.). Thus, adjacent uplands in the vicinity of this pond are utilized by juvenile and adult CRLF for foraging and movement corridors between aquatic habitats in the vicinity, especially during rainfall periods and seasons when the area receives significant ground surface moisture from foggy weather. I observed no barriers to prevent CRLF from accessing and foraging in the Landstra parcel or either of the City of Half Moon Bay-owned properties to the east and southeast of the SAM Plant. Further, based on a number well-documented records submitted to the California Natural Diversity Data
Base in recent years, CRLF have been found foraging in the residential areas to the north of Kehoe watercourse. Since CRLF have been found to move this far from the mouth of Pilarcitos Creek and the adjacent Caltrans CRLF mitigation pond, then they can easily be considered to move a similar distance within the City's parcels to the east and southeast.

Besides the above, these same City-owned parcels should also be considered suitable hibernation habitat for SFGS. This species is known to inhabit Pilarcitos Creek and probably forages for CRLF in the Caltrans mitigation site's pond. Since upland areas provide hibernation habitats safe from creek side flooding, there is a very high probability that SFGS are utilizing the parcels in question at least for part of the year.

Examination of the vegetation structure of the riparian plants along the Kehoe watercourse and Pilarcitos Creek and the coastal upland vegetation along the City-owned properties, Venice Beach Parcels, and State Beach lands, shows that it's suitable for CRLF use, despite some degradation in places by introduced cape ivy (*De lairea odorata*), sea figs (*Carpobrotus edulis* and *C. chilensis*), and pampas grass (*Cortaderia selloana*). However, I have observed CRLF utilizing such habitats at other coastal locations such as San Simeon State Beach (Rathbun et al. 1993), Carmel State Beach (Jennings 2005), and SFGS utilizing such habitats at Pescadero Marsh and Rancho Del Oso (Jennings 1992). Based on radio tracking studies of CRLF, these amphibians are able to easily move through such areas of dense vegetation, often using small mammal burrows as travel routes (Rathbun et al. 1993).

Finally, it is my professional opinion that CRLF (and probably SFGS) are probably utilizing the Venice Beach Parcel as upland foraging habitat based on the number of recently observed CRLF sightings along the northwestern edge of the Casa del Mar neighborhood. All of these CRLF records have been documented by photographs and submitted to the California Natural Diversity Data Base.

In closing, I would like to point out that my opinions regarding CRLF and SFGS habitat on the parcels in question are nothing new. Both the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as other professional biological consultants have indicated that these areas are suitable habitat for these two species (e.g., see Coast Ridge Ecology 2013, Tattersal 2013, Norris 2015). Thus, my professional opinion is merely another confirmation that previous CRLF and SFGS habitat assessments remain valid for the positive presence of these species.

Thank you allowing me to provide my comments. Please let me know if you have any questions on the above.

Sincerely,

Mark R. Jennings
President and
Herpetologist/Fisheries Biologist

cc: Roger Moore, Esq. Rossmann and Moore, LLP.
Documents Cited


MATTEUCCI SPECIFIC PLAN

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

I. STANDARDS AND DEFINITIONS

This Specific Plan covers the 13 lots as depicted on the attached map. Except as herein specified, all definitions and standards shall be according to Chapter 18 of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code.

II. PERMITTED USES

A. Single-family residential dwellings
B. Second units that conform to standards of City ordinance
   - The existing unit on Lot 8c shall be considered as a second unit and the future, primary residence shall conform to all development standards.
C. Accessory buildings consistent with setback requirements.
D. Home occupations consistent with City ordinance.
E. Single-family recreational facilities (swimming pools, tennis court, etc.)
F. Agricultural uses – including field crops, specialty crops, etc. that are compatible with adjacent residential uses, provided any and all necessary permits have been approved.

III. PROHIBITED USES

A. Uses inconsistent with the permitted uses.
B. Farm labor housing.
C. Retail sale of agricultural products on or off site.
D. Commercial horse stables.
E. Further subdivision of any lot.

IV. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

A. The R-1 standards in Chapter 18.06 of the zoning code shall apply to Lots A and 8d.
B. Lots size: Minimum size as indicated on the attached map.
C. Lot coverage: Footprint of all structures shall not exceed 20%.
D. Floor Area Ratio: 35% maximum.
E. Height: No structure shall exceed 28 feet in height
F. Setbacks:
   Front yard – 25 feet
   Side yard – 10 feet minimum, 15% of lot width combined
   Rear yard – 20 feet
G. Riparian setback: 50 feet from the edge or the riparian corridor as defined in Chapter 18.38 or 100 feet from the centerline of Pilarcitos Creek or as determined by the attached flood study, whichever is greater.
H. Existing structures are exempt from the Specific Plan setback requirements. All new construction must meet the Specific Plan requirements.
I. Utilities: All services shall be underground.

J. Fencing: A fencing plan for individual parcels must be approved by the City prior to issuance of a building permit to ensure that all urban uses are maintained on the subject parcel. Side yard fences shall meet the standards set forth in Chapter 18.06. An 8-foot high fence shall be permitted on the eastern and northern sides of the project area to separate the higher density development if approved by the Architectural Review Committee; otherwise, the maximum height shall be 6 feet.

K. Parking: Minimum garage space for three vehicles, except existing houses. All recreational vehicles and boats shall be stored in City approved structures or hidden from view. A minimum of six off-street parking spaces shall be provided for each new home in the PUD.

L. Landscaping: All developer installed landscaping shall be drought tolerant.

M. Architectural Review: All development is subject to Architectural Review Committee approval.

V. OPEN SPACE / COASTAL RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS:

A. A minimum of 80% of the site will be devoted to private open space on all lots.

B. Riparian setback as set forth by Development Standard ‘G’.

C. Dedication of bike lane along Kelly Avenue.

D. Two 4-foot bike lanes to be built on alleyway when widened.

VI. AMENITIES:

A. Each site shall have two street trees installed.

B. Rolled curbs and gutters to be installed with street improvements.

C. “See-through” fencing shall be installed on the north and east sides with drought tolerant landscaping.

D. All garages shall be wired for 220V circuits to provide changing stations for electric vehicles.

E. All homes shall be oriented to obtain good use of solar gain.

F. State-of-the-art communications shall be wired to each home in the form of category 5 telephone and computer wire and cable for each room to provide availability of TV and cable modems.

G. All communication wiring to be home run to a central location to provide for adaptation to a form of smart homes. Each home shall have extra conduit run to the house for future technological capability, such as fiber optics.

VII. RIGHT TO FARM

Right to farm language shall be recorded against each parcel of the Specific Plan.

VIII. PARK IN-LIEU OF FEES

The applicable “in-lieu” fees for City parks shall be double for all new construction in the Specific Plan.
NOTICE OF DEED RESTRICTION

Restriction on use of a Single Family Residence *
32 Jenna Lane, Half Moon Bay (APN 056-072-280)

The property adjacent and to the west of the property located at 32 Jenna Lane, Half Moon Bay (APN 056-072-280) has been used for agricultural purposes. While not presently zoned or designated on the City of Half Moon Bay General Plan for primarily agricultural use, this adjacent property contains an existing agricultural operation of a type that would be obvious to an uninformed observer after a physical inspection of the property.

Any owner, lessor, or optionor of this property will not consider the inconveniences or discomforts arising from agricultural operations to be a nuisance if such operations are legal, consistent with accepted customs and standards and operated in a non-negligent manner.

Any owner, lessor, or optionor may be subject to inconveniences or discomfort arising from these operations. Such discomfort or inconveniences may include, but are not limited to, noise, odors, dust, chemicals, smoke, insects, operation of machinery during any 24 hour period, aircraft operation.

One or more of the inconveniences described above may occur even in the case of an agricultural operation that is in conformance with existing laws and regulations and locally accepted customs and standards. You should be prepared to accept such inconveniences or discomfort as a normal and necessary aspect of living in an area with a strong rural character and a health agricultural sector.

Agricultural operations means all operations necessary to conduct agriculture including, but not limited to, preparation, tillage and maintenance of the soil or other growing medium, the production, irrigation, frost protection, cultivation, growing, raising, breeding, harvesting, or processing of any living organism having value as an agricultural commodity or product, and any commercial practices performed incident to or in conjunction with such operations on the site where the agricultural product is being produced, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or market, or to carriers for transportation to market.

This adjacent property may at some time in the future be developed for uses other than agriculture.

*Legally described as: See Exhibit "A"
Robert Williamson

Joni Williamson

State of California,
County of San Mateo

On April 12, 2002 before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared Robert Williamson and Joni Williamson, personally known to me to be the person(s) whose name(s) are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that they executed the same in their authorized capacity(ies), and that by their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature

Name (typed or printed) (Seal)
EXHIBIT "A"

The land referred to is situated in the State of California, County of San Mateo, City of Half Moon Bay, and is described as follows:

PARCEL 1, as designated on that certain Approval of Lot Line Adjustment recorded April 35th, 2000 in Official Records, under Recorder's Serial Number 2000-047208, more particularly described as follows:

All that certain real property situate in the City of Half Moon Bay, County of San Mateo, State of California, being Lot 1 and a portion of Lot 2, as said Lots are described in that certain Lot Line Adjustment recorded as Document #94172365 in the office of the Recorder of San Mateo County, State of California, on November 8, 1994, more particularly described as follows:

All of said Lot 1, and all that portion of said Lot 2 lying northerly of a line parallel and northerly 1,170.00 feet of the centerline of Kelly Avenue as said centerline is shown on that certain Record of Survey filed in Volume 19 of LLS Maps at Pages 57 & 58.

A.P.N. 056-072-280
Matteucci Subdivision Appeal Meeting

The parties agree to the following:

1. The homes on Lots #1 and #2 shall be separated by a total distance of not less than 134.6 feet.

2. No roof to exceed 22 feet on any of the lots except: Lot #2 (24.5 feet with a 1.5 foot open guardrail) provided that the second floor not exceed 727 sq.ft. dated 06/11/01 and Lot #6 shall not exceed 28 feet.

3. One additional lot other than lot#1 may have a 28-foot maximum height dwelling unit but the square footage of the second story shall be limited to a maximum of 400 square feet.

4. Story poles as directed by planning commission requirements on remaining, unimproved lots in the Matteucci Specific Plan shall not be required. City Council will direct Planning Commission that these will not be required.

5. Dwelling unit on Lot #2 shall be moved 15 feet west and 5 feet south from submitted plans dated 06/11/01.

6. Keep fences of open design facing south, east and north four feet on front yard perimeters. Keep fences of open design facing south, west and north on back yard perimeters.

7. Move site “1” main house and guest house 46 feet north and 8 feet west from submitted plans dated 07/18/01.

8. No guest house to exceed 700 square feet and be no more than single story.
9. No trees or shrubs to exceed 7 feet in height in view corridor between any of the houses.

10. Bob Williamson will support use of Matteucci project park mitigation fees for creating park in Matteucci/Pilarcitos Park.

11. Bob Williamson will donate $1,000 per lot in lieu of story poles to the park fund.

12. Bob Williamson will increase the riparian setback along the north side of Lot #1 to 100 feet from the edge of vegetation. Delineate and dedicate a trail easement in the riparian setback westward through the full extent of property in Matteucci PUD and the Williamson property to the west zoned Urban Reserve, in perpetuity and without conditions. Delineate and dedicate a multi-use path easement in perpetuity along the east side of #1 as mentioned in versions of the PUD. Both easements should not have perimeter fencing and/or hedges that blocks views.

13. Bob Williamson will secure and dedicate an easement at the south end of Jenna Lane for possible future widening of the street to a full two lanes throughout. He will install a gas line at the proper depth to accommodate street widening.

Signed: Robert Williamson Date: 09/25/01
Bob Williamson

Signed: Fayden Hombole Date: 07/20/01

Signed: Tim Shockey Date: 7/19/01

Signed: Jan Sommer Date: 9/19/01
Irrevocable Offer to Dedicate Trail Easement

This Covenant, herein "AGREEMENT," is made and entered into on this 12th day of July, 2002, by Robert Williamson (hereinafter referred to as "GRANTOR") and the City of Half Moon Bay (hereinafter referred to as "CITY" or "GRANTEE").

1. GRANTOR is the owner of certain real property described in Exhibit ‘A’, located at 32 Jenna Lane in the City of Half Moon Bay, California, which property is shown on the 2001-2002 San Mateo County Property Tax Rolls as Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 056-072-280 (hereinafter referred to as the “PROPERTY”).

2. On September 27, 2001, the CITY approved a Coastal Development Permit (PDP-64-01) to construct a Single Family Residence on the PROPERTY.

3. The CITY placed a Condition of Approval on the Coastal Development Permit requiring an irrevocable offer to dedicate a trail easement for the future development of the Pilarcitos Creek Trail.

4. GRANTOR has elected to comply with the Condition and execute this Offer so as to enable GRANTOR to undertake the development authorized by the Permit.

5. In consideration of granting of the Permit to the GRANTOR by the CITY, the GRANTOR hereby irrevocably offers to dedicate to the CITY, an easement, as public property, in gross and in perpetuity over a portion of the PROPERTY to be dedicated as follows:

   a) Description. The easement offered hereby affects that portion of the PROPERTY covering the eastern 10 feet of the property and is hereby offered as an access easement to the proposed Pilarcitos Creek Trail. A 20-foot wide strip starting 30 feet south of the edge of the riparian vegetation of Pilarcitos Creek as specifically described in Exhibit ‘B’ attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference (herein referenced as the "Protected Land"), is hereby offered as an easement to construct the proposed Pilarcitos Creek Trail.

   b) Purpose. The sole purpose of the easement is to provide for the future development of the Pilarcitos Creek Trail along the north boundary of PROPERTY and to provide future access to the proposed Pilarcitos Creek Trail along the east boundary of PROPERTY at such time that the Pilarcitos Trail is completed. No other access or use is intended by this dedication.
c) **Duration, Acceptance and Transferability.** This irrevocable offer of dedication shall be binding upon the owner and the heirs, assigns, or successors in interest to the PROPERTY described above in perpetuity. The City may accept this offer by recordation of an acceptance of the offer.

d) **Benefit and Burden.** This offer shall run with and burden the PROPERTY and all obligation, terms, conditions, and restrictions running with the land and shall be binding upon the inure to the benefit of the successors and assigns of both the GRANTOR and City, whether voluntary or involuntary.

e) **Remedies.** Any act, conveyance, contract, or authorization by the GRANTOR whether written or oral which uses or would cause to be used or would permit use of the Protected Land contrary to the terms of this offer will be deemed a violation and a breach thereof. The GRANTOR or City may pursue any and all available legal and/or equitable remedies to enforce the terms and conditions of this offer and easement and their respective interest in the property. In the event of a breach, any forbearance on the part of any such party to enforce the terms and provisions hereof shall not be deemed a waiver of enforcement rights regarding any subsequent breach.

f) **Maintenance.** As public property, the maintenance of the proposed Pilarcitos Creek Trail, and the proposed access easement to the proposed Pilarcitos Creek Trail shall be the obligation of the GRANTEE. The GRANTOR shall not be obligated to maintain public property, nor be obligated to maintain, improve, or alter the easements created by this offer. Any costs and expenses for such maintenance, improvement, use, possession, or alteration, including costs incurred or monitoring compliance with the terms of this easement shall be borne by the GRANTEE.

g) **Liability and Indemnification.** This dedication is made and accepted upon the express condition that both the GRANTEE, and the GRANTOR shall be free from all liability and claim for damages by reason of any injury to any person or persons, property of any kind, to whomsoever belonging, for any cause or causes whatsoever, except matters arising out of the sole negligence of the GRANTEE, while in, upon, or in any way connected with the PROPERTY. The GRANTOR hereby agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the GRANTEE, its departments, officers, agents and employees from all liability, loss, cost, and obligations on account of or arising out of any injuries or losses however occurring. The GRANTEE hereby agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the GRANTOR from all liability, loss, cost, and obligations on account of or arising out of any injuries or losses however occurring. The City shall have no right of control over, nor duties and responsibilities with respect to the PROPERTY, which would subject the City to any liability other than the obligation as cited in section (f) of this dedication. The right of the GRANTEE to enter the land is strictly limited to preventing uses inconsistent with the interest granted in this easement dedication and does not include the right to enter the land for the purposes of correcting any dangerous condition as defined by California Government Code section 830.
h) **Severability.** If any provision of these restrictions is held to be invalid or for any reason becomes unenforceable, no other provision shall be thereby affected or impaired.

The PARTIES TO THIS AGREEMENT hereby indicate their acknowledgement and acceptance of terms and conditions stated herein as evidenced by the following signatures of their duly authorized representatives. It is the intent of the parties that this AGREEMENT shall be effective as of the day and year indicated above.

City of Half Moon Bay (GRANTEE)

By: [Signature]

Title: **City Manager**

OWNERS (GRANTOR)

By: [Signature]

Title: **Owner**
The land referred to is situated in the State of California, County of San Mateo, City of Half Moon Bay, and is described as follows:

LOT 1, as designated on that certain Approval of Lot Line Adjustment recorded April 17th, 2000 in Official Records, under Recorder’s Serial Number 2000-047268, are particularly described as follows:

All that certain real property situate in the City of Half Moon Bay, County of San Mateo, State of California, being Lot 1 and a portion of Lot 2, as said Lots are described in that certain Lot Line Adjustment recorded as Document #94172365 in the office of the Recorder of San Mateo County, State of California, on November 8, 1994, are particularly described as follows:

All of said Lot 1, and all that portion of said Lot 2 lying northerly of a line parallel and northerly 1,170.00 feet of the centerline of Kelly Avenue as said centerline is shown on that certain Record of Survey filed in Volume 19 of LLS Maps at Pages 57 & 58.

A.P.N. 055-072-280
FUTURE TRAIL ACCESS EASEMENT
LOT NO. 1
MATTEUCI SPECIFIC PLAN
MINUTES
CITY OF HALF MOON BAY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2016
EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER (EOC) / 537 KELLY AVENUE

Commissioner Deman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Commissioners Evans, Conroy, Deman, and Reimer
ABSENT: Commissioner Hernandez

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL

Commissioner Deman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Commissioner Conroy made a motion to nominate Commissioner Deman to be Interim Chairman for the evenings Planning Commission Meeting, as Commissioner/Interim Chair Hernandez was absent.
Commissioner Evans seconded the motion. Motion carried by a unanimous vote.

II. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Commissioner Conroy made a motion to defer the election to the next scheduled Planning Commission Meeting.
Commissioner Deman seconded the motion. Motion carried by a unanimous vote.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Conroy made a motion to approve the agenda with no changes.
Commissioner Evans seconded the motion. Motion carried by a unanimous vote.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Commissioner Conroy made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 14, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting.
Commissioner Evans seconded the motion. Motion carried by a unanimous vote.

V. PLANNING MANAGER REPORT

Bruce Ambo, Planning Manager reported Planning updates.
VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

VII. PLANNING HEARING ITEMS

1. PDP-2015-051 – Recommendation to approve a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program, and approve by Resolution, PDP-15-051 an application for a Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit and Architectural Review, to allow the modification of an approved 22 feet in height, 6,932 square foot residence to construction of a new 28 feet in height, 8,290 square-foot single-family residence and associated site improvements, on an 66,141 square-foot lot at 32 Jenna Lane located in the PUD, Planned Unit Development Zoning District and the Planned Development District General Plan designation (APN 056-072-280), based upon the Findings and Evidence contained in Exhibit A of the Draft Resolution, and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in Exhibit B.

Scott Phillips, Associate Planner, presented Staff Report.

Derek Vinh, Project Applicant, commented and was available for comment.

Public Comment:

Paulette Eisen
Xueshan Feng
Matt Berman
Mike Ferreira
Angela Sandy Lee
Shue Lang

Commissioner Conroy made a motion to continue PDP-2015-051 with a date certain of October 11, 2016 with the request for the following information:
- Memo from City Attorney explaining details on the Mattucci PUD agreement;
- Submittal of a Landscape Plan for the project;
- Staff to identify the language of the deed restriction on second unit;
- Revised Negative Declaration to show 28 foot height of structure.

Commissioner Evans seconded the motion. Motion carried by a unanimous vote.
PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Reimer made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 p.m. Commissioner Evans seconded the motion, Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted:

[Signature]

Bridget Jett, Planning Analyst

Approved:

[Signature]

Les Deman, Interim Chairman
Dear Scott and committee members of city planning board,

My name is Helen Ge, one of the owner on 16 Jenna Lane, HMB.

My husband and I accidentally walked into the hearing on 9/13/2016 for the application of building a 8,290 SF house on 32 Jenna Lane. Since we were unprepared for the hearing which turned out that we were the target by the opposition party of several condo owners on Cypress street, we felt that these attacks were personal slanders and we demand a public apology from Susan Hatfield and Sandy Lee on next hearing. These baseless slanders are subject to any legal remedies if this happens again in the public place.

Air b&b is not a commercial renting but a home sharing programs with a platform to help those home owners to temporarily rent out their spare rooms for additional income to help pay for their bills. Each participant will receive a 1099 from Air b&b by the end of each year to fulfill their tax obligations.

My concerns on the house that will be built on 32 are as following:

1. A reversed floor plan did not fit this 8,290 SF house. The major disadvantage of the reversed floor plan is lacking of light on the first floor. The original intent of such design was to increase the view for a small cabin built on the hill with very limited lot size so the owner can capture a mountain view from a small cabin. As a result, sacrificing a bright living space on the first floor of few hundred SF seems to justify., but not justify for over 4,000 SF of living space.

For a 8,290 SF Manson with 66,000 SF lot size, such a sacrifice does not make any sense economically from the energy saving point. Since the entire country are facing the energy shortage, energy saving should be the priority consideration for every home owner as well as the government.

2. This house design does not have an open foyer which is an essential feature for any Mediterranean design (French, Tuscan and Spanish). Without an open foyer, the whole house would look like a locked box with no light, no fresh air and no space, but a huge darkness cellar. The open foyer not only increases the space, the grand feeling of the house, but also increases the light dramatically. This has been the reason why so many people in American like the Mediterranean house design, because the open foyer makes the house so spacious and brightness.

3. The upper lever deck in the front with the access from the dinning room was a huge mistake. No matter how big the deck is with two arc stairs around the deck, it is not a formal entry to the house, but to the dinning room. I wish that they could use that design for the formal house entry, but the house is limited by the height of the house.

Since all these mistakes exist on the house design, it will depreciate its value dramatically after it gets built, and will significantly drag down the home value on the rest of homes on Jenna Lane, simply because 32 is the largest house on street.
I want this email to be served as an official memorandum for the city planning department. If this wrongly designed home gets approval and our home values get drag down from it, as a home owner, we can hold someone as accountable for our loss.

Thank you very much.

Helen Ge
Sent from my iPhone
Helen and all,

Helen,

About 32 Jenna Hearing:
I was not lying and had no intention to slander, I only wanted to come forward to provide information told in my own home by someone who knows the owner of 32 Jenna and perhaps knows you too. I thought my information is pertinent to the case, but perceived by city attorney as a piece of useless information and he told planning commission to ignore.

I apologize to you for your uncomfortable feelings. Curious why you come forward with so much information about Air B&B program?

But I really appreciate your comments on 32 Jenna.

Thank you for reading

Sandy Lee
> My concerns on the house that will be built on 32 are as following:
>  
> 1. A reversed floor plan did not fit this 8,290 SF house. The major disadvantage of the reversed floor plan is lacking of light on the first floor. The original intent of such design was to increase the view for a small cabin built on the hill with very limited lot size so the owner can capture a maximum mountain view from a small cabin. As a result, sacrificing a bright living space on the first floor of few hundred SF seems to justify, but not justify for over 4,000 SF of living space.
>  
> For a 8,290 SF Manson with 66,000 SF lot size, such a sacrifice does not make any sense economically from the energy saving point. Since the entire country are facing the energy shortage, energy saving should be the priority consideration for every home owner as well as the government.
>  
> 2. This house design does not have an open foyer which is an essential feature for any Mediterranean design (French, Tuscan and Spanish). Without an open foyer, the whole house would look like a locked box with no light, no fresh air and no space, but a huge darkness cellar. The open foyer not only increases the space, the grand feeling of the house, but also increases the light dramatically. This has been the reason why so many people in American like the Mediterranean house design, because the open foyer makes the house so spacious and brightness.
>  
> 3. The upper lever deck in the front with the access from the dinning room was a huge mistake. No matter how big the deck is with two arc stairs around the deck, it is not a formal entry to the house, but to the dinning room. I wish that they could use that design for the formal house entry, but the house is limited by the height of the house.
>  
> Since all these mistakes exist on the house design, it will depreciate its value dramatically after it gets built, and will significantly drag down the home value on the rest of homes on Jenna Lane, simply because 32 is the largest house on street.
>  
> I want this email to be served as an official memorandum for the city planning department. If this wrongly designed home gets approval and our home values get drag down from it, as a home owner, we can hold someone as accountable for our loss.
>  
> Thank you very much.
>  
> Helen Ge
>  
> Sent from my iPhone
Dear Planning Commission,

Who withdrew the approved original plan for the main house on Lot 1 of the Mettuicci land? Was it the HMB City Planning Commission or the owner? How great a riparian setback is required? Are the currently proposed enormous main home and the increased size of the secondary home compatible with the Half Moon Bay community? Why are incomplete plans that are so out of keeping with the coastal environment being considered as unchangeable at this point? Who listens to the concerns of the neighbors? These are the questions I have after watching the recording of the 9/13/16 meeting of the HMB Planning Commission in which the plans for 32 Jenna Lane were reviewed.

I live on the corner of Jenna Lane and Cypress Avenue in the Daisyview Condominium complex. I am concerned that the planning commission saw no reason to object to the enormous size of the primary residence that is being proposed. Several commissioners stated that the size seemed compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. However, my neighbor who lives at 28 Jenna Lane presented statistical proof that the size of the home was absolutely not compatible with the size of her home which is one of the largest homes on Jenna Lane.

I observed that the designer presented incomplete plans. He even admitted that he needed to make changes here and there. The commissioners continued to respond as if the plans were complete, while stating that the home was poorly designed for the local weather and wind patterns; that it was not an energy efficient home; that it did not appear to meet Coastal Commission specification for riparian setback; and that its roof line could have been designed to lower the extreme height of 28 feet. Yet the only requirement that the commission gave the designer was to come back with a landscape plan at the next meeting. However, the planners instructed staff to look further into the Metteucci plan which seems to have been a handshake agreement that the developer and neighbors agreed upon to maintain a neighborly environment on both sides of Jenna Lane. Somehow, no one seemed clear as to who withdrew the initial plan for house to be built on Lot 1. Whether it was city or developer makes a difference. My neighbor attended the meeting when the agreement was made. Why wasn’t it recorded? Where is the documentation of this important decision?
My neighborhood is the most diverse neighborhood in Half Moon Bay. It is a neighborhood of working class people, teachers, small business owners, seniors, and young families just getting started. Our former Mayor is one of our residents. Most of the dwellings on the east side of Jenna are multiple family residences. Whether the homes are rented apartments, duplexes, or owner occupied condos, we also support the city with property tax. Rent includes property tax. This neighborhood should be treated with the same respect and consideration as any other area of the city.

Yet, I saw a visible shrug, and an, “oh, well, we can't stop it now”, response to the building of this megamansion. One commissioner even stated that no other home of this size have ever been built in Half Moon Bay, but another said, “It can barely be seen, anyway, so don't worry”. It is not a compatibly sized building. It is not well designed. It is not energy efficient. It doesn't meet habitat protection requirements. The commissioners stated these issues. Yet, the commission shrugged at the enormous size and the fact that it is poorly designed. The commission ignored the well documented protests of the immediate neighbor at 28 Jenna who objected to having a home of this size approved for Lot #1.

This proposal should not be considered as a done deal. I know of another property owner who in the past was required to lower the roof line of her home by two feet even though her plans were previously approved by the city, but her neighbors complained. The main ridge beam had to be lowered and the roof line redesigned. She had to do this expensive change because the planning commission did not catch the error in design. Designs should be carefully reviewed both for the builders of the new homes, and for the surrounding neighbors. At least we, the neighbors, are speaking up now.

Those of us who live on the EAST Side of Jenna Lane as well as the WEST side are a “diverse neighborhood”, but not a neighborhood to be ignored. We do care about the well-being of our neighborhood. We are hardworking people who ask that our concerns be given due consideration. We ask to have the same basic services and respect from our city and its appointed commissioners and their staff members as other neighborhoods would receive.

We expect the planning commission and the city to listen to our concerns, to take the time to assure that a monster home, not compatible with the size of any existing home on Jenna Lane, is not built just because a plan was presented by its designer as finished. The designer even stated his plan needed some change. It may not meet Coastal Commission environmental standards. According to what I heard on the recording, the previously approved Metteucci plans for the main house were withdrawn at the request of the developer, not by the city. Please, get the facts straight before finalizing this decision. Listen to the neighbors who are directly impacted. We are not opposed to the home size that was previously approved. We do oppose the current plan as presented.

Respectfully,

Susan F. Hatfield
Homeowner
Dear Scott and committee members of city planning board,

I checked the newly updated building code from the energy department of State of California, the building code updated in 2014 and took effective in 2016 requires the energy saving as a mandatory requirement when the city issues a new building permit to the new home owners.

The reversed floor plan adopted by the home owner of 32, Jenna Lane does not comply with the newly updated building code on energy saving enforced by the EOD of State of California, therefore, the application should be rejected immediately.

The home with a reversed floor plan on Fairview Drive in Ocean Colony was built in 1980's when the country had no issue of energy saving back then, but now, the whole country are facing the energy crisis and the government from both the Federal and State level to enforce the energy saving law and required that the energy saving to be included into the building code in every state.

The city of Half Moon Bay has the obligation to comply with the Federal and State energy saving requirement nonetheless.

This email is in addition to my previous email as a part of memorandum.

Helen Ge

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: gehelen54@gmail.com
Date: September 21, 2016 at 11:21:29 AM PDT
To: sphillips@hmncity.com
Cc: chamilton@hmncity.com, RKowalczyk@hmncity.com, DRuddock@hmncity.com, MFraser@hmncity.com, JMuller@hmncity.com, DPenrose@hmncity.com, sfhatfield@yahoo.com, pianoblvd@hotmail.com, sfeng@stanford.edu, xuwang@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Concerns on house to be built on 32 Jenna Lane, HMB

Dear Scott and committee members of city planning board,

My name is Helen Ge, one of the owner on 16 Jenna Lane, HMB.

My husband and I accidentally walked into the hearing on 9/13/2016 for the application of building a 8,290 SF house on 32 Jenna Lane. Since we were un prepared for the hearing which turned out that we were the target by the opposition party of several condo owners on Cypress
Hi Sandy,

I accept your apology. The reason I came forward with the information on Air b&b because we were accused of and slandered by you and Ms. Hatfield for commercial renting of our home and conducted a tax evasion practice, which was a baseless accusation with the nature of slandering.

If you and Ms. Hatfield want to block the building permit issuance on 32 Jenna Lane, you must have a legal base on if their building application violates any building code required by the state and federal government, not by dragging the innocent neighbors into your baseless argument for that purpose.

I want to make clear to all of you as the property owner on Jenna Lane that our properties are protected by the laws and we have every right to do what is our best interest under the law.

Furthermore, I want to let you know that Air b&b program has been protecting millions of home owners from foreclosing of their homes since 2008. If the previous home owner on 28 Jenna Lane had information of Air b&b, they would have been able to hold their house and would not have to sale it for less during their financial difficult time.

Helen Ge

Sent from my iPhone

> On Sep 21, 2016, at 12:15 PM, Amanda Sandy Lee <pianoblvd@hotmail.com> wrote:
> 
> > Helen and all,
> > > Helen,
> > > > About 32 Jenna Hearing:
> > > I was not lying and had no intention to slander, I only wanted to come forward to provide information told in my own home by someone who knows the owner of 32 Jenna and perhaps knows you too. I thought my information is pertinent to the case, but perceived by city attorney as a piece of useless information and he told planning commission to ignore.
> > > I apologize to you for your uncomfortable feelings. Curious why you come forward with so much information about Air B&B program?
> > > But I really appreciate your comments on 32 Jenna.
> > > Thank you for reading
> >
Dear Scott and members of Planning board,

I reviewed the draft of building permit documents on 32 Jenna Ln you posted on line. I noticed that the Title 24 report, as a part of building code for issuing a new construction permit was missing. The Title 24 report is the energy consumption report and all of the codes in title 24 had been updated by the Energy Department of the State California (EOD) in 2014 and effected this year.

According to EOD, if every new home design does not meet the newly updated energy consumption code, the city and county can not issue a building permit. Every new home design must be energy saving and energy efficiency. This is a mandatory, not an option.

A realtor showed me a house with a reversed floor plan on Fairview Drive in Ocean Colony in 2007 when we were looking for a property in Half Moon Bay. The first floor was very dark, lack of oxygen and damp. Per realtor, the house was on the market for over a year and the owner had reduced the price many times, but was still difficult to sell. The owner was very regret for the reversed floor plan they had chosen when they built that house.

During the hearing on 9/13, when I heard the architect for 32, Jenna Lane said that the house design was a reversed floor plan, I immediately recalled the house on Fairview Drive, and felt that the house design on 32 would be a disaster.

Since there are many houses in Ocean Colony, one bad apple does not affect the price on neighbor's that much, because there are more houses in the subdivision that would average out on neighbor's home value. However, there are only six houses on Jenna Lane, and 32 will be the largest one. If 32 has a bad design, it will affect the home price on all of us.

We can not control what the house design would be on 32, but it must meet the energy code mandated by the State energy department, because it is a part of building code too.

Thank you very much.

Helen Ge

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Helen Ge <gehelen54@gmail.com>
Date: September 21, 2016 at 1:52:05 PM PDT
OWNER: LUI JING / YU XIAN
ADDRESS: 32 JENNA LANE, HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019
APN: 056-072-280
ZONING DISTRICT: PUD (MATTECCI)
OCCUPANCY: R-3
CONSTRUCTION TYPE: TYPE V NON-RATED

FLOOR PLAN

A4.0 SECTIONS
A5.1 DOOR SCHEDULE
A1.2 (N) ENLARGE SITE PLAN
A1.3 EXISTING & NEW SITE PLANS
A1.1 LANDSCAPE PLAN
C-1 GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN
C-2 DETAILS
C-3 EROSION CONTROL PLAN
L2 LANDSCAPE PLAN

PROJECT DATA,

DRAWING INDEX,

SYMBOLS &

ABBREVIATIONS

GENERAL NOTES

1. ALL CONSTRUCTION TO CONFORM TO 2013 CALIFORNIA BUILDING, ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL, AND PLUMBING CODES AND ALL STATE, COUNTY, AND CITY ORDINANCES AND REGULATIONS INCLUDING PERMITS.
2.應用 BREAST PLATE PLASTIC CHOCKS FOR THE JOB SITE. ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN DRAWINGS AND EXISTING CONDITIONS SHALL BE RESOLVED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SOLICITED BID.
3. INSTALL ALL MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT, FIXTURES, AND APPLIANCES IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MANUFACTURER AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF ALL APPLICABLE CODES.
4. ALL SITE-CONSTRUCTED DOORS, SKYLIGHTS, AND WINDOWS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO FIELD MANUFACTURED DOORS, SKYLIGHTS, AND WINDOWS SHALL BE CALIBRATED BETWEEN THE CODES, SKYLIGHTS, ON WINDOW AND THE BUILDING, AND SHALL BE MACHINED TO THE SIZE AND DESIGN.
5. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO THE FACE OF STUD, FACE OF CONCRETE, OR FACE OF FRAME UNLESS NOTES OTHERWISE.
6. INSTALL ALL MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT, FIXTURES, AND APPLIANCES IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ALL APPLICABLE CODES.
7. VERIFY EXACT LOCATION OF PLUMBING AND PIPING WITH THE PLUMBING CONTRACTOR. BRING ANY INCONSISTENCIES TO THE ATTENTION OF THE ARCHITECT BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.
8. ELECTRICAL WORK TO BE DESIGN-BUILD AND UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT.
9. PLUMBING WORK TO BE DESIGN-BUILD AND UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT.
10. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE THE BUILDING OWNER WITH THE LIST OF MECHANICAL, EQUIPMENT, DUCTS, GRILLES, COMPONENTS AND DEVICES IN THE BUILDING AND INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO USE THEM.
11. VERIFY EXACT LOCATION OF MECHANICAL, EQUIPMENT, DUCTS, GRILLES, COMPONENTS AND DEVICES IN THE BUILDING AND INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO USE THEM.
12. VERIFY EXACT LOCATION OF MECHANICAL, EQUIPMENT, DUCTS, GRILLES, COMPONENTS AND DEVICES IN THE BUILDING AND INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO USE THEM.
13. VERIFY EXACT LOCATION OF MECHANICAL, EQUIPMENT, DUCTS, GRILLES, COMPONENTS AND DEVICES IN THE BUILDING AND INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO USE THEM.
14. VERIFY EXACT LOCATION OF MECHANICAL, EQUIPMENT, DUCTS, GRILLES, COMPONENTS AND DEVICES IN THE BUILDING AND INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO USE THEM.
15. ELECTRICAL WORK TO BE DESIGN-BUILD AND UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT.
16. ALL SITE-CONSTRUCTED DOORS, SKYLIGHTS, AND WINDOWS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO FIELD MANUFACTURED DOORS, SKYLIGHTS, AND WINDOWS SHALL BE CALIBRATED BETWEEN THE CODES, SKYLIGHTS, ON WINDOW AND THE BUILDING, AND SHALL BE MACHINED TO THE SIZE AND DESIGN.
17. VERIFY EXACT LOCATION OF MECHANICAL, EQUIPMENT, DUCTS, GRILLES, COMPONENTS AND DEVICES IN THE BUILDING AND INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO USE THEM.
18. VERIFY EXACT LOCATION OF MECHANICAL, EQUIPMENT, DUCTS, GRILLES, COMPONENTS AND DEVICES IN THE BUILDING AND INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO USE THEM.
19. VERIFY EXACT LOCATION OF MECHANICAL, EQUIPMENT, DUCTS, GRILLES, COMPONENTS AND DEVICES IN THE BUILDING AND INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO USE THEM.
20. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR FILING/RECEIVING OF ALL REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION, IDENTIFICATION, AND INSTALLED R-VALUE.
21. METHOD SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
22. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
23. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
24. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
25. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
26. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
27. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
28. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
29. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
30. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
31. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
32. METHODS AND SCHEDULE FOR GRADING, EXCAVATION, FILLING, CLEARING OF VEGETATION, AND STORAGE AND DISPOSAL OF EXCAVATED OF CLEAR MATERIAL.
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Response letter to Planning Commissioner Hearing 09/13/2016

Dear Planning Commissioners,

The following letter is to address comments and concerns raise by the planning commission during the 09/13/2016 design review hearing. To erect a new two story single family structure on 32 Jenna Lane, Half Moon Bay.

One of the main concern is the massive design of the new structure. The use of giant concrete columns and guard rail are not compatible to the city of Half Moon Bay but rather something we see in Los Altos Hill or Hillsborough. We have since took a different approach and design the house to fit into the city of Half Moon Bay. The French style architectural are scale down and the use of different type of stone veneer along with arch windows will break down the massing presented in the previous design.

Replacing the fiber glass roof with synthetic slate roof tile further enhance the French style and the roof durability. Synthetic slate roof tile will last longer or even double the life time and lower the maintain issue presented by fiber glass roof. The roof height has also been adjusted in various part of the new design such as the first floor wine cellar, first floor garage, and second floor bedroom.

Regarding energy efficiency of the home are also been address by reconfigured windows layout and implemented the use of skylights. Windows facing west has been resize to appropriate size to avoid absorbing heat. With climate changing dramatically from day to night, reduce the size of windows help keep the house warmer.

The large empty space on the first floor from the previous design has been adequately address by redesign the floor plan. The room layout are proportionally design to avoid out of size bedroom. The larger rooms are common family room, living room. We also place bedrooms on the first floor to even distribute all space.

Landscape plan are provided on plan sheet along with 3D rendering of the newly design single family home.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Matteucci Subdivision Appeal Meeting

The parties agree to the following:

1. The homes on Lots #1 and #2 shall be separated by a total distance of not less than 134.6 feet.

2. No roof to exceed 22 feet on any of the lots except: Lot #2 (24.5 feet with a 1.5 foot open guardrail) provided that the second floor not exceed 727 sq.ft. dated 06/11/01 and Lot #6 shall not exceed 28 feet.

3. One additional lot other than lot#1 may have a 28-foot maximum height dwelling unit but the square footage of the second story shall be limited to a maximum of 400 square feet.

4. Story poles as directed by planning commission requirements on remaining, unimproved lots in the Matteucci Specific Plan shall not be required. City Council will direct Planning Commission that these will not be required.

5. Dwelling unit on Lot #2 shall be moved 15 feet west and 5 feet south from submitted plans dated 06/11/01.

6. Keep fences of open design facing south, east and north four feet on front yard perimeters. Keep fences of open design facing south, west and north on back yard perimeters.

7. Move site “1” main house and guest house 46 feet north and 8 feet west from submitted plans dated 07/18/01.

8. No guest house to exceed 700 square feet and be no more than single story.
9. No trees or shrubs to exceed 7 feet in height in view corridor between any of the houses.

10. Bob Williamson will support use of Matteucci project park mitigation fees for creating park in Matteucci/Pilarcitos Park.

11. Bob Williamson will donate $1,000 per lot in lieu of story poles to the park fund.

12. Bob Williamson will increase the riparian setback along the north side of Lot #1 to 100 feet from the edge of vegetation. Delineate and dedicate a trail easement in the riparian setback westward through the full extent of property in Matteucci PUD and the Williamson property to the west zoned Urban Reserve, in perpetuity and without conditions. Delineate and dedicate a multi-use path easement in perpetuity along the east side of #1 as mentioned in versions of the PUD. Both easements should not have perimeter fencing and/or hedges that blocks views.

13. Bob Williamson will secure and dedicate an easement at the south end of Jenna Lane for possible future widening of the street to a full two lanes throughout. He will install a gas line at the proper depth to accommodate street widening.

Signed: Robert Williamson Date: 09/25/01

Bob Williamson

Signed: JH Habib Date: 07/20/01

Fayden Hombole

Signed: Tim Shockey Date: 07/19/01

Tim Shockey

Signed: Jan Sommer Date: 07/19/01

Jan Sommer
May 12, 2017

Mr. Scott Phillips
Associate Planner
City of Half Moon Bay
501 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

RE: Comments on Landscape Plan, 32 Jenna Lane, Half Moon Bay, California

Dear Mr. Phillips:

This letter provides comments on a Landscape Plan prepared for the residential development project located at 32 Jenna Lane in Half Moon Bay, California (“project site”). A Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) (CRB 2015a), response to comments from the California Coastal Commission (CCC) (CRB 2015b), and addendum letter (CRB 2016) have been previously prepared to address biological resource issues associated with the project. This letter is focused on the Landscape Plan, prepared by Bruce A. Chan, Landscape Architect, dated March 14, 2017. During the BRA and subsequent reports and consultations with the CCC, wetland and riparian Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs), as defined in the California Coastal Act (CCA)/Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program (LCP), were identified on the project site, with potential buffers around these resources included.

The Landscape Plan shows a mixture of lawn, meadow grass, and tree, shrub, and herbaceous plantings, along with a wooden split-rail fence to demarcate the area from the adjacent ESHA buffer zone. Landscaping would involve replacement of existing Ruderal Herbaceous and Developed/Landscaped habitats (CRB 2015a; 2016) and require periodic maintenance. Project landscaping would constitute ground disturbance conducted as part of the overall project and would be addressed via mitigation measures for biological resources described in the BRA and subsequent reports. However, it is unclear from the Landscape Plan whether project landscaping encroaches on ESHA buffer zones as determined by the City of Half Moon Bay and CCC (the Landscape Plan shows the riparian buffer but no wetland buffers).

According to Section 3-12(a) of the LCP regarding permitted uses in riparian buffer zones: “Within buffer zones, permit only the following uses: (1) uses permitted in riparian corridors, (2) structures on existing legal building sites, set back 20 feet from the limit of riparian vegetation, only if no feasible alternative exists, and only if no other building site on the parcel exists, (3) crop growing and grazing consistent with Policy 3-9, (4) timbering in "streamside corridors" as defined and controlled by State and County regulations for timber harvesting, and (5) no new parcels shall be created whose only building site is in the buffer area except for parcels created in compliance with Policies 3-3, 3-4, and 3-5 if consistent with existing development in the area and if building sites are set back 20 feet from the limit of riparian

1 Potential ESHA buffers were included in the final addendum letter (CRB 2016) based on a field visit with the CCC, City of Half Moon Bay staff, and the project Applicant. It was understood during that meeting that the project biologist would map wetland and riparian boundaries, apply potential buffers to the map, and the City and CCC would make a final determination of required buffers based on the CCA/LCP.
vegetation or if no vegetation 20 feet from the bank edge of a perennial and 20 feet from the midpoint of an intermittent stream.”

According to Section 18.38.075 of the Half Moon Bay Zoning Code: “Permitted uses within riparian buffer zones include: (1) Uses permitted in riparian corridors; (2) Crop growing and grazing, provided no existing riparian vegetation is removed and no soil is allowed to enter stream channels; and (3) Timbering in ‘stream side corridors’ as defined and controlled by state and county regulations for timber harvesting. The following are permitted uses within riparian buffer zones where no feasible alternative exists: (1) The construction of new structures on existing legal building sites, set back twenty feet from the limit of riparian vegetation, only if no other building site on the parcel exists; (2) The creation of new parcels only if the only building sites available are those within buffer area, if the proposed parcels are consistent with existing development in the area, and if the building sites are set back twenty feet from the limit of riparian vegetation, or if there is no vegetation, twenty feet from the bank edge of a perennial stream or twenty feet from the mid-point of an intermittent stream.”

According to Section 18.38.080 of the Half Moon Bay Zoning Code regarding Permitted Uses within Wetlands Buffer Zones: “The riparian buffer zone uses listed in this title shall apply to wetlands buffer zones.”

Therefore, landscaping and associated ground disturbance and maintenance would not be a permitted use in the riparian and wetland buffer zone. The City and CCC would need to make a final determination on the required wetland and riparian buffer zone for conformance with the CCA/LCP, and project related ground disturbance not conforming to the allowable uses in the buffer zone as defined above would generally be prohibited.

In addition, due to the sensitivity of the Pilarcitos Creek corridor and the possibility of invasive plant propagules entering into the corridor and adjacent buffer zone, I recommend prohibiting the use of invasive plant species (e.g., those listed on the California Invasive Plant Council [Cal-IPC] list [Cal-IPC 2017]) in project landscaping. In reviewing the plant list on the Landscape Plan, one species—fountain grass (*Pennisetum setaceum)*—is included on the Cal-IPC list and rated as Moderate. I recommend removal of this species from the Landscape Plan.

Please contact me if you have questions or need additional information. I would be happy to discuss these issues with regulatory agency staff or other project stakeholders to resolve any concerns regarding biological resources related to the project.

Sincerely,

Tom Mahony  
Principal/Plant Ecologist  
(831) 426-6226  
coastrange@sbcglobal.net

---


3 Defined as species that have “substantial and apparent—but generally not severe—ecological impacts on physical processes, plant and animal communities, and vegetation structure. Their reproductive biology and other attributes are conducive to moderate to high rates of dispersal, though establishment is generally dependent upon ecological disturbance. Ecological amplitude and distribution may range from limited to widespread.”
REFERENCES


____. 2016. Addendum to BRA, 32 Jenna Lane, Half Moon Bay, California. Dated April 22.

Hi Scott,

I forwarded the latest plans to our biologist and discussed the proposed bike/ped path. As we expressed in a previous comment letter (2/22/16), the area next to Pilarcitos Creek is an important migration corridor for wildlife, and thus, we recommend the following modifications:

- Limit the path to 10’ in width instead of 20’
- Require permanent wildlife-friendly fencing on either side of the path to maintain a visual barrier between human activity and the surrounding buffer area
- Re-align the path outside of the limit of poison hemlock (Conium maculatum) delineated in the attached BRA Addendum (dated 8/22/16). As proposed, the trail is 30 feet from the edge of riparian vegetation but appears to traverse through the stand of hemlock, which qualifies as a one-parameter wetland in the Half Moon Bay LCP.

Please let us know if the applicant would be amenable to these changes, and if possible, provide revised plans that include an overlay of the limit of poison hemlock in relation to proposed development to ensure the path does not directly impact wetland areas.

Thank you,
Patrick

____________________________
Patrick Foster
Coastal Planner
North Central Coast District
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 904-5267
patrick.foster@coastal.ca.gov
www.coastal.ca.gov
Here is the latest version of the plans for 32 Jenna Lane. Let me know if I can help further.

_______________________________________________________

Scott Phillips
Associate Planner
Phone: 650-726-8299
Email: sphillips@hmncity.com

City of Half Moon Bay
501 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Purpose

The purpose of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) is to identify any potential environmental impacts from construction of a new single-family residence, remodel of the existing single family residence, associated tree removal (non-heritage) and site improvements. Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15367, the City of Half Moon Bay is the Lead Agency in the preparation of this IS/MND and any additional environmental documentation required for the project. The City has discretionary authority over the proposed project. The intended use of this document is to determine the level of environmental analysis required to adequately prepare the project IS/MND and to provide the basis for input from public agencies, organizations, and interested members of the public regarding the proposed Coastal Development Permit and Architectural Review.

The remainder of this section provides a brief description of the project location and the characteristics of the project. Section 2 includes an environmental checklist and an analysis of the potential impacts that may result from project implementation.

1.2 - Project Location

The project area is located on 32 Jenna Lane (APN 056-072-280), which is at the northern terminus of Jenna Lane at Cypress Avenue, north of Kelly Avenue and approximately 0.20 miles west of Highway 1 (Cabrillo Highway) in the City of Half Moon Bay (Figure 1). The project area encompasses the entirety of APN 056-072-280, measuring approximately 380 feet x 225 feet and is 66,141 square feet, or 1.52 acres in area. The site is within the Kelly Avenue Tract subdivision, which is within the Matteucci Planned Unit Development, with a Planned Development District General Plan / Local Coastal Program designation. The site is within the California Coastal Commission Appeals Jurisdiction.
1.3 - Project Description

The project consists of a Coastal Development Permit, Architectural Review and Use Permit to allow the construction of a new two-story 8,290 square-foot single-family residence, including a three-car attached garage, remodel of the existing guesthouse on the site and...
associated site improvements. The removal of three non-heritage trees on the site is also included with the proposal. The applicant and property owner will implement the project.

1.4 - Project Applicant’s Name and Address

Derek Vinh, 90 South Spruce Avenue, Suite K, South San Francisco, CA 94080

1.5 - General Plan and Zoning – Site and Surrounding Area

General Plan Designation: Planned Development District
Zoning: PUD (Planned Unit Development, Matteucci)

Figure 2. Existing driveway and location of proposed new house, facing northwest from the eastern edge of the circular driveway.
1.6 - Existing Setting

1.4.1 - Regional Setting

The City of Half Moon Bay (City), San Mateo County, California lies entirely within Coastal Zone established under the California Coastal Act. The City is located along the San Mateo County coastline and encompasses approximately 6.4 square miles. It has a population of 11,653 (USDOC, 2013). The unincorporated communities of El Granada, Moss Beach, Montara, and Princeton-by-the Sea are north and San Gregorio and Pescadero are south of the City. The City and County of San Francisco is approximately 25 miles north. The City’s climate is characterized by cool summer Mediterranean climate and an annual precipitation average of 22.5 inches (Teale, 1997). The area is currently experiencing severe drought conditions.

Half Moon Bay is a popular visitor destination; public access to the beach and coastal bluffs is available from Highway 1 via City streets and the downtown offers dining and
retail amenities. A substantial portion of the City’s population work outside of Half Moon Bay, within other communities in the greater Bay Area. Highways 92 and 1 connect Half Moon Bay to other communities in the Peninsula and coastal cities to the north and south.

1.4.2 - Site Setting

The project site is located at the northern terminus of Jenna Lane at Cypress Avenue north of Kelly Avenue and approximately 0.20 miles west of Highway 1 (Cabrillo Highway) and adjacent to the south side of Pilarcitos Creek and 0.2 miles west of Highway 1 (Cabrillo Highway). The site itself is currently developed with a single-family residence. The northern property line of the subject parcel runs along the centerline of Pilarcitos Creek. Land use in the vicinity includes single-family residences south of the subject property, along the western side of Jenna Lane, multi-family residences east of Jenna Lane and along Cypress Avenue and Oak Avenue further to the east, with agriculture and undeveloped vacant land to the west. A large parking lot associated with the Stawflower Shopping Center is directly across Pilarcitos Creek and the riparian area from the subject property. The topography within the study area consists of relatively level ground ranging in elevation from approximately 46 to 45 feet above mean sea level, within the area of the existing and new house, with the northern portion of the subject property decreasing in elevation approaching Pilarcitos Creek.
Figure 4. Aerial photo, dated 03/18/15, Subject property (in green), approximate location of the new residence (in red), access / utility easement (in blue) and surrounding area.
1.7 - Required Discretionary Approvals

The proposed project would require the following discretionary approvals by the City of Half Moon Bay:

- Coastal Development Permit
- Architectural Review
- Use Permit

1.8 - Intended Uses of this Document

This IS/MND has been prepared to determine the appropriate scope and level of detail required in completing the environmental analysis for the proposed project. This document will also serve as a basis for soliciting comments and input from members of the public and public agencies regarding the proposed project. The Draft IS/MND will be circulated for a minimum of 20 days, during which period comments concerning the analysis contained in the IS/MND should be sent to:

Scott Phillips, Associate Planner
City of Half Moon Bay
Planning Division
501 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Phone: 650.726.8299
Fax: 650.726.8261
Email: sphillips@hmbcity.com
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SECTION 2: EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics, Light, and Glare
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Utilities and Services Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

1. Aesthetics, Light, and Glare

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Aesthetics, Light and Glare</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Increase the amount of shade in public and private open space on adjacent sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The project site is located at the northern end of Jenna Lane. It includes a developed 66,141 square-foot (1.52 acres) residential lot, which currently contains one single-family residence. Most of the site is generally flat with a subtle elevation decline (approximately 4%) towards Pilarcitos Creek along the northern property line. The site is covered with ruderal vegetation. The site is
bordered to the west by a vacant property that is also within the Matteucci Planned Unit Development, a City owned parcel to the north and northeast, and other developed residential properties to the east, south, and southeast. Pilarcitos Creek runs along the northern boundary of the property.

**Impact Evaluation**

a-b) **No Impact.** The proposed project consists of removal of 3 existing non-heritage trees on the site, construction of one (1) two-story single-family residence and remodel of the existing home on the site, within the existing Kelly Avenue Tract subdivision. The proposed house would be a maximum of 268 feet in height, would be located approximately 0.2 miles west of Highway 1 (Cabrillo Highway), and would not be highly visible from the Highway due to the distance and intervening structures and vegetation. Highway 1 does not have a State Scenic Highway designation within the City of Half Moon Bay and the subject site is not located within a visual resource area as designated by Section 18.37.020 of the Half Moon Bay Zoning Code. The trees proposed for removal are within the proposed building footprint for the new home. The trees are less than the minimum size required in order to meet the definition on Heritage Tree. There are no Heritage trees, rock out-croppings, historic buildings or other scenic resources on the project site. There would be no impact.

c) **No Impact.** The proposed project would alter the existing visual character of the site by introducing a new single-family residence on property that is currently developed with a smaller house and associated improvements; however, these changes would be compatible with the existing pattern of development in the area. The proposed project has undergone design review at a staff level to ensure that it is compatible with the site and surroundings. Temporary aesthetic impacts would occur during construction; however these impacts are not considered significant in that they are temporary and the site would be restored after construction is complete. There would be no impact.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** The proposed residence would introduce new nighttime lighting sources to the undeveloped portion of the site. These new sources are limited to residential lighting similar to the lighting associated with existing residence on the site and surrounding area and would not result in substantial light or glare or adversely affect views. In the event that brighter, more intense light fixtures are considered for installation on
the site, the following mitigation measure would reduce potentially adverse impacts to views in the area to less than significant.

**ALG-MM1**: In order to reduce glare and light impacts on the surrounding properties, all new exterior light fixtures associated with the new residence shall be shielded and facing downward. No flood lights would be allowed with the new improvements on the site.

e) **No Impact.** The proposed project conforms to the Zoning Code requirements, including the Matteucci Specific Plan, relative to height, bulk, and maximum building envelope. Given the large size of the lot, the proposed project will not unduly shade adjacent properties. There would be no impact.

## 2. Agricultural Resources

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Agricultural Resources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

The San Mateo County Important Farmland Map 2014, prepared by the California Department of Conservation and the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, classifies land in seven categories in order of significance: 1) prime farmland, 2) farmland of Statewide importance, 3)
unique farmland, 4) farmland of local importance, 5) grazing land, 6) urban and built-up land, and 7) other land. The project site is partially classified as "Prime Farmland," which is defined as land having the best combination of physical and chemical soils able to sustain long-term agriculture production. The definition for Prime Farmland also states, “the land must have been used for irrigated agriculture production at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.” The project site is also partially classified as “Unique Farmland,” which is defined as land consisting of lesser quality soils used for the production of the state’s leading agricultural crops. The definition for Unique Farmland also states, “land must have been cropped at some time during the four years prior to the mapping date.”

The California Land Conservation Act (“Williamson Act”) was enacted to help preserve agricultural and open space lands via a contract between the property owner and the local jurisdiction. Under the contract, the owner of the land agrees not to develop the land in exchange for reduced property taxes. The project site is not under a Williamson Act contract.

“Forest land” is defined by the California Public Resources Code as land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. “Timberland” means land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees.

**Impact Evaluation**

**a-e) Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is not zoned or used for agriculture; is not under Williamson Act contract and is not identified as Farmland of Statewide Importance. The site is partially mapped as Prime Farmland and Unique Farmland, as shown on the San Mateo County Important Farmland Map of 2014. However, the subject property contains an existing single-family residence, large driveway and landscaping. The subject site has not been used for irrigated agricultural production or crop production since before the adoption of the Matteucci Specific Plan in 1999. Therefore, the addition of one new single-family residence and the remodel of the existing single-family residence in an existing developed residential subdivision is not expected to result in the conversion of, or other impacts relative to proximate farmland.
The project site is an infill parcel not located on forest land or timberland. The proposed construction of one single-family residence, tree removal and remodel of the existing residence on the site is in an existing partially-developed subdivision zoned for residential use and is not expected to result in direct or indirect environmental impacts relative to the loss of agriculture or forest land.

3. **Air Quality**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Air Quality</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

The project site is located in the San Francisco Bay Area air basin, where air quality is monitored and regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Air pollution is generated by anything that burns fuel (including but not limited to cars and trucks, construction equipment, backup generators, boilers and hot water heaters, barbeques and broilers, gas-fired...
cooking ranges and ovens, fireplaces, and wood-burning stoves), almost any evaporative emissions (including the evaporation of gasoline from service stations and vehicles, emissions from food as it is cooked, emissions from paints, cleaning solvents, and adhesives, etc.), and other processes (fugitive dust generated from roadways and construction activities, etc.).

The Bay Area is currently classified as “attainment” or “unclassifiable” with respect to every National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) except ozone and fine particulate matter PM2.5), for which it is still classified as “nonattainment.” Ozone concentrations in the Bay Area have also decreased considerably over the last several decades, but NAAQS are required to be set to be protective of public health “allowing an adequate margin of safety” and have also become more stringent. Prior to 2008, attaining the ozone NAAQS required that the peak 8-hour average concentration on the 4th-worst day of the year (averaged over three consecutive years)--be below 0.08 parts per million (ppm); the Bay Area was classified as “marginal” nonattainment with respect to that standard. The Bay Area’s current ozone design value (based on 2008-2010 data) is 0.080 ppm, but in 2008, the ozone NAAQS was revised to 0.075 ppm. Therefore, while EPA has not yet finalized its attainment designations for the 2008 ozone standard, it is proposing to designate the Bay Area as “marginal nonattainment” (0.076 - 0.086 ppm) with respect to that standard. The State of California also has its own ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) which are equivalent to or more stringent than the NAAQS; the Bay Area is currently classified as nonattainment with respect to the CAAQS for ozone, particulate matter smaller than 10 microns (PM10), and “fine” particulate matter smaller than 2.5 microns (PM2.5).

A sensitive receptor is defined as a location where human populations, especially children, seniors, and sick persons, are located where there is a reasonable expectation of continuous human exposure to air pollutants. These typically include residences, hospitals, and schools. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the multifamily residences located to the south and directly east of the subject property on Oak and Cypress Avenues. Additionally, a large single-family residence is located directly south of the subject property.

**Impact Evaluation**

a) **No Impact.** The project, the construction of one (1) new single-family residence, remodel of the existing single-family residence, associated tree removal and site improvements, would not
increase regional population growth or cause changes in vehicle travel that will affect implementation of the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (CAP). The project conforms to the Half Moon Bay General Plan, which was considered in development of the CAP growth assumptions; consequently, it will not conflict with BAAQMD clean air planning efforts. The project incorporates tree planting and construction of pedestrian sidewalks in conformance with air quality control measures identified in the 2010 CAP. The project does not conflict with the 2010 Clean Air Plan. There is no impact.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The BAAQMD thresholds of significance specify that if project vehicle emissions of carbon monoxide (CO) exceed 9 ppm (8-hour average) or 20 ppm (1-hour average); and if a project generates over 54 lbs/day of reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOx) or over 82 lbs/day of suspended particulate matter (PM2.5 from exhaust) (PM10 from exhaust), it would have a significant air quality impact. For construction-related PM10 and PM2.5 fugitive dust, the threshold of significance is a requirement that the facility employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize dust.

BAAQMD screening criteria provide lead agencies with a conservative indication of whether a proposed project could result in potentially significant air quality impacts. If the screening criteria are met, then an air quality assessment of a project’s air pollutant emissions is not required and the project would not result in the generation of operational-related criteria air pollutants and/or precursors that exceed the District’s thresholds of significance. The screening criteria for operationally-related impacts require that a project is less than 325 dwelling units. The 2010 screening criteria for construction include the following:

1. The project is below the applicable screening level size (less than 114 dwelling units).
2. All Basic BAAQMD Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented during construction.
3. Construction activities would not include demolition contrary to BAAQMD regulations, construction of two phases or two land uses simultaneously, or extensive grading or materials transport.

The proposed project includes one single-family residence, which is well below the dwelling unit thresholds; BAAQMD BMPs are incorporated into the City’s Standard Permit Conditions and will be implemented by this project; and project construction does not include demolition, more than one simultaneous phase or land use, or extensive grading and materials transport.
The proposed one (1) single-family residence meets the operational and construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants; consequently the impact for ROG, NOx, PM10, PM2.5, and local CO is less than significant.

**Standard Permit Condition:** The project would be developed in conformance with the following standard BAAQMD dust control measures during all phases of construction on the project site:

- All active construction areas shall be watered twice daily or more often if necessary. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles-per-hour.

- Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads and parking and staging areas at construction sites.

- Cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, and any other materials that can be windblown. Trucks transporting these materials shall be covered.

- All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

- Subsequent to clearing, grading, or excavating, exposed portions of the site shall be watered, landscaped, treated with soil stabilizers, or covered as soon as possible. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas and previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more.

- Installation of sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.

- Replanting of vegetation in disturbed areas as soon as possible after completion of construction.

- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
• All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.

• Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the applicant’s representative and the City of Half Moon Bay regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The BAAQMD’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the 2012 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, if a project requires a General Plan Amendment (GPA) or would generate more Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) than anticipated under a previous land use designation, there could be a significant cumulative impact. The proposed project would not require a GPA because implementation of the project would be consistent with allowable development identified for the project site’s land use designation. The project site is designated as Planned Development District in the City’s General Plan at a residential density of 1.5 acres per unit, and regional air quality modeling has therefore already factored in the vehicle trips associated with the proposed construction and development of the project site. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable new increase in any criteria pollutant. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site are residents of existing single-family residences along Jenna Lane and residents of existing multifamily residences along Oak Avenue and the northern side of Cypress Avenue. The closest residence to the single-family project site is located directly south at 28 Jenna Lane. A multifamily complex is also located directly east of the subject property at 444 Oak Avenue. The proposed single-family residence and remodel of the existing residence would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Temporary increases in dust may result from the excavation of soil, and other construction activities on the subject site, but these impacts would be less than significant based on compliance with the BAAQMD’s standard abatement measures for construction period emissions (as outlined in Section b above). Impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.
e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Operation of the proposed single-family residence would not create additional sources of odor; however, during construction, various diesel-powered vehicles and equipment used on the site could create localized odors. These odors would be temporary and not likely to be noticeable for extended periods of time much beyond the project’s site boundaries. The project is subject to the City’s standard requirement for implementation of BAAQMD abatement measures for construction period emissions identified in, b) above. The project’s potential odor impacts are less-than-significant.

f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Constituent gases of the Earth’s atmosphere, called atmospheric greenhouse gases, play a critical role in the Earth’s radiation budget by trapping infrared radiation emitted from the Earth’s surface, which would otherwise have escaped into space. This phenomenon, known as the “greenhouse effect,” is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate. Anthropogenic emissions of these greenhouse gases in excess of natural ambient concentrations are responsible for the enhancement of the greenhouse effect and have led to a trend of unnatural warming of the Earth’s natural climate, known as global warming or climate change. Prominent greenhouse gases contributing to this process include carbon dioxide and methane, among others. Climate change is a planet-wide effect, and greenhouse gases are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants, which are pollutants of regional and local concern.

The draft BAAQMD 2010 CEQA Guidelines (Table 3-1) screening criteria for greenhouse gases specify that operation of up to 56 single-family houses would not exceed the greenhouse gas significance threshold of 1,100 metric tons per year. This screening criteria is more stringent than the BAAQMD 1999 CEQA Guidelines (Table 6). Therefore, greenhouse gas emissions associated with the proposed one single-family residence would be less than significant.

g) **No Impact.** The proposed project conforms to the Half Moon Bay General Plan and Local Coastal Program. The project would not conflict with BAAQMD’s proposed plan for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
### 4. Biological Resources

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Biological Resource</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1,6,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Analysis**

This section is based on the conclusions contained in the Biological Resources Assessment – 32 Jenna Lane, dated October, 2015, prepared by Coast Range Biological LLC. The complete report is provided in Appendix A.
Figure 5. Habitat on the study area
a) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** In conformance with the provisions set forth in Chapter 18.38 of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code, Coast Range Biological LLC evaluated the project area, and a 200-buffer around both the subject property. The evaluation included an assessment of riparian areas, and special-status plant and animal species that may be adversely affected by project activities.

Potential impacts are discussed by species and mitigation is identified to reduce all potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. If any species subject to the Endangered Species Act is identified within the Project location during pre-work surveys or during maintenance activities, work within that Project location will be postponed/cease until such time as a program is developed to operate within the requirements of the Endangered Species Act.

**Special-status Plant Species**

No special-status plant species were observed in the project site or surrounding study area during the field visits (Appendix C), but the visits occurred outside the typical blooming period of most plant species, and no floristic surveys were conducted. All 37 special-status plants identified for the region during the background literature search are unlikely to inhabit the project site because: (1) the project site is dominated by Developed/Landscaped and Ruderal Herbaceous habitats that lack suitable habitat components (e.g., soil type, micro-habitat, plant community) for special-status plant species known from the region; (2) the project site is subject to past and ongoing disturbance and was farmed until at least 1991, likely precluding the presence of a remnant soil seed bank for special-status species; (3) no special-status plants have been documented in the immediate project site vicinity (SWCA 2014; CDFW 2015a); and/or (4) a species (e.g., shrubs or other perennial species) should’ve been identifiable during the field visits and was not observed. The Central Coast Riparian Scrub on the study area provides potential habitat for several special-status plant species (Appendix A of the attached biological report), but this habitat is an ESHA that will not be impacted by the project due to the buffer of least 50 feet. Therefore, no special-status plants are expected to occur on the project site and no project impacts to special-status plants are anticipated.
Special-status Wildlife

No special-status wildlife species were observed in the study area during the September 2015 reconnaissance field visits, but no focused surveys were conducted. Due to the presence of suitable habitat and documented occurrences in the area, ten special-status wildlife species could occur on the study area: steelhead, California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), Allen's hummingbird (*Selasphorus sasin*), saltmarsh common yellowthroat, grasshopper sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum*), San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (*Neotoma fuscipes annectens*), western red bat (*Lasiurus blossevilli*), and long-legged myotis (*Myotis volans*). In addition, trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation on the study area could provide nesting habitat for non-listed bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and state Fish and Game Code.

**California Red-legged Frog**
The California red-legged frog (CRLF) is a large (85-138 mm), nocturnal species that historically occupied much of central and southern California. The species requires still or slow-moving water during the breeding season, where it deposits large egg masses, usually attached to submerged or emergent vegetation. Breeding typically occurs between December and April, depending on annual environmental conditions and locality. Eggs require 6 to 12 days before hatching and metamorphosis occurs 3.5 to 7 months after hatching (Stebbins 2003). Following metamorphosis between July and September, juveniles generally do not travel far from aquatic habitats. Movements of individuals generally begin with the first rains of the weather-year, in response to receding water or following the breeding season (Fellers and Kleeman 2007). Radio-telemetry data indicates that individuals generally engage in straight-line movements irrespective of riparian corridors and can move up to two miles (Bulger et al. 2003; Fellers and Kleeman 2007). California red-legged frogs utilize a variety of water sources during the non-breeding season, and females are more likely than males to depart from perennial ponds shortly after depositing eggs (Fellers and Kleeman 2007). They may take refuge in small mammal burrows, leaf litter or other moist areas during periods of inactivity or whenever it is necessary to avoid desiccation (Rathbun et al. 1993; Jennings and Hayes 1994). Occurrence of this frog has shown to be negatively correlated with presence of introduced bullfrogs (Moyle 1973; Hayes and Jennings 1986, 1988), but both species coexist at some locations, particularly along the coast. Genetic
studies indicate that the nominal subspecies *draytonii* and *aurora* represent separate lineages and are therefore distinct species (Shaffer et al. 2004).

Nine CRLF occurrences are documented within three miles of the study area in the CNDDB (CDFW 2015a) (See Figure 3 within the attached Biological Resource Assessment). The nearest documented CRLF occurrence is from 2006 along the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor upstream from the study area (CDFW 2015a), with additional occurrences downstream (Figure 3). The reach of Pilarcitos Creek within the study area does not provide breeding habitat, but the riparian corridor offers appropriate summering habitat for CRLF and foraging and sheltering habitat for some size classes all year round. The project site, and in particular the location of proposed ground disturbance, does not offer aquatic non-breeding habitat. However, CRLF could occur incidentally on the project site during project ground disturbance (primarily in the wet season during dispersal to breeding sites). Therefore, mitigation measures BIO-MM1a through BIO-MM1d noted below to reduce the impact to a less than significant level for CRLF are included.

**San Francisco Garter Snake**

The San Francisco garter snake (SFGS) is found only on the San Francisco peninsula in San Mateo County and the northern portion of Santa Cruz County (Barry 1978; Brode 1990; USFWS 2006). It is an extremely colorful snake with a bright orange-red head, blue belly, greenish-yellow dorsal stripe and red and black stripes along either side. It grows to a length of three to four feet (Stebbins 2003). It occupies freshwater marshes, ponds, sloughs, and associated riparian corridors, especially where dense shoreline vegetation is present. It also uses a variety of upland habitats including grassland, woodland and coastal scrub in proximity to these aquatic habitats. During the fall and winter, it stays relatively inactive underground in rodent burrows, up to at least 150 meters from aquatic habitat (McGinnis, et al. 1987). During the spring and summer, it occupies dense vegetation near ponds or marshes and adjacent scrub and open upland habitat for temperature regulation and cover. Females produce between 12 and 24 live young in July or August. Adults feed primarily on larger frogs including CRLF, but may also take fish, salamanders, newts and earthworms. Pacific treefrogs appear to be an important part of the diet of young snakes (Larsen 1994). It is rarely seen but can sometimes be observed near the water's edge, basking on warm days, or when it retreats to water. Much of the range of the SFGS lies within a heavily urbanized area, and alteration and isolation of habitats has been identified as the primary threat to
the subspecies (Brode 1990). Agricultural development, overgrazing and illegal collecting have also been implicated in its decline.

The nearest documented occurrences of the SFGS are along Pilarcitos Creek, both upstream and downstream of the study area within ~2,000-feet (CDFW 2015a). Habitat connectivity between the documented occurrences and the study area exists via Pilarcitos Creek and associated Central Coast Riparian Scrub. Although the habitat on the project site, and in particular the location of project ground disturbance, is disturbed, high numbers of Botta's pocket gopher burrows are present (which could be used by SFGS for predator protection), and SFGS could occur on the project site during project ground disturbance. Therefore, mitigation measures BIO-MM1a through BIO-MM1d noted below to reduce the impact to a less than significant level for SFGS are included.

**BIO-MM1a:** Within two weeks prior to the start of construction, a worker education program shall be presented at the project site by a qualified biologist. Associated written material will be distributed. It shall be the onsite foreman’s responsibility to ensure that all construction personnel and subcontractors receive a copy of the education program. The education program shall include a description of the CRLF and SFGS and their habitat, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act, the necessity of adhering to the Act to avoid penalty, measures implemented to avoid affecting CRLF and SFGS specific to the project and the work boundaries of the project.

**BIO-MM1b:** Prior to construction, the project disturbance envelope (encompassing all ground disturbance associated with the project, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, and material storage) shall be clearly identified on project site plans, shall be located as far as feasible from the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor, and shall be located outside of the 50-foot ESHA buffer, as well as the wildlife movement corridor extending 25-feet from the ESHA buffer edge (as described in Mitigation Measure 3). Exclusion fencing shall be installed around the entire work area under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Fencing shall be at least 36 inches above ground level and buried at least 6 inches into the ground, and shall have a gate or similar opening to allow access to the work area, but shall remain closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels for snakes. The fencing shall be monitored daily.
by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist at least once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project. All ground disturbance associated with project construction, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, material storage, and parking, shall occur within the fenced area, and no construction equipment or personnel shall enter areas outside of the fenced area.

**BIO-MM1c:** A qualified biologist shall monitor all removal of vegetation on the project site. Immediately prior to vegetation removal, the qualified biologist shall survey the work area for CRLF and SFGS. If CRLF and SFGS are observed in the work area, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW contacted for guidance. If no CRLF or SFGS are observed during the vegetation removal effort, then no additional biological monitoring (other than exclusion fence inspections, mentioned above) shall be performed unless a CRLF or SFGS is subsequently reported by construction personnel or others in the area. If a CRLF or SFGS is observed on or near the project site, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted immediately, and they may require daily biological monitoring and other mitigation measures.

**BIO-MM1d:** Exposed trenches resulting from project construction shall be backfilled as soon as work is complete. Open trenches shall have an escape ramp every 50-feet or less (composed of earthen material no greater than 45 degrees) installed at each end before nightfall each work day so that any entrapped wildlife may exit. To reduce impacts to nocturnal species in the area, construction shall be limited to daylight hours and no construction lighting shall remain at night.

**Native Bird Species**

In addition to the species mentioned above, several special-status birds could occur within the vicinity of the subject area. These special-status birds include the White-tailed kite, Allen’s hummingbird, Saltmarsh common yellowthroat and grasshopper sparrow. The White-tailed kite, Allen’s hummingbird and Grasshopper sparrow, in particular have the potential to be negatively impacted by the project.
White-tailed Kite
Numerous observations of white-tailed kites are regularly reported in and around Half Moon Bay (eBird 2015). The species was recorded as a possible breeder in the area during surveys conducted from 1991-97 (Sequoia Audubon Society 2001). Suitable nesting habitat is present in Central Coast Riparian Scrub and other mature trees on and adjacent to the study area. Construction buffers around raptor nests of up to 300 feet are typically required by CDFW, and tree removal, noise, and other construction disturbance during the breeding season could result in nest destruction or abandonment. Therefore, mitigation measures for white-tailed kites are included below.

Allen's Hummingbird
Allen's hummingbird is considered to be a regular and common breeder in coastal San Mateo County (Sequoia Audubon Society 2001; Metropulos 2006). Potential nesting habitat is available in Central Coast Riparian Scrub and trees and shrubs on the project site. Construction buffers around passerine nests of up to 50 feet are typically required by CDFW. Tree and shrub removal during the breeding season, as well as noise and other disturbance within ~50-feet of nesting birds, could result in nest destruction or abandonment. Mitigation measures for Allen's hummingbird are included in Section 5.0.

Grasshopper Sparrow
The grasshopper sparrow has been reported from the vicinity of the study area (eBird 2015). It is considered to be relatively common breeder in appropriate habitat along the San Mateo Coast (Sequoia Audubon Society 2001; eBird 2015). Localized areas with taller grass and scattered shrubs, including Ruderal Herbaceous habitat, provide potential nesting habitat for grasshopper sparrows. Vegetation removal during the breeding season, as well as noise and other disturbance within ~50-feet of nesting birds, could result in nest destruction or abandonment. Mitigation measures for grasshopper sparrow are included in Section 5.0. Allen's hummingbird is considered to be a regular and common breeder in coastal San Mateo County (Sequoia Audubon Society 2001; Metropulos 2006). Potential nesting habitat

BIO-MM2: If project construction is conducted during the February 1 to August 15 breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey throughout area of suitable habitat within 300 feet of the project site within 30 days prior to the onset of any construction activity. If bird nests are observed, an appropriate buffer zone shall be established around all active nests to protect nesting adults and their young.
from construction disturbance. Buffer zones shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW based on the site conditions and the species potentially impacted. Work within the buffer zone shall be postponed until all the young are fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.

**Wildlife Corridors**
Projects that “interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites” could result in significant impacts under CEQA. The study area, including Pilarcitos Creek, Central Coast Riparian Scrub, and adjacent Ruderal Herbaceous habitat, is used as a movement corridor for native wildlife. The proposed house will be located adjacent to dense development to the south and east, and the Central Coast Riparian Scrub will be protected with a 50-foot buffer. However, a game trail with abundant evidence of wildlife use is present along and within ~25-feet of the 50-foot Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge. Project plans available for review do not specify fencing or landscaping on the project site. If fencing or other significant barriers to wildlife movement are placed near the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge, it could adversely impact wildlife movement on the study area. Therefore, mitigation measure BIO-MM3 noted below to reduce the impact to a less than significant level for wildlife corridors are included.

**BIO-MM3**: Any fencing located within 25-feet of the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge shall be wildlife friendly (such as split rail or other fencing that allows for the passage of wildlife). No other significant barriers to wildlife movement shall be placed in this area.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** The One riparian ESHA was observed along Pilarcitos Creek: Central Coast Riparian Scrub. This habitat is dominated by native riparian trees including arroyo willow, red willow, Pacific willow, red alder, and black cottonwood, and was delineated to the edge of the riparian dripline (Figure 2 of the attached BRA).

According to Section 3-11(a) of the LCP, “On both sides of riparian corridors, from the ‘limit of riparian vegetation’, extend buffer zones 50 feet outward for perennial streams and 30 feet outward for intermittent streams.” This requirement is also contained in Section
18.38.075 (D)(1) of the City of Half Moon Bay Zoning Code, where the “Riparian Buffer Zone” is defined as: “land on both sides of the riparian corridors which extends from the “limit of riparian vegetation” 50 feet outward for perennial streams and 30 feet outward for intermittent streams.” Since Pilarcitos Creek is a perennial stream, a 50-foot buffer would apply (Figure 2). Further, Section 18.38.085 (D) of the Zoning Code also requires a 50-foot buffer around the “habitat of a rare or endangered species,” which would also apply since the Central Coast Riparian Scrub provides suitable habitat for CRLF, SFGS, and other special-status wildlife species. Based on current plans, ground disturbance associated with the proposed project will occur outside the 50-foot riparian buffer zone (Figure 2 of the attached BRA), and no impacts to Central Coast Riparian Scrub or Pilarcitos Creek are anticipated during project construction. Given the conclusions in the Biological Resources Assessment provided in Appendix A, the project has the potential to impact sensitive habitat areas (specifically habitats containing or supporting unique species or any rare and endangered species), implementation of mitigation measures BIO-MM1 thorough BIO-MM3 (above) would reduce potentially significant adverse effects to a less than significant level.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** Pilarcitos Creek, a jurisdictional water under Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act, abuts the northern property line of the subject property. No potential wetlands identified as a Critical Coastal Area are associated with the subject property. The Biological Resource Assessment for this project did not identify any wetlands that meet the wetland definition within the LCP or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, in the opinion of the consulting biologist based upon site surveys. Wetland Deliniation Data Forms were prepared by the consulting biologist and are included the within Biological Resources Assessment (Appendix A). Comment letters from California Coastal Commission (CCC) staff indicate that areas of the site meet the one-parameter LCP definition due to the existence of hydrophytic vegetation (Conium maculatum). Additional mitigation language was added to mitigation measures MM 1b, MM1c, MM1d and MM3, as recommended within the response to CCC staff from the project biologist and within the addendum to the Biological Resource Assessment. The additional mitigation measures include more frequent weekly biological monitoring, biological monitoring of all vegetation removal, and the requirement that all new fencing shall be of split rail, wildlife friendly design.
d) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** With the exception of the CRLF, native bird species, SFDW and bat species, no potential impact on established native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species, wildlife corridor, or on native wildlife nursery sites were identified within the Biological Resources Assessment (Appendix A). Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-MM1 through BIO-MM3 (above) would reduce potentially significant adverse effects on CRLF, native bird species, SFDW and bat species to a less than significant level.

e) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** Chapter 18.38 The Half Moon Bay Municipal Code requires any proposed project within 100 feet of a “sensitive habitat area” to prepare a biological report. Sensitive habitat is defined as sand dunes, marine habitats, sea cliffs, riparian areas, wetlands, rocky intertidal zones, coastal scrub, and habitats supporting rare and endangered species defined by the California State Fish and Game Commission. The proposed project would involve work within 100 feet of a sensitive habitat area and Coast Range Biological LLC has prepared a Biological Resource Assessment (Appendix A) to assess potential project impacts and identify feasible mitigation. The biology report prepared for the project is consistent with the requirements of the Municipal Code.

Based on the above analysis, the Project is consistent with all local ordinances protecting biological resources. Mitigations BIO-MM 1-3 above, have been identified to reduce potential impacts on biological resources in the Project area to a less than significant level.

f) **No Impact.** The proposed project site is not within the boundaries of a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. This precludes the possibility of these project components conflicting with the provisions of such a plan. No impacts would occur.

### 5. Cultural Resources

**Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Issues – Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact Analysis

a) **No Impact.** There are no known National Register or California State Historic Resource properties, California Historical landmarks, or California Points of Historic interest on the project site or in the project vicinity. The City of Half Moon Bay Historical Resources Inventory does not identify any historical structures or other resources on or proximate to the subject site. The proposed project would not result in an adverse change in a significant historical resource. No impact would occur.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** The project site is not archaeologically sensitive pursuant to the Local Coastal Program’s Potential Archaeological Resources Map; consequently, the project is not expected to impact subsurface archaeological resources or human remains. However, in the event that human remains, subsurface historic and/or archeological remains are discovered, the following mitigation measures would apply.

**CR-MM1:** Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American(s). If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the
permittee shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.

**CR-MM2:** If subsurface historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect archaeological resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.

In the event that human remains, subsurface archeological resources are discovered during construction, mitigation measures ARC-MM1 and ARC-MM2 would apply for the preservation of archeological resources in order to reduce any impact to such resources to a less than significant level.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** There are no known unique geologic features or paleontological resources on the site or in the project area. However, if such geologic features or paleontological resources are unearthed during construction, the following mitigation measure would apply, reducing the impact to geologic and/or paleontological resources to less than significant level.

**PALEO-MM1:** If subsurface geologic and/or paleontological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist to perform reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect such resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is not archaeologically sensitive pursuant to the Local Coastal Program’s Potential Archaeological Resources Map; however, if human remains are encountered, the applicant will comply with the requirements of Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code regarding the handling of human remains. The impact would be less than significant.
6. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Geology, Soils and Seismicity</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

The site is not within a State of California designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, but it is located in the San Francisco Bay Area, considered one of the most seismically active regions in the United States. Significant earthquakes have occurred in the Bay Area, and will continue to occur
with varying intensities depending upon the magnitude of the earthquake and the distance of the site from the causative fault and the type of material underlying the site. The nearest fault zones are the San Gregorio Fault Zone, located approximately 2 mile west of Half Moon Bay, and the San Andreas Fault Zone, located approximately 6 miles east of Half Moon Bay.

**Impact Analysis**

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.**

1) **Fault Rupture.** No active faults or fault traces are known to pass through the project site; therefore the risk of fault rupture in the area is non-existent. No impact would occur.

2) **Seismic Ground Shaking.** The proposed project may be exposed to strong seismic ground shaking associated with an earthquake on the San Gregorio or San Andreas Faults. High accelerations can be expected during a moderate to major earthquake on the San Andreas Fault or a major earthquake on the San Gregorio Fault. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant will be required to submit plans to the City demonstrating that the house is designed to accommodate earthquake vibrations in conformance with the requirements of the California Building Code; consequently, the impact would be less than significant.

3) **Seismic-Related Ground Failure.** A geotechnical investigation addressing the potential hazard of liquefaction will be required prior to issuance of a building or grading permit. Project construction in conformance with the recommendations of the report and with the requirements of the California Building Code will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.

4) **Landslides.** Landslides are related to instabilities in slopes and can be induced by earthquakes or heavy amounts of rainfall. There are no slopes on this nearly flat site; therefore there is no potential for landslides. No impact would occur.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed single-family residence, remodel of the existing home on the site and site improvements (including removal of vegetation, excavation, and site grading) could result in temporary increases in soil erosion. The project is subject to the San Mateo County Storm Water Pollution Best Management Practices during
construction and will prepare an erosion and sediment control plan to minimize soil erosion and loss of topsoil during the construction phase in conformance with the San Mateo County Municipal Regional Storm Water Permit. After construction is complete, permanent landscaping of unpaved areas on the single-family lot will minimize erosion and topsoil loss. The project will result in less than significant erosion impacts.

c) **No Impact.** A geotechnical investigation addressing the potential hazard of liquefaction will be required prior to issuance of a building or grading permit. Project construction in conformance with the recommendations of this report and with the requirements of the California Building Code will ensure that no impact would occur related to liquefaction. No impact would occur.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** A geotechnical investigation addressing the potential hazard of expansive soil will be required prior to issuance of a building or grading permit. Project construction in conformance with the recommendations of the report and with the requirements of the California Building Code will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.

e) **No Impact.** The proposed single-family residence will be connected to the sanitary sewer system. No alternative wastewater system is proposed. No impact would occur.

### 7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Hazards and Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Environmental Issues – Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>10, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact Analysis

**a-b) No Impact.** The proposed single-family residence, remodel of the existing residence on the site and associated site improvements are not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through construction, routine transport, use, release or disposal of hazardous materials. Minor amounts of hazardous materials may be used during construction, including vehicle fuels, paints, solvents, pesticides and herbicides. However, use, transport, and disposal of such materials will be required to conform to applicable federal, state, and County hazardous materials, which will ensure that hazardous materials do not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impact would occur.

**c) No Impact.** The project is not located within a quarter mile of any existing or proposed school. No impact would occur.
d) **No Impact.** The project site is currently vacant. No known hazardous materials are currently being used, stored, or disposed of on or adjacent to the project site and the site is not included on the State’s Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese List) pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; therefore, no impact would occur.

e) **No Impact.** The project site is more than 4 miles from the Half Moon Bay Airport. No impact would occur.

f) **No Impact.** There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. No impact would occur.

g) **No Impact.** The proposed single-family residence, remodel of the existing residence on the site and associated site improvements would not interfere with access on local streets or highways or otherwise interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. No impact would occur.

h) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Cal Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map for San Mateo County indicates that the project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The Coastside County Fire Protection District provides fire services to the site. The project will comply with all District requirements regarding fire access and vegetation control within the project site; therefore, the risk of exposure of people or structures to impacts from wild land fires would be less than significant.

8. **Hydrology and Water Quality**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Water Quality</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental Issues – Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-or off-site?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) Otherwise substantially degradate water quality?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>j) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact Analysis

**a) No Impact.** The project would be required to comply with the City’s NPDES (storm water control) requirements and SWRCB’s General Construction Permit for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period and has included Stormwater Requirements Checklist for Small Projects in compliance with the City’s NPDES requirements for small projects / Best Management Practices. Consequently, the proposed single-family residence and remodel of the existing residence would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No impact would occur.

**b) No Impact.** Project construction would not use ground water. The Coastside County Water District would provide domestic water to the proposed residence. Groundwater quality and
overall infiltration are not expected to be significantly affected by project development. There would be no impact to groundwater.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Project construction would involve ground disturbing activities such as excavations and grading; however, these activities would not substantially alter the existing topography of the project site, which is relatively flat. The project would be required to comply with the City’s NPDES (storm water control) requirements and SWRCB’s General Construction Permit for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period; consequently, the project is not likely to contribute substantial amounts of erosion or siltation on- or off-site due to construction. Post-construction, the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation because there would be no exposed native soils and the topography of the project site would remain flat. The impact would be less than significant.

d-e) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** Construction of the proposed single-family residence and site improvements would increase storm water flows from the site by increasing the amount of impervious surface. The City requires that development projects limit post-development storm water discharge to equal or less than pre-development discharge. The following mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant adverse effects to stormwater runoff to a less than significant level.

**WQ-MM1:** Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant will be required to submit plans demonstrating on-site detention limiting storm water discharge from the site to pre-development levels in conformance with City standards.

f) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** The following Construction of the proposed single-family residence and site improvements has the potential to degrade water quality through sediment runoff during construction. The following mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant adverse effects to water quality during construction.

**WQ-MM2:** Compliance with the City’s NPDES (storm water control) requirements and SWRCB’s General Construction Permit for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period will be required throughout the construction process.
g-h) **No Impact.** Staff reviewed the FEMA flood map associated with the subject property (Map #06081C0260E Panel 260 of 510, Effective 10/16/12) and verified that the property site is outside of the 100-year flood hazard area and within Flood Zone X. This particular flood zone designation is defined as, “Areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain.” Therefore, according to the Flood Insurance Rate Maps prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. The project would not expose housing to flood hazards or impede or redirect flood flows.

i) **No Impact.** The project site is shown as adjacent to the Dam Failure Inundation Zone, as shown on map data provided by the San Mateo County GIS data. However, the construction site is outside of the Dam Failure Inundation Zone. No impact would occur.

j) **Less Than Significant Impact.** A small portion of the project site is located in a tsunami inundation area, as shown on the Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning. The portion of the site within the tsunami inundation zone is limited to the northern portion of the site adjacent to Pilarcitos Creek and below 40 feet elevation. Tsunami warning sirens and tsunami evacuation route directional signage exist within the vicinity of the subject property. The tsunami directional signage and warning sirens would reduce the impact to less than significant by informing the residents of the new single-family house of any impending tsunami and facilitating evacuation. The project site is not located in an area subject to seiche or mudflows. The impact would be less than significant.

### 9. Land Use

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Land Use</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>16, 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Analysis

a) **No Impact.** The site of the proposed single-family residence and remodel of the existing residence is Zoned PUD, Planned Unit Development and within the Matteucci Planned Unit Development and has a General Plan designation of Planned Development District. The site is located at the northern terminus of Jenna Lane at Cypress Avenue, north of Kelly Avenue and approximately 0.20 miles west of Highway 1 (Cabrillo Highway), near the end of the developed portion of an existing residential subdivision that takes access from Highway 1 via Kelly Avenue and Jenna Lane. The proposed development is consistent with the site’s zoning (PUD), the Matteucci Specific Plan and General Plan designations and with the existing pattern of development along Jenna Lane; consequently, it will not divide an established community. No impacts would occur.

b) **No Impact.** The proposed project complies with the requirements of the Matteucci Specific Plan, PUD Zoning District and is consistent with the site’s Planned Development District’s General Plan designation. The project applicant will be required to implement the City’s regulations for Water Efficiency in Landscaping and storm water control (NPDES). A biological assessment has been prepared for the proposal in conformance with the requirements of Municipal Code Chapter 18.38 to identify potentially significant impacts on identified coastal resources on the project site and feasible mitigation to reduce those potential impacts to a less than significant level.

c) **No Impact.** The Project area is not located within an existing habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan and will not conflict with the provisions of such a plan. No impacts would occur.
10. **Mineral Resources**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Mineral Resources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Analysis**

a-b) **No Impact.** Pursuant to the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA), neither the State Geologist, nor the State Mining and Geology Board have designated any area with the jurisdiction of the City of Half Moon Bay as containing mineral deposits of regional significance nor any deposits for which significance requires further evaluation. The project site and surrounding area contain no mineral deposits subject to SMARA. No impacts would occur.

11. **Noise**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues - Noise</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Issues - Noise</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

Policy 1.a and Exhibit 13 of the City of Half Moon Bay Noise Element (1991) establish maximum exterior and interior noise levels for residential uses using the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). CNEL is the average sound level over a 24 hour period, with a penalty of 5 dB added between 7 p.m. and 10 p.m. and a penalty of 10 dB added for the nighttime hours of 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. For single-family residential land uses, the Noise Element limits interior noise levels to 40 dBA CNEL and exterior noise levels to 60 dBA CNEL. The Noise Element specifies that construction noise is addressed through Half Moon Bay Municipal Code noise regulations. The Municipal Code specifies that no person shall between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. make, cause, suffer or permit to be made any offensive noise (1) which is made within one hundred feet of any building or place regularly used for sleeping purposes, or (2) which disturbs, or would tend to disturb, any person within hearing distance of such noise. Municipal Code Section 14.40.010 allows construction only during the following hours: 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday; 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Saturdays; and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Sundays and holidays.
The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the multifamily residences located directly east of the subject property and along Cypress Avenue and Oak Avenue. Additionally, a large single-family residence is located directly south of the subject property. A large parking lot associated with the Stawflower Shopping Center is directly across Pilarcitos Creek and the riparian area from the subject property.

**Impact Analysis**

a) **Less That Significant Impact.** The primary noise source in the area is traffic noise from Highway 1 located approximately 0.2 miles west of the site. The *Existing Traffic Noise Contours for Major Roadways in Half Moon Bay*, prepared in 2014, indicate that existing traffic noise in the area of the project site is less than 55 dB CNEL, below the Noise Element exterior residential standard of 60 dB CNEL. Based on standard construction, (generally expected to reduce noise by 20 dB) the interior of the proposed residence would be subject to traffic noise levels of 35 dB CNEL, well below the Noise Element interior standard of 40 dB CNEL. The project will not expose future occupants of the proposed residence to noise in excess of General Plan standards.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project includes the construction of one single-family residence, the remodel of the existing residence on the site and construction of associated site improvements. Construction of the proposed project would not require pile driving or other construction techniques likely to cause perceptible, off-site, ground-borne noise or vibration. Activities associated with earthmoving equipment and similar construction equipment would occur on a temporary basis. Operation of the project would not involve any activity that would produce perceptible ground-borne noise or vibration. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) **No Impact.** The proposed project includes the construction of one single-family residence, the remodel of the existing residence on the site and construction of associated site improvements. The primary source of noise from the residence would be vehicle trips associated with the residence, which are estimated to be no more than 10 per day. Given the low number of vehicle trips, the proposed project would not cause a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** During construction activities, the potential would exist for temporary or periodic increases in noise levels and existing residences in the project vicinity.
would be subject to elevated noise levels. The degree of such increases would depend on the type and intensity of construction activity, equipment type used, duration of equipment use, and distance between the noise source and noise receiver. Adherence to the hours of operation of Municipal Code Section 14.40.010 and to the limitations established in the City’s Noise Ordinance would ensure that any such noise increases would result in less than significant impacts.

e) **No Impact.** The project site is not located with 2 miles of an airport or airport land use plan. The nearest airport (Half Moon Bay Airport) is located approximately 4 miles from the project site. No impacts would occur.

f) **No Impact.** There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity. No impacts would occur.

### 12. Population and Housing

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Population and Housing</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>21, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Analysis**

a) **No Impact.** The proposed construction of one new single-family residence and site improvements in an existing neighborhood will not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area.

b) **No Impact.** The proposed project site also includes the remodel of the existing residence on the site, which will be used as maids quarters for the new residence on the site. The
proposed project would not displace existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing. No impacts would occur.

c) **No Impact.** As mentioned above, the project site has an existing single-family residence. This residence will be remodeled to provide living space for support staff for the new residence. The proposed project would not displace people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing. No impacts would occur.

### 13. Public Services

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues - Public Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire Protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police Protection?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Analysis

a) No Impact. Fire protection services are provided to the site by the Coastside County Fire Protection District. The proposed construction of one single-family residence in an existing residential neighborhood would not require new fire facilities or reduce response times. No impact would occur.

b) No Impact. Police services to the site are provided by the San Mateo County Sheriff’s Department. One new single-family residence in an existing neighborhood would not increase demands on policy services or require expanded police protection facilities. No impact would occur.

c) No Impact. The site is located within the Cabrillo Unified School District. The addition of one single-family residence has the potential to incrementally increase the demand for school services, but one new single-family residence would not trigger the need for new or expanded school facilities. The project applicant is required to pay school fees for provision of school facilities for new development within the District’s boundaries. No impacts would occur.

d) No Impact. The proposed construction of one single-family residence and within an existing residential neighborhood would not increase demands on parks such that new or expanded park facilities would be required. No impacts would occur.

e) No Impact. The construction of one new single-family residence would not increase demands on any public facilities such that new or expanded public facilities would be required. No impacts would occur.

14. Recreation

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues - Recreation</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Environmental Issues - Recreation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)  Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Analysis**

a) **No Impact.** Based on the U.S. Census average of 2.65 persons per household in Half Moon Bay, the proposed one new single-family residence would generate a very small increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks and recreation facilities and would not increase demand such that new or expanded park facilities would be required. No impact would occur.

b) **No Impact.** The project does not include new or expanded recreation facilities. No impact would occur.

**15. Transportation**

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues - Transportation</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Environmental Issues - Transportation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact Analysis**

a) **No Impact.** With the construction of the new single-family residence and remodel of the existing residence on the site, the project would add 10 daily one-way vehicle trips to the existing circulation system and would not exceed the capacity of the system or result in a significant impact on streets, intersections, highways, freeways, pedestrian or bicycle facilities or mass transit. No impact would occur.

b) **No Impact.** The project would add negligible traffic to the existing circulation system and would not conflict with the City’s level of service standards or with standards set by the County congestion management agency. No impact would occur.

c) **No Impact.** The Half Moon Bay Airport, the closest airport to the project site, is located approximately 4 miles northwest of the project site. Due to this distance, the project would not impact air traffic patterns and would not result in substantial safety risks. No impact would occur.

d) **No Impact.** An existing driveway and round parking area connects the sites of the existing and proposed residences to Jenna Lane. No additional street improvements are included with the project. No impact would occur.
e) **No Impact.** Emergency access to the proposed single-family residence and remodeled existing residence is provided through the existing driveway and Jenna Lane connecting to Kelly Avenue. No impact would occur.

f) **No Impact.** The project includes the construction of one single-family residence and remodel of the existing residence. Sidewalks roads and infrastructure exists to the site. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with policies, plans and programs supporting alternative transportation. No impact would occur.

### 16. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issues – Utilities and Service Systems</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact Analysis

a,b,e) **No Impact.** Wastewater treatment would be provided to the proposed single-family residence and remodeled single-family residence by the Sewer Authority Mid-Coast. The project would not require expansion or construction of wastewater treatment facilities; current facilities are adequate for both the project and existing treatment demand. No impact would occur.

c) **No Impact.** The City requires the limiting of post-development discharge to equal or less than pre-development discharge. Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit, the project would be required to submit plans demonstrating on-site detention of any potential increase in storm water runoff from proposed structures and other impervious surfaces. No impact would occur.

d) **No Impact.** Domestic water service is provided to the site by the Coastside County Water District (CCWD). CCWD has provided comments on this project. The comments indicate that the site currently has one 3/4 inch water connection. No additional water service is anticipated for this project. No impact would occur.

f) **No Impact.** Solid waste generated from the project site during construction would be disposed of in compliance with CALGreen sorting and recycling requirements. Proof of compliance with this requirement would be provided to the Building Division prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the new residence.

g) **No Impact.** The project would be required to conform to Chapter 14.50 of the Half Moon Bay Municipal Code which specifies standards for recycling, salvage, or reuse of demolition debris. In addition, the single-family residence and remodeled existing residence would conform to City requirements for recycling and solid waste collection designed to maximize diversion of solid waste from landfills. No impacts would occur.
17. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory Findings of Significance</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mandatory Findings of Significance

a) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** The proposed project would result in potential impacts associated with Biological Resources that would be significant if left unmitigated. Mitigation Measures identified for these impacts would fully mitigate all potential impacts to levels of less than significant. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** Mitigation Measures identified for impacts to biological resources would fully mitigate all potential significant biological impacts to a less than significant level. All cumulative impacts related to air quality, noise, and traffic are less than significant. Given the size of the project and its impacts and mitigation measures, the incremental effects of this proposed single-family residence and associate street extension are not considerable when considered in connection with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a
cumulatively considerable impact on these areas. Impacts are less than significant with implementation of mitigation.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** All impacts identified in this IS/MND are either less than significant after mitigation or less than significant and do not require mitigation. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in environmental effects that cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. Impacts are less than significant with mitigation.
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measure based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signed: Scott Phillips, Associate Planner
Date: 06/20/16
### SECTION 3: REFERENCES

1. Bay Area Air Quality Management District Bay Area, Clean Air Plan, CEQA Guidelines
2. Biological Resources Assessment, 32 Jenna Lane, dated October, 2015
3. Cal Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map, San Mateo County
5. California Department of Conservation Earthquake Fault Zone Maps, 2007
6. California Environmental Protection Agency Cortese List Data Resources
7. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5
8. California Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94 and 5097.98
9. California Public Resources Code Sections 4526 and 12220 (g)
13. City of Half Moon Bay, City Engineer
15. City of Half Moon Bay Historical Resources Inventory
16. City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program
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24. San Mateo County Important Farmlands Map, 2014
25 City of Half Moon Bay Design Guidelines, 2015
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COAST RANGE BIOLOGICAL LLC
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of the City of Half Moon Bay, Coast Range Biological LLC and Biosearch Associates conducted a Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) on the property located at 32 Jenna Lane in Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, California (APN: 056-072-280). The proposed project consists of: (1) development of an approximately 8,000 ft² single-family residence and associated infrastructure, including the removal of three trees; and (2) renovation of an existing residence on a portion of the property. The area evaluated for this BRA includes: (1) a ~1.5-acre “project site” encompassing the 32 Jenna Lane property where the residential development will occur and where biological resource impact determinations are made; and (2) a ~9.6-acre “study area,” which includes the project site and surrounding 200-foot buffer, where habitats are mapped and evaluated for the potential presence of special-status biological resources.

No special-status plant species were observed on the project site or surrounding study area during the September 2015 reconnaissance field visits (though the field visits occurred outside the blooming period of most special-status plants), and none are expected to occur on the project site because it is heavily disturbed and lacks suitable habitat components for special-status plants. The Central Coast Riparian Scrub on the study area provides potential habitat for several special-status plant species, but this habitat is an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area that will not be impacted by the project and buffered by at least 50 feet. Therefore, no impacts to special-status plants are anticipated from the proposed project.

No special-status wildlife species were observed on the study area during the September 2015 reconnaissance field visits, although focused surveys were not conducted. One special-status wildlife species, steelhead (Oncorhyncus mykiss irideus), is known to inhabit Pillaritos Creek, which passes through the study area. Nine additional special-status wildlife species were considered to have potential for occurrence on the study area: California red-legged frog (Rana draytonii), San Francisco garter snake (Thamnophis sirtalis tetrateenia), white-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus), Allen's hummingbird (Selasphorus sasin), saltmarsh common yellowthroat (Geothlypis trichas sinuosa), grasshopper sparrow (Ammodramus savannarum), San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (Neotoma fuscipes annecens), western red bat (Lasiurus borevilli), and long-legged myotis (Myotis volans). In addition, trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation on the project site and surrounding study area could provide nesting habitat for non-listed bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and state Fish and Game Code. Mitigation measures are included to address any potential significant impacts to special-status wildlife species.

Central Coast Riparian Scrub occurs along Pillaritos Creek on the study area and qualifies as an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA). A 50-foot buffer is required around this habitat based on Section 3-11(a) of the Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program and Section 18.38.075 (D)(1) of the City of Half Moon Bay Zoning Code. According to current plans, ground disturbance associated with the proposed project will occur outside the 50-foot buffer zone, and no impacts to the ESHA are anticipated from the proposed project.

The study area is used as a movement corridor for native wildlife species. Mitigation measures are included so the proposed project does not result in significant adverse impacts to wildlife corridors.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

At the request of the City of Half Moon Bay, Coast Range Biological LLC and Biosearch Associates conducted a Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) on the property located at 32 Jenna Lane in Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County, California (APN: 056-072-280) (Figure 1). The proposed project consists of: (1) development of an approximately 8,000 ft² single-family residence and associated infrastructure, including the removal of three trees; and (2) renovation of an existing residence on a portion of the property. The area evaluated for this BRA includes: (1) a ~1.5-acre “project site” encompassing the 32 Jenna Lane property where the residential development will occur1 and where biological resource impact determinations are made; and (2) a ~9.6-acre “study area,” which includes the project site and surrounding 200-foot buffer, where habitats are mapped and evaluated for the potential presence of special-status biological resources (Figure 2).

This BRA addresses the potential for occurrence of special-status biotic resources on the study area, including special-status plant and wildlife species and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas as defined by the Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program (LCP) and California Coastal Act (CCA). Potential significant project impacts are identified and mitigation measures suggested to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

2.0 METHODS

2.1 Definitions

Special-status species are defined here to include: (1) all plants and animals that are listed under the federal or state Endangered Species Acts as rare, threatened or endangered; (2) all federal and state candidates for listing; (3) California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Species of Special Concern; (4) plants that qualify under the definition of "rare" in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), section 15380; (5) all plants with a Rare Plant Rank of 1 or 2 (and 3 or 4 when they meet the definition of “rare”) of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS 2015); and (6) plants and animals considered “rare and endangered” in the Half Moon Bay LCP.

Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) are defined in the LCP as “any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments.” In addition to populations of special-status species, discussed above, habitats that could qualify as ESHAs include those considered sensitive in the region by CDFW, such as Sacramento-San Joaquin coastal lagoon, North Central Coast California roach/stickleback/steelhead stream, serpentine bunchgrass, northern maritime chaparral, northern coastal salt marsh, and valley needlegrass grassland, as well as those listed in the LCP, including sand dunes, sea cliffs, marine habitats, wetlands, and riparian areas/corridors.

Riparian Area and Corridor is defined in the LCP as: “Any area of land bordering a perennial or intermittent stream or their tributaries, or around a lake or other body of fresh water, including its banks and land at least up to the highest point of an obvious channel or enclosure of a body of water. Riparian corridors are the areas between the limits of riparian vegetation, where limits are determined by vegetative coverage, at least fifty percent of which is comprised of a combination of the following

---

1 Only a portion of the project site will be impacted by ground disturbance associated with the proposed project. This area is labeled “Project Footprint” in Figure 2.
plant species: red alder, jaumea, pickleweed, big leaf maple, narrow-leaf cattail, arroyo willow, broadleaf cattail, horsetail, creek dogwood, black cottonwood, and box elder. These areas and corridors are sensitive habitats requiring protection.”

Wetlands are defined in the LCP (Section 30121) as “lands within the Coastal Zone which may be covered periodically or permanently with shallow water and include saltwater marshes, freshwater marshes, open or closed brackish water marshes, swamps, mudflats, and fens.” The CCA/LCP wetland definition generally follows the “one-parameter approach”, where the presence of any one wetland parameter (hydrophytic vegetation, wetland hydrology, and hydric soils) is generally sufficient to delineate an area as wetland. Hydrophytic vegetation (Lichvar et al. 2014) is defined as “the sum total of macrophytic plant life that occurs in areas where the frequency and duration of inundation or soil saturation produce permanently or periodically saturated soils of sufficient duration to exert a controlling influence on the plant species present” (Environmental Laboratory 1987). Wetland hydrology “encompasses all hydrologic characteristics of areas that are periodically inundated or have soils saturated to the surface at some time during the growing season sufficient to create anaerobic and reducing conditions” (Environmental Laboratory 1987; USACE 2008). Hydric soils are defined by the Natural Resources Conservation Service as “soils that formed under conditions of saturation, flooding, or ponding long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions in the upper part of the soil” (Federal Register 1994).

2.2 Literature Review

Prior to conducting field studies, a background literature search was conducted to determine which special-status species, ESHAs, and other sensitive biological resources have potential to inhabit the study area region based on documented occurrences and range distribution (Appendix A). The primary sources for this search included the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB) (CDFW 2015a), CNPS Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (CNPS 2015), and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service list of threatened or endangered species (USFWS 2015a) records for the Half Moon Bay and surrounding USGS 7.5’ quadrangles. In addition, other lists and publications were consulted, including the CDFW Special Animals list (CDFW 2015b), Zeiner et al. (1988; 1990a; 1990b), eBird (2015), the National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS 2015b), Web Soil Survey (NRCS 2015), topographic maps (USGS 1991), Baldwin et al. (2012), other biological reports prepared for the study area vicinity (SWCA Environmental Consultants 2014), and the Half Moon Bay LCP.

2.3 Field Studies

2.3.1 Special-status Species

Reconnaissance-level field studies were conducted on September 10 and 15, 2015. The project site and accessible portions of the study area were traversed on foot to document habitat conditions to determine the potential for occurrence of special-status plant and wildlife species. The potential for occurrence of special-status species was assessed based on the presence of necessary habitat characteristics, confirmed records from the region, and the biologist’s knowledge of the target species. No focused field surveys were performed.

---

2 Wetlands also fall under the jurisdiction of other state and federal regulatory agencies, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act. Since the project site is located in the Coastal Zone, the more expansive CCA/LCP definition is used here. Any wetland impacts would require permits from all applicable agencies.

3 The initial raw species list was refined to remove species that are documented in the general region but are not expected to occur in Half Moon Bay due to range limitation or extirpation, or occur in habitats obviously lacking from the study area. The remaining species were analyzed for their potential to occur on the study area (Appendix A).
Potential for occurrence of special-status species was classified as follows: None, Low, Moderate, High, or Present. For species with a potential for occurrence of None or Low, habitat for the species is lacking or is otherwise degraded or unsuitable, and no further recommendations are made since the species is unlikely to inhabit the study area. For species that are Present on the study area (based on field observations and/or documentation during the background literature search), or for species with a Moderate or High potential for occurrence (based on the presence of suitable habitat), mitigation measures are recommended to reduce any potential significant impacts to less than significant levels (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G).

2.3.2 Wetlands and Other ESHAs

A routine-level jurisdictional wetland delineation was conducted on the project site on September 10, 2015 to locate areas that could meet the CCA/LCP wetland definition. The project site was field-checked for indicators of hydrophytic vegetation, wetland hydrology, and hydric soils. Sample points were taken on the project site and recorded on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) data forms provided in the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0) (“Arid West Supplement”) (USACE 2008). The wetland delineation followed the CCA/LCP wetland definition and delineation methodology provided in the Arid West Supplement and the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual (“Corps Manual”) (Environmental Laboratory 1987).

Potential ESHAs were mapped in the field with a Trimble GPS unit (sub-meter accuracy) and overlain on a digital orthophoto (dated June 8, 2014) using ArcGIS mapping software. Other habitats were drawn directly onto the orthophoto based on variation in texture, color, and structure. The project site boundary was estimated onto the orthophoto based on available site plans.

3.0 PROJECT SITE AND STUDY AREA DESCRIPTION

The ~1.5-acre project site is located at 32 Jenna Lane in Half Moon Bay (Figures 1 and 2). The ~9.6-acre study area includes the project site and surrounding 200-foot buffer. The project site occurs at ~40 feet elevation and is generally level, sloping moderately to the north near Pilarcitos Creek (USGS 1991). The project site is heavily disturbed and consists of an existing residence, associated infrastructure and landscaping, and undeveloped former agricultural land (see project site photographs in Appendix B). A review of historic aerial photographs indicates the project site was farmed until at least 1991, with the residence constructed ca. 2003. Land uses on and adjacent to the study area include residential development to the south and east, agriculture to the west, and undeveloped land along Pilarcitos Creek to the north (Figure 2).

3.1 Vegetation

Three habitats are present on the study area: Ruderal Herbaceous, Central Coast Riparian Scrub, and Developed/Landscaped. Ruderal Herbaceous habitat, consisting of a highly disturbed phase of Non-Native Grassland⁴ and a mixture of ruderal herbaceous Alliances found in Sawyer et al. (2009), covers most of the project site and adjacent areas to the west (Appendix B-1). Dominant species are

⁴ The Arid West Supplement was chosen for the delineation rather than the Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region Supplement because the study area's habitat and climatic conditions are more typical of San Francisco Bay Area conditions where the Arid West Supplement is used. As stated in the Arid West Supplement: “The decision to use the Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Regional Supplement or the Arid West Regional Supplement on a particular field site should be based on landscape and site conditions, and not solely on map location.”

⁵ Vegetation nomenclature follows Holland (1986).
non-native grasses and forbs, including bristly ox-tongue (*Helminthotheca echioides*), wild radish (*Raphanus sativus*), poison hemlock (*Conium maculatum*), soft chess (*Bromus hordeaceus*), Italian ryegrass (*Festuca perennis*), wild oats (*Avena sp.*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), field bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*), cheeseweed (*Malva parviflora*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), orchard grass (*Dactylis glomerata*), bull thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*), and rattail fescue (*Festuca myuros*), with occasional native species such as California poppy (*Eschscholzia californica*), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), spreading rush (*Juncus patens*), and horseweed (*Erigeron canadensis*). Central Coast Riparian Scrub, consisting primarily of the *Salix lasiolepis* Shrubland Alliance (Sawyer et al. 2009), occurs along Pilarcitos Creek and is dominated by a multilayered canopy of native trees, including arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), red willow (*Salix laevigata*), Pacific willow (*Salix lasiandra* var. *lasiandra*), red alder (*Alnus rubra*), and black cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*) (Appendix B-2 and B-3). The dense understory consists primarily of native shrubs and herbaceous species, including California blackberry (*Rubus ursinus*), stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*), red elderberry (*Sambucus racemosa*), dogwood (*Cornus sp.*), sword fern (*Polystichum munitum*), lady fern (*Athyrium filix-femina*), water cress (*Nasturtium officinale*), water parsley (*Oenanthe sermentosa*), and horsetail (*Equisetum sp.*), along with occasional non-native species such as cape ivy (*Delairea odorata*), garden nasturtium (*Tropaeolum majus*), and poison hemlock. Developed/Landscaped habitat consists of existing residential development and planted ornamental species such as Monterey cypress (*Hesperocyparis macrocarpa*), coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), periwinkle (*Vinca major*), myoporum (*Myoporum sp.*), rose (*Rosa spp.*), iris (*Iris sp.*), and fruit trees (*Prunus spp.*) (Appendix B-4). A list of plant species observed on the study area is included in Appendix C.

### 3.2 Wildlife

Wildlife expected on the study area include a variety of native species common in Half Moon Bay near the urban limit line, as well as some species that are tolerant of human disturbance. Pilarcitos Creek supports a dense riparian canopy and provides a perennial source of water, which, combined with the agricultural and undeveloped open space to the west and north, creates a movement corridor for a variety of wildlife. Both coyote (*Canis latrans*) and bobcat (*Lynx rufus*) were detected. Striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*) and raccoon (*Procyon lotor*) are expected. Evidence of either feral or house cats was observed. Botta's pocket gopher (*Thomomys bottae*) is common. Pacific chorus frog (*Pseudacris regilla*) and California toad (*Anaxyrus boreas halophilus*) may breed in backwater pools that were observed in Pilarcitos Creek, which is expected to support several species of native fish. Western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*) and gopher snake (*Pituophis catenifer*) may use open areas. Resident breeding birds that were observed included chestnut-backed chickadee (*Poecile rufescens*), spotted towhee (*Pipilo maculatus*), and song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia*). A variety of native migrant birds are expected to use the dense riparian corridor during the breeding season. A list of wildlife species observed or detected by sign during the site visit is included in Appendix D.

### 3.3 Soils

Six soil types have been mapped on the study area (NRCS 2015):

- **BcA**—Botella clay loam, nearly level
- **DcA**—Denison clay loam, nearly level
- **DmC**—Denison loam, sloping
- **FcA**—Farallone coarse sandy loam, nearly level
- **FcD2**—Farallone coarse sandy loam, moderately steep, eroded

---

*Botanical nomenclature follows Baldwin et al. (2012).*
Gw—Gullied land

Botella clay loam, nearly level, is a well-drained soil derived from alluvium and found on terraces, benches, and alluvial fans. It consists of clay loam from 0 to 28 inches and silty clay loam from 28 to 60 inches of soil profile. The depth to water table and a restrictive feature is >80 inches. Denison clay loam, nearly level, is a moderately well-drained soil derived from alluvium and found on terraces. It consists of clay loam from 0 to 10 inches, clay from 10 to 45 inches, and clay loam from 45 to 61 inches of soil profile. The depth to water table and a restrictive feature is >80 inches. Denison loam, sloping, is a moderately well-drained soil derived from alluvium and found on terraces. It consists of loam from 0 to 15 inches, clay from 15 to 45 inches, and clay loam from 45 to 60 inches of soil profile. The depth to water table and a restrictive feature is >80 inches. Farallone coarse sandy loam, nearly level, is a well-drained soil derived from alluvium and found on alluvial fans and floodplains. It consists of coarse sandy loam from 0 to 20 inches and sandy loam from 20 to 48 inches of soil profile. The depth to water table and a restrictive feature is >80 inches. Farallone coarse sandy loam, moderately steep, eroded, is a well-drained soil derived from alluvium and found on alluvial fans and floodplains. It consists of coarse sandy loam from 0 to 15 inches and sandy loam from 15 to 48 inches of soil profile. The depth to water table and a restrictive feature is >80 inches. Gullied land is derived from alluvium and found on alluvial fans. The soil profile is variable.

None of these soils have been listed as Hydric Soils on the National Hydric Soils List (NRCS 2014).

3.4 Hydrology

The principal hydrologic sources for the study area are direct precipitation, surface sheet flow, and drainage through Pilarcitos Creek. Pilarcitos Creek is a perennial stream that drains westbound across the northern portion of the study area before discharging into the Pacific Ocean ~0.6-miles west of the study area. It is mapped as a stream on the USGS (1991) Half Moon Bay topographic quadrangle and the National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS 2015b). Pilarcitos Creek had 3 to 6 inches of flowing water at the time of the field surveys. No other drainages or wetlands have been mapped on the study area on the USGS (1991) topographic quadrangle or the NWI (USFWS 2015b).

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 Special-status Plants

Thirty-seven special-status plant species are documented to occur in the study area region based on the background literature search discussed in Section 2.1. A list of these species, their status, and their typical habitats is presented in Appendix A. A search of the CNDDB GIS database found no documented occurrences7 of special-status plant species on the study area (Figure 3). Two special-status plant species are documented within three miles of the study area (CDFW 2015a): Kellogg’s horkelia (Horkelia cuneata ssp. sericea) and Choris’s popcorn-flower (Plagiobothrys chorisanus var. chorisanus).

No special-status plant species were observed on the project site or surrounding study area during the field visits (Appendix C), but the visits occurred outside the typical blooming period of most plant species, and no floristic surveys were conducted. All 37 special-status plants identified for the region during the background literature search are unlikely to inhabit the project site because: (1) the project site is dominated by Developed/Landscaped and Ruderal Herbaceous habitats that lack suitable

7 The lack of documented occurrences does not necessarily mean that a species does not occur in an area, only that no occurrences have been reported.
habitat components (e.g., soil type, micro-habitat, plant community) for special-status plant species known from the region; (2) the project site is subject to past and ongoing disturbance and was farmed until at least 1991, likely precluding the presence of a remnant soil seed bank for special-status species; (3) no special-status plants have been documented in the immediate project site vicinity (SWCA 2014; CDFW 2015a); and/or (4) a species (e.g., shrubs or other perennial species) should’ve been identifiable during the field visits and was not observed. The Central Coast Riparian Scrub on the study area provides potential habitat for several special-status plant species (Appendix A), but this habitat is an ESHA that will not be impacted by the project and buffered by at least 50 feet (see Section 4.3). Therefore, no special-status plants are expected to occur on the project site and no project impacts to special-status plants are anticipated.

4.2 Special-status Wildlife

Thirty-three special-status wildlife species were analyzed for their potential occurrence on the project site and surrounding study area because they: (1) occur in habitats present in the general vicinity of the study area, and (2) have ranges that include Half Moon Bay (Appendix A). A search of the CNDDB GIS database found no documented occurrences of special-status wildlife species on the study area, but California red-legged frog (Rana draytonii) has been documented immediately upstream (Figure 3), and steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus) are known from Pilarcitos Creek (Philip Williams & Associates, Ltd. 2008). Three additional special-status wildlife species have been documented within three-miles of the study area: San Francisco garter snake (Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia), saltmarsh common yellowthroat (Geothlypis trichas sinuosa), and monarch butterfly (Danaus plexippus) (Figure 3).

No special-status wildlife species were observed on the study area during the September 2015 reconnaissance field visits, but no focused surveys were conducted. Due to the presence of suitable habitat and documented occurrences in the area, ten special-status wildlife species could occur on the study area: steelhead, California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake, white-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus), Allen’s hummingbird (Selasphorus sasin), saltmarsh common yellowthroat, grashopper sparrow (Ammodramus savannarum), San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (Neotoma fuscipes amnectens), western red bat (Lasiurus blossevillii), and long-legged myotis (Myotis volans). In addition, trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation on the study area could provide nesting habitat for non-listed bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and state Fish and Game Code. These species are discussed below.

The remaining special-status wildlife species analyzed are considered absent or to have a low potential to inhabit the project site or study area, and it is therefore unlikely they would be adversely impacted by the proposed project (Appendix A). These species are not discussed further. In addition, numerous special-status wildlife species documented from the region and/or mentioned in the LCP were not included in Appendix A because suitable habitat is clearly absent from the project site and study area. These include all marine organisms (e.g., marine mammals, reptiles, birds, and invertebrates), as well as species found in tidal marsh or other habitats clearly lacking from the study area, including: western snowy plover (Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus), California black rail (Rallus jamaicensis coturnicul), double-crested cormorant (Phalacrocorax auritus), California brown pelican (Pelecanus occidentalis), California least tern (Sterna antillarum browni), California clapper rail (Rallus longirostris obsoletus), and salt-marsh harvest mouse (Reithrodontomyys raviventris). In addition, the following species are documented in the region but their range does not include Half Moon Bay: Mission blue butterfly (Plebejus icarioides missionensis), San Bruno elfin butterfly (Callophrys mossii bayensis), and Myrtle’s silverspot (Speyeria zerene myrtleae).

---

8 San Francisco garter snake location records are considered sensitive and are not included in Figure 3.
Central California Coast Steelhead DPS (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*), Federal Status: Threatened; State Status: None.

Steelhead typically inhabit coastal streams that contain water all year round for spawning and rearing. Both natural and man-made barriers often restrict movements, especially during drought years (Alley 1999). The Central California coast population is recognized as a Distinct Population Segment (DPS) by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), which regulates the fishery (NMFS 2011; CDFW 2015a). In California, juvenile steelhead generally live in fresh water for one to three years before departing for the ocean where they remain for two to three years before returning to the same stream to breed (Moyle et al. 1995). Young fish that have physiologically transformed for ocean life (“smolts”) typically migrate to the ocean from March to June (Alley 1999). Spawning typically occurs in the upper reaches of creeks on clean gravel that receives good flow. Rearing habitat appears limited by availability of food, cover (woody debris, undercut banks, surface turbulence, large rocks that are not embedded), and sufficient pool and riffle depth (Alley 1999).

Steelhead are known from Pilarcitos Creek, and the creek is considered a critical habitat for the recovery of the species (Philip Williams & Associates, Ltd. 2008). Due to the distance between project ground disturbance and Pilarcitos Creek (>200 feet), the low relief of the project site, the intervening Central Coast Riparian Scrub and Ruderal Herbaceous habitats, and the incorporation of standard Best Management Practices during construction, no adverse impacts to steelhead habitat in Pilarcitos Creek are anticipated from the proposed project, and no mitigation measures are recommended.

**California Red-legged Frog (*Rana draytonii*), Federal Status: Threatened; State Status: Species of Special Concern**

The California red-legged frog (CRLF) is a large (85-138 mm), nocturnal species that historically occupied much of central and southern California. The species requires still or slow-moving water during the breeding season, where it deposits large egg masses, usually attached to submerged or emergent vegetation. Breeding typically occurs between December and April, depending on annual environmental conditions and locality. Eggs require 6 to 12 days before hatching and metamorphosis occurs 3.5 to 7 months after hatching (Stebbins 2003). Following metamorphosis between July and September, juveniles generally do not travel far from aquatic habitats. Movements of individuals generally begin with the first rains of the weather-year, in response to receding water or following the breeding season (Fellers and Kleeman 2007). Radio-telemetry data indicates that individuals generally engage in straight-line movements irrespective of riparian corridors and can move up to two miles (Bulger et al. 2003; Fellers and Kleeman 2007). California red-legged frogs utilize a variety of water sources during the non-breeding season, and females are more likely than males to depart from perennial ponds shortly after depositing eggs (Fellers and Kleeman 2007). They may take refuge in small mammal burrows, leaf litter or other moist areas during periods of inactivity or whenever it is necessary to avoid desiccation (Rathburn et al. 1993; Jennings and Hayes 1994). Occurrence of this frog has shown to be negatively correlated with presence of introduced bullfrogs (Moyle 1973; Hayes and Jennings 1986, 1988), but both species coexist at some locations, particularly along the coast. Genetic studies indicate that the nominal subspecies *draytonii* and *aurora* represent separate lineages and are therefore distinct species (Shaffer et al. 2004).

Nine CRLF occurrences are documented within three miles of the study area in the CNDDB (CDFW 2015a) (Figure 3). The nearest documented CRLF occurrence is from 2006 along the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor upstream from the study area (CDFW 2015a), with additional occurrences downstream (Figure 3). The reach of Pilarcitos Creek within the study area does not provide breeding habitat, but the riparian corridor offers appropriate summering habitat for CRLF and foraging and
sheltering habitat for some size classes all year round. The project site, and in particular the location of proposed ground disturbance, does not offer aquatic non-breeding habitat. However, CRLF could occur incidentally on the project site during project ground disturbance (primarily in the wet season during dispersal to breeding sites). Mitigation measures for CRLF are included in Section 5.0.

**San Francisco Garter Snake (Thamnophis sirtalis tetrateaenia), Federal Status: Endangered; State Status: Endangered, Fully Protected**

The San Francisco garter snake (SFGS) is found only on the San Francisco peninsula in San Mateo County and the northern portion of Santa Cruz County (Barry 1978; Brode 1990; USFWS 2006). It is an extremely colorful snake with a bright orange-red head, blue belly, greenish-yellow dorsal stripe and red and black stripes along either side. It grows to a length of three to four feet (Stebbins 2003). It occupies freshwater marshes, ponds, sloughs, and associated riparian corridors, especially where dense shoreline vegetation is present. It also uses a variety of upland habitats including grassland, woodland and coastal scrub in proximity to these aquatic habitats. During the fall and winter, it stays relatively inactive underground in rodent burrows, up to at least 150 meters from aquatic habitat (McGinnis, et al. 1987). During the spring and summer, it occupies dense vegetation near ponds or marshes and adjacent scrub and open upland habitat for temperature regulation and cover. Females produce between 12 and 24 live young in July or August. Adults feed primarily on larger frogs including red-legged frogs, but may also take fish, salamanders, newts and earthworms. Pacific treefrogs appear to be an important part of the diet of young snakes (Larsen 1994). It is rarely seen but can sometimes be observed near the water's edge, basking on warm days, or when it retreats to water. Much of the range of the SFGS lies within a heavily urbanized area, and alteration and isolation of habitats has been identified as the primary threat to the subspecies (Brode 1990). Agricultural development, overgrazing and illegal collecting have also been implicated in its decline.

The nearest documented occurrences of the SFGS are along Pilarcitos Creek, both upstream and downstream of the study area within ~2,000-feet (CDFW 2015a). Habitat connectivity between the documented occurrences and the study area exists via Pilarcitos Creek and associated Central Coast Riparian Scrub. Although the habitat on the project site, and in particular the location of project ground disturbance, is disturbed, high numbers of Botta's pocket gopher burrows are present (which could be used by SFGS for predator protection), and SFGS could occur on the project site during project ground disturbance. Mitigation measures for SFGS are included in Section 5.0.

**White-tailed Kite (Elanus leucurus), Federal Status: None; State Status: Fully Protected**

The white-tailed kite is a medium-sized raptor that occupies low-elevation grassland, agricultural, wetland, oak woodland and oak savanna habitats (Dunk 1995). The species is distributed throughout the coastal foothills and valleys along the entire length of the state, throughout the Central Valley, and into the foothills of the Sierra Nevada (Dunk 1995). It nests in a wide variety of trees and shrubs, either isolated or part of larger stands. Typically, four eggs are laid in February and March and chicks hatch after 30-32 days. Juveniles often share their parents' home range for at least one season. During the non-breeding season, the species roosts communally. Nearby open areas are required for foraging, and the species will use certain types of agricultural fields. Food habit studies have demonstrated that voles make up a large proportion of its diet, although other small mammals, birds and insects are also eaten (Dunk 1995). The species hunts during the day primarily by hovering and searching for prey. White-tailed kites in California are generally resident, although they may occupy different areas during the non-breeding and breeding seasons. The species underwent a dramatic reduction in numbers due to habitat loss and hunting, and was extirpated throughout much of its range in the early 1900s. Between the 1940s and early 1980s, the population recovered and its range expanded. More recently, population declines have again been noted, possibly as a result of the conversion of
agricultural lands to urban uses (Dunk 1995). In California, the white-tailed kite is listed as "Fully Protected" in the California Fish and Game Code and as a Bird of Conservation Concern by the USFWS.

Numerous observations of white-tailed kites are regularly reported in and around Half Moon Bay (eBird 2015). The species was recorded as a possible breeder in the area during surveys conducted from 1991-97 (Sequoia Audubon Society 2001). Suitable nesting habitat is present in Central Coast Riparian Scrub and other mature trees on and adjacent to the study area. Construction buffers around raptor nests of up to 300 feet are typically required by CDFW, and tree removal, noise, and other construction disturbance during the breeding season could result in nest destruction or abandonment. Mitigation measures for white-tailed kites are included in Section 5.0.

**Allen’s Hummingbird** (*Selasphorus sasin*), Federal Status: Bird of Conservation Concern, State Status: None.

Allen’s hummingbird breeds in a narrow band along the coast of California and southern Oregon and winters from Central California south through Baja and Central Mexico. Nesting habitat in the San Francisco Bay region includes mixed evergreen forest, redwood forests, riparian woodland, nonnative eucalyptus and cypress groves, and occasionally live oak woodlands and coastal scrub with scattered trees (Mitchell 2000). In addition to nectar, insects are taken, especially spiders. Allen’s hummingbird is an extremely early migrant, and arrives on nesting grounds in January and February (Mitchell 2000). Males engage in a distinct J-shaped flight pattern when courting females. Nests are often clustered and semi-colonial. Females typically produce two broods. The species was recently added to the federal Birds of Conservation Concern primarily due to its restricted breeding range.

Allen’s hummingbird is considered to be a regular and common breeder in coastal San Mateo County (Sequoia Audubon Society 2001; Metropulos 2006). Potential nesting habitat is available in Central Coast Riparian Scrub and trees and shrubs on the project site. Construction buffers around passerine nests of up to 50 feet are typically required by CDFW. Tree and shrub removal during the breeding season, as well as noise and other disturbance within ~50-feet of nesting birds, could result in nest destruction or abandonment. Mitigation measures for Allen’s hummingbird are included in Section 5.0.

**Saltmarsh Common Yellowthroat** (*Geothlypis trichas sinuosa*), Federal Status: Bird of Conservation Concern, State Status: Species of Special Concern.

The saltmarsh common yellowthroat (= San Francisco common yellowthroat) occurs in fresh and saltwater marshes in the San Francisco Bay Area, and along the coast from Marin through San Mateo Counties (Gardali and Evens 2008). It inhabits salt, brackish and fresh water marshes, as well as riparian corridors and canals with appropriate vegetation. It requires thick, continuous cover down to the water surface for foraging. It nests in emergent vegetation on or near the ground or just above the water (Dunn and Garrett 1997; Gardali and Evens 2008). In the winter, it spreads out into the coastal marshes from San Francisco south to San Diego. The subspecies has declined as wetlands throughout its range have been drained and rivers channelized (Dunn and Garrett 1997). The entire population was estimated at fewer than 200 pairs in the 1970s but in the 1980s 500 pairs were reported and more recently the estimate ranges from 1000-2000 individuals (Remson 1978; Gardali and Evens 2008).

Saltmarsh common yellowthroat is documented to occur in the Half Moon Bay area along the Frenchman’s Creek riparian corridor, near the mouth of Pilarcitos Creek, and at Princeton Marsh. It is regularly reported from the vicinity of the study area and is considered to be relatively common in appropriate habitat along the San Mateo Coast (Sequoia Audubon Society 2001; eBird 2015).
Potential nesting habitat is present in and along Central Coast Riparian Scrub. Since nesting habitat for saltmarsh common yellowthroat is restricted to Central Coast Riparian Scrub, which will be protected with a 50-foot buffer, no impacts to this species are anticipated from the project.

**Grasshopper Sparrow (Ammodramus savannarum), Federal Status: None; State Status: Species of Special Concern.**

The grasshopper sparrow is a small- to medium-sized sparrow that is widely distributed in North America and Central America. Although not well-studied in California, it is generally associated with short to middle-height grasslands and little to no shrub cover (Unitt 2008). The species can also be found in pastures and certain agricultural fields. It feeds primarily on insects but also eats a significant amount of vegetation including seeds. Grasshopper sparrows nest on the ground between April and July and normally produce 4 or 5 eggs (Rising and Beadle 1996). They are thought to be loosely colonial during the breeding season although numbers in any one area may change over time. In California, the species breeds in appropriate habitat along much of the coast and is also found in scattered localities in the western foothills of the Sierra Nevada. During the winter, much of the breeding population in the northern portion of the state migrates to southern California. Due to the widespread conversion of grasslands, populations in California have declined drastically in recent years. It is designated as a Species of Special Concern by CDFW.

The grasshopper sparrow has been reported from the vicinity of the study area (eBird 2015). It is considered to be relatively common breeder in appropriate habitat along the San Mateo Coast (Sequoia Audubon Society 2001; eBird 2015). Localized areas with taller grass and scattered shrubs, including Ruderal Herbaceous habitat, provide potential nesting habitat for grasshopper sparrows. Vegetation removal during the breeding season, as well as noise and other disturbance within ~50-feet of nesting birds, could result in nest destruction or abandonment. Mitigation measures for grasshopper sparrow are included in Section 5.0.

**Other Nesting Bird Species**

Suitable nesting habitat for other, non-listed bird species protected under the MBTA and Fish and Game Code occurs in trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation on the project site and surrounding study area. The MBTA regulates or prohibits taking, killing, and possession of migratory bird species and their nests as listed in Title 50 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Section 10.13. Bird species and their nests are also protected under Sections 3515 and 3503 of the state Fish and Game Code. Vegetation removal during the nesting season, or noise and other disturbance during project construction, could adversely impact nesting bird species on the study area, should they be present, potentially resulting in nest destruction, abandonment, or failure. Mitigation measures to address potential significant impacts to nesting bird species are included in Section 5.0.

**San Francisco Dusky-footed Woodrat (Neotoma fuscipes annectens), Federal Status: None; State Status: Species of Special Concern.**

The San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat (SFDW) occurs from San Francisco Bay south through the Santa Cruz Mountains to Elkhorn Slough and inland to the Diablo Range (Hall 1981). The species is most common in riparian, oak woodland and scrub habitats (Carraway and Verts 1991). It typically constructs houses, which are often referred to as nests or middens, out of sticks and other debris. They are constructed on the ground, in rocky outcrops or in trees and are often found in concentrations along riparian corridors. The species can also live in hollows in logs or trees and colonize man-made structures that provide appropriate protection from predators. Houses are often reused by successive generations and some can grow to be six feet or more in height, while others are well-hidden and
easily overlooked. Houses are used for rearing young, protection from predators, resting, food storage, thermal protection and social interaction (Carraway and Verts 1991).

No SFDW houses were observed on the study area. However, suitable habitat is present in Central Coast Riparian Scrub. Most of the project site, and in particular the area of proposed ground disturbance, lacks suitable habitat for SFDW due to the lack of cover and ongoing human disturbance. Therefore, due to the distance (>50 feet) from project ground disturbance and suitable habitat, no impacts to SFDW are anticipated from the proposed project, and no mitigation measures are recommended.

**Western Red Bat (Lasiurus blossevillii), Federal Status: None; State Status: Species of Special Concern.**

The western red bat is widely distributed in the western United States, Central America and South America. Lasiurus blossevillii formerly was included in Lasiurus borealis, but recent genetic work has demonstrated that the two represent distinct species (Morales and Bikham 1995; Baker, et al. 2003). The species roosts primarily in the foliage of trees and shrubs and is closely associated with riparian habitats (Shump and Shump 1982). It feeds primarily on insects, which are taken in flight or while foraging on the ground. Breeding occurs in late summer, while fertilization is delayed until the spring (Shump and Shump 1982). It appears that red bats in California do not migrate out of the state, although there may be seasonal movements (Cryan 2003). Loss of riparian habitat has been implicated in the decline of this species. The western red bat is designated as a Species of Special Concern by the CDFW.

Potential roosting and foraging habitat for western red bats is present in Central Coast Riparian Scrub. The project site generally lacks roosting habitat for the species. Therefore, due to the distance (>50 feet) from project ground disturbance and suitable roosting habitat, no impacts to western red bat are anticipated from the proposed project, and no mitigation measures are recommended.

**Long-legged Myotis (Myotis volans), Federal Status: None; State Status: Western Bat Working Group High Priority.**

The long-legged myotis is found throughout much of California with the exception of the low desert regions (Warner and Czaplewski 1984; Hoffmeister 1986). It is primarily associated with coniferous forests, although it may be found in riparian and desert habitats as well (Warner and Czaplewski 1984). Day roosts are generally in hollow trees, rock crevices, mines and buildings. A single young is produced each year in June or July. Maternity roosts can be large, numbering in the hundreds. Long-legged myotis hibernate in California, and there are likely seasonal movements between summer and winter roosts. The species feeds primarily on moths, but will also eat beetles, flies and termites (Warner and Czaplewski 1984). Its population status is poorly understood. The long-legged myotis is listed as a High Priority species by the Western Bat Working Group.

There are no records of long-legged myotis in the study area vicinity, but this may be due to a lack of survey effort. Potential roost sites are present in the Central Coast Riparian Scrub. The project site generally lacks roosting habitat for the species. Therefore, due to the distance (>50 feet) from project ground disturbance and suitable roosting habitat, no impacts to long-legged myotis are anticipated from the proposed project, and no mitigation measures are recommended.
4.3 Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas

One riparian ESHA was observed along Pilarcitos Creek: Central Coast Riparian Scrub. This habitat is dominated by native riparian trees including arroyo willow, red willow, Pacific willow, red alder, and black cottonwood, and was delineated to the edge of the riparian dripline (Figure 2).

According to Section 3-11(a) of the LCP, "On both sides of riparian corridors, from the 'limit of riparian vegetation', extend buffer zones 50 feet outward for perennial streams and 30 feet outward for intermittent streams." This requirement is also contained in Section 18.38.075 (D)(1) of the City of Half Moon Bay Zoning Code, where the "Riparian Buffer Zone" is defined as: "land on both sides of the riparian corridors which extends from the "limit of riparian vegetation" 50 feet outward for perennial streams and 30 feet outward for intermittent streams." Since Pilarcitos Creek is a perennial stream, a 50-foot buffer would apply (Figure 2). Further, Section 18.38.085 (D) of the Zoning Code also requires a 50-foot buffer around the "habitat of a rare or endangered species," which would also apply since the Central Coast Riparian Scrub provides suitable habitat for CRLF, SFGS, and other special-status wildlife species. Based on current plans, ground disturbance associated with the proposed project will occur outside the 50-foot riparian buffer zone (Figure 2), and no impacts to Central Coast Riparian Scrub or Pilarcitos Creek are anticipated during project construction.

No potential wetlands protected under the CCA/LCP or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act were observed on the project site during the wetland delineation (delineation sample points are included in Appendix E), and no other ESHAs were observed on the study area.

4.4 Wildlife Corridors

Projects that "interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites" could result in significant impacts under CEQA. The study area, including Pilarcitos Creek, Central Coast Riparian Scrub, and adjacent Ruderal Herbaceous habitat, is used as a movement corridor for native wildlife (see Section 3.2). The proposed house will be located adjacent to dense development to the south and east, which impedes wildlife movement, and the Central Coast Riparian Scrub will be protected with a 50-foot buffer. However, a game trail with abundant evidence of wildlife use is present along and within ~25-feet of the 50-foot Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge (Figure 2; Appendix B-1). Project plans available for review do not specify fencing or landscaping on the project site. If fencing or other significant barriers to wildlife movement are placed near the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge, it could adversely impact wildlife movement on the study area. Mitigation measures for wildlife corridors are included in Section 5.0.

4.5 Wild Strawberry Habitat

Section 18.38.090 of the Half Moon Bay Zoning Code lists "California Wild Strawberry" (scientific name not given) as a Unique Species, defined as "those organisms which have scientific or historic value, few indigenous habitats, or some characteristics that draw attention or are locally common." The species is also discussed in Chapter 3 of the LCP, which states the following:

Require any development within ½-mile of the coast to mitigate against the destruction of any California wild strawberry in one of the following ways: (1) Prevent any development, trampling, or other destructive activity which would destroy the plant, or (2) After determining specifically if the plants involved are of particular value, successfully transplant them or have them successfully
transplanted to some other suitable site. Determination of the importance of the plants can only be made by a professional doing work in strawberry breeding.

The study area is located ~0.5-miles from the coast. No individuals of wild strawberry were observed on the study area, and no impacts to this habitat are anticipated from the proposed project.

5.0 POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

The proposed project consists of: (1) development of an approximately 8,000 ft² single-family residence and associated infrastructure, including the removal of three trees; and (2) renovation of an existing residence on a portion of the ~1.5-acre property. The project site itself is composed of Ruderal Herbaceous and Developed/Landscaped habitats, and the project footprint lacks quality habitat for special-status species. However, several special-status wildlife species could occur incidentally on the project footprint (such as during CRLF dispersal to breeding sites) and/or be indirectly impacted by project construction (such as impacts to breeding birds by construction noise) without the incorporation of mitigation measures, discussed below. The proposed mitigation measures are intended to reduce all significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Potential Significant Impact 1a: The project site does not provide aquatic habitat for CRLF or SFGS. However, foraging and sheltering habitat for CRLF and SFGS is present along Pilarcitos Creek and associated Central Coast Riparian Scrub, and these species could occur on the project site. CRLF could occur incidentally during the rainy season, and SFGS could occur during their above-ground activity period from approximately March to November (but potentially any season if appropriate temperatures are present).

Mitigation Measure 1a: Within two weeks prior to the start of construction, a worker education program shall be presented at the project site by a qualified biologist. Associated written material will be distributed. It shall be the onsite foreman's responsibility to ensure that all construction personnel and subcontractors receive a copy of the education program. The education program shall include a description of the CRLF and SFGS and their habitat, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act, the necessity of adhering to the Act to avoid penalty, measures implemented to avoid affecting CRLF and SFGS specific to the project and the work boundaries of the project.

Mitigation Measure 1b: Exclusion fencing shall be installed around the entire work area under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Fencing shall be at least 36 inches above ground level and buried at least 6 inches into the ground, and shall have a gate to allow access to the work area, but shall remain closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels. The fencing shall be monitored daily by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project.

Mitigation Measure 1c: A qualified biologist shall monitor the initial removal of vegetation on the project site. Immediately prior to vegetation removal, the qualified biologist shall survey the work area for CRLF and SFGS. If CRLF and SFGS are observed in the work area, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW contacted for guidance. If no CRLF or SFGS are observed during the vegetation removal effort, then no additional biological monitoring (other than exclusion fence inspections, mentioned above) shall be performed unless a CRLF or SFGS is subsequently reported by construction personnel or others in the area. If a CRLF or SFGS is observed on or near the project
site, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted immediately, and they may require daily biological monitoring and other mitigation measures.

**Mitigation Measure 1d:** Exposed trenches resulting from project construction shall be backfilled as soon as work is complete. Open trenches shall have an escape ramp every 50-feet or less (composed of earthen material no greater than 45 degrees) installed at each end before nightfall each work day so that any entrapped wildlife may exit.

**Potential Significant Impact 2:** Trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation on the project site and surrounding study area provide suitable nesting habitat for common and special-status native bird species protected under the MBTA and Fish and Game Code. Vegetation removal, as well as noise and other disturbance during construction, could adversely impact nesting bird species, if present in the vicinity, potentially resulting in nest destruction or abandonment.

**Mitigation Measure 2:** If ground disturbance is conducted during the February 1 to August 15 breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey throughout areas of suitable habitat within 250 feet of the project site within 30 days prior to the onset of any construction activity. If bird nests are observed, an appropriate buffer zone shall be established around all active nests to protect nesting adults and their young from construction disturbance. Buffer zones shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW based on the site conditions and the species potentially impacted. Work within the buffer zone shall be postponed until all the young are fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.

**Potential Significant Impact 3:** The study area is used as a movement corridor for native wildlife. If fencing or other significant barriers to wildlife movement are placed near the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge, it could adversely impact wildlife movement on the study area.

**Mitigation Measure 3:** Any fencing located within 25-feet of the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge shall be wildlife friendly (such as split rail or other fencing that allows for the passage of wildlife). No other significant barriers to wildlife movement shall be placed in this area.

The conclusions of this biotic assessment reflect conditions observed at the time of the field visits and the biologist’s interpretation of those conditions. Government regulatory agencies make the final determination regarding biological resource issues on the project site.
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Appendix A. Special-status species documented to occur in the study area region

List compiled from searches of the CNDDB (CDFW 2015a), CNPS (2015), and USFWS (2015a) records for the Half Moon Bay, Montara Mountain, San Mateo, Woodside, La Honda, and San Gregorio 7.5' USGS quadrangles, the City of Half Moon Bay LCP, CDFW Special Animals List (2015), and other publications (e.g., Zeiner et al. 1988, 1990a). This list has not been reviewed by the regulatory agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Typical Habitat</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Agrostis bisulata</em> Bladdale’s bent grass</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes, coastal prairie, 5-150 m. Blooms May-July.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Allium fimbriatum</em> var. <em>franciscanum</em> Franciscan onion</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal bluff scrub, eucalypt woodland, valley and foothill grassland (clay, often on serpentine), dry hillsides, 100-300 m. Blooms May-June.</td>
<td>None. Clay and serpentine soils lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Antennaria linearis</em> bent-flowered fiddleneck</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal bluff scrub, eucalypt woodland, valley and foothill grassland, 3-500 m. Blooms March-June.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arabis blepharophylla</em> coast rock cress</td>
<td>LCP, 4.3</td>
<td>Broadleafed upland forest, coastal bluff scrub, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, 3-1,100 m. Blooms February-May.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arctostaphylos montanae</em> Montara manzanita</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Chaparral, coastal scrub, 150 to 500 m. Blooms January-March.</td>
<td>None. No <em>Arctostaphylos</em> observed on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arctostaphylos regismonterana</em> Kings Mountain manzanita</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Broadleaved upland forest, chaparral, North Coast coniferous forest, 305-730 m. Blooms January-April.</td>
<td>None. No <em>Arctostaphylos</em> observed on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Astragalus pygmaea</em> var. <em>pygmaea</em> coastal marsh milk-vetch</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal dunes (mesic), coastal scrub, marshes and swamps (coastal salt, streamside), 6-30 m. Blooms April-October.</td>
<td>None. No suitable habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>California macrophylla</em> round-leaved flaxree</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal prairie, meadows and swamps (coastal salt), valley and foothill grassland (vernal wetland/anoxic), 2-420 m. Blooms May-November.</td>
<td>None. Heavy clay soils lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Centromadia parryi</em> subsp. <em>parryi</em> pappose tarplant</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes, coastal prairie, coastal scrub (sandy), 3-215 m. Blooms April-August.</td>
<td>None. No suitable sandy habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chorisotneae eusilens</em> var. <em>eusilens</em> San Francisco Bay spineflower</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes, coastal prairie, coastal scrub (sandy), 3-215 m. Blooms April-August.</td>
<td>None. No suitable sandy habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cirsium andrewsii</em> Franciscan thistle</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes, coastal prairie, coastal scrub (mesic), 2-420 m. Blooms April-November.</td>
<td>None. No suitable serpentine habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Collinsia multicolor</em> San Francisco collinsia</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes, coastal prairie, coastal scrub (sandy), 3-215 m. Blooms April-August.</td>
<td>None. No suitable sandy habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Typical Habitat</td>
<td>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Dirca occidentalis*  
western leatherwood | IB.2 | Broadleafed upland forest, chaparral, closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland, North Coast coniferous forest, riparian forest and woodland. Usually on brushy slopes, mesic sites in mixed evergreen and foothill woodland communities, 25-425 m. Deciduous shrub, blooms January-April. | *None.* No suitable habitat on the project site. Suitable habitat present in Central Coast Riparian Scrub but species not observed and this habitat will not be impacted by the project. |
| *Erythranthe flourescens*  
San Francisco wallflower | ICP, 4.2 | Chaparral, coastal dunes, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland (serpentine, granite, coastal dunes), 0-520 m. Blooms March-June. | *None.* No suitable serpentine or sandy habitat present. |
| *Fritillaria lanceolata var. tristis*  
Marin checker lily | IB.1 | Coastal bluff scrub, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, 15-150 m. Blooms February-May. | Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming. |
| *Fritillaria liliacea*  
fragrant fritillary | IB.2 | Cismontane woodland, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland (often serpentine), 3-410 m. Blooms February-April. | *None.* No suitable habitat present. |
| *Gaultheria hirsuta var. maritima*  
San Francisco gumpplant | 3.2 | Coastal bluff scrub, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland (sandy or serpentine), 15-400 m. Blooms June-September. | Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming. |
| *Hesperovx sparsiflora var. brevifolia*  
short-leaved evax | IB.2 | Coastal bluff scrub (sandy), coastal dunes, coastal prairie, 0-215 m. Blooms March-June. | *None.* No suitable sandy habitat present. |
| *Horkelia canavensis subsp. sericea*  
Kellogg's horkelia | IB.1 | Closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, coastal dunes, old sand hills, coastal scrub (sandy or gravelly openings), 10-200 m. Blooms April-September. | *None.* No suitable sandy habitat present. |
| *Horkelia maritima*  
Point Reyes horkelia | IB.2 | Coastal dunes, coastal prairie, coastal scrub (sand), 5-350 m. Blooms May-September. | *None.* No suitable sandy habitat present. |
| *Lepidostrobus croceus*  
coast yellow linanthus | IB.1 | Coastal bluff scrub, coastal prairie, 10-150 m. Blooms April-May. | Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming. |
| *Lepidostrobus roseus*  
rose linanthus | IB.1 | Coastal bluff scrub, 0-100 m. Blooms April-July. | *None.* No suitable habitat present. |
| *Limnanthes douglasii subsp. subapica*  
Point Reyes meadowfoam | SE, ICP, IB.2 | Coastal prairie, meadows and seeps, marshes and swamps (freshwater), vernal pools, 1-140 m. Blooms March-May. | *None.* No suitable habitat present. |
| *Lupinus arboreus var. eximius*  
San Mateo tree lupine (~Davy's bush lupine) | LCP, 3.2 | Chaparral, coastal scrub, 90-550 m. Blooms April-July. | *None.* No suitable habitat present. Species not observed. |
| *Malacothamus aboriginitum*  
Indian Valley bush mallow | IB.2 | Chaparral, cismontane woodland (rocky, granitic, often in burned areas), 150-1,700 m. Blooms April- |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Typical Habitat</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Malacothamnus arcausius</em> arcausius bush mallow</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Chaparral, cismontane woodland, 15-355 m. Blooms April-September.</td>
<td>None. No <em>Malacothamnus</em> observed on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Malacothamnus davidsonii</em> Davidson's bush-mallow</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, riparian woodland, 185-855 m. Blooms June-June.</td>
<td>None. No <em>Malacothamnus</em> observed on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Malacothamnus hallii</em> Hall's bush mallow</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Chaparral, coastal scrub, 10-760 m. Blooms May-September.</td>
<td>None. No <em>Malacothamnus</em> observed on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Microseris paludosa</em> marsh microseris</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Closed-cone coniferous forest, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland (mesic), 5-300 m. Blooms April-June.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Perideridia gairdneri</em> subsp. gairdneri</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Broadleafed upland forest, chaparral, coastal prairie, valley and foothill grassland, vernal pools, 0-365 m. Blooms June-October.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Plagiotrochys choristanus</em> var. choristanus</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Chaparral, coastal prairie, coastal scrub (mesic), 15-100 m. Blooms March-June.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming. Marginal habitat in open portions of Central Coast Riparian Scrub but this habitat will not be impacted by the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polemonium carnescens</em> Oregon polemonium</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Coastal prairie, coastal scrub, lower montane coniferous forest, 0-1,830 m. Blooms April-September.</td>
<td>None. No suitable habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Potentilla hickmani</em> Hickman’s cinquefoil</td>
<td>FE, SE</td>
<td>Coastal bluff, closed-cone coniferous forest, meadows and seeps (vernally mesic), marshes and swamps (freshwater), 10-135 m. Blooms April-August.</td>
<td>Low. No suitable habitat present on the project site. Marginal habitat present along Pillaritos Creek but this habitat will not be impacted by the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Silene verecunda</em> subsp. verecunda San Francisco campion</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Coastal bluff scrub, chaparral, coastal prairie, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland (sandy), 30-645 m. Blooms March-June (sometimes into August).</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trifolium hydrophilum</em> saline clover</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Marshes and swamps, valley and foothill grassland (mesic/alkaline), vernal pools, 0-300 m. Blooms April-June.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trifolium floribunda</em> San Francisco owl’s-clover</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Coastal prairie, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland (usually serpentinic), 10-160 m. Blooms April-June.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat generally lacking due to dense cover of non-native species, heavy disturbance, and past farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trifolium californica</em> coastal triquetrilla</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>Coastal bluff scrub, coastal scrub, 10-100 m.</td>
<td>None. No suitable habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Typical Habitat</td>
<td>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invertebrates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cochla globosa</em> globose dune beetle</td>
<td>LCP</td>
<td>Inhabits coastal dunes. Tunnels underneath dune vegetation.</td>
<td>None. No suitable habitat on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Danaus plexippus</em> monarch butterfly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter roost sites extend along the coast from northern Mendocino to Baja. Roosts in wind-</td>
<td>Low (roost site). No roost sites documented on the study area (CDFW 2015a), and no suitable roost sites observed on the study area. Planted Monterey cypress present on the project site but stand is small and lacks wind protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Euphydryas editha bayensis</em> Bay chockerspot butterfly</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Restricted to native grasslands on outcrops of serpentine soil near SF Bay. Plantago arenaria - primary host plant, with Orthocarpus densiflorus and <em>O. purpureus</em> secondary.</td>
<td>None. No suitable soil or host plants present on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Grapholitha edwardsiana</em> San Francisco tree lupine moth</td>
<td>LCP</td>
<td>Yellow bush lupine host plant for larvae of this species.</td>
<td>None. No yellow bush lupine observed on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tryonia inerita</em> California brackishwater snail</td>
<td>LCP</td>
<td>Inhabits coastal lagoons, estuaries, and salt marshes from Sonoma County south to San Diego County. Found only in permanently submerged areas in a variety of sediment types; able to withstand a wide range of salinities.</td>
<td>None. No suitable habitat on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eucyclogobius newberryi</em> tidewater goby</td>
<td>FE, SSC</td>
<td>Inhabits brackish water habitats along the California coast from San Diego to the Smith River. Found in shallow lagoons and lower stream reaches with fairly still, but not stagnant, water and high oxygen levels.</td>
<td>None. The Pilarcitos Creek reach on the study area does not support suitable brackish habitat for this species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</em> steelhead – central California coast</td>
<td>FT</td>
<td>From Russian River south to Sequo Creek and to, but not including, the Pajaro River. Also includes San Francisco and San Pablo Bay Basins.</td>
<td>None (project site). High (study area). Steelhead are known from Pilarcitos Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphibians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rana draytonii</em> California red-legged frog</td>
<td>FT, SSC</td>
<td>Breeds in semi-permanent and perennial water sources often with dense, shrewy or emergent riparian vegetation including stock ponds and marshes; uses a variety of wetland habitats including streams during the summer months.</td>
<td>Low (project site). High (study area). No breeding habitat present on the project site or surrounding study area. Potential foraging and sheltering habitat present along the creek in Central Coast Riparian Scrub. Could occur incidentally on the project site, especially during the rainy season. Documented along Pilarcitos Creek near the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Typical Habitat</td>
<td>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emys marmorata</em> western pond turtle</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Inhabits permanent or nearly permanent bodies of water in many habitat types below 6000 ft. elevation. Typically nests in grassy, open habitat.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable aquatic habitat present along Pilarcitos Creek but primarily expected to be used as a movement corridor since the Central Coast Riparian Scrub is shady with nearly a closed canopy; could potentially use Ruderal Herbaceous habitat on project site for nesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia</em> San Francisco garter snake</td>
<td>FE, SE, FP</td>
<td>Vicinity of freshwater marshes, ponds, and slow-moving streams in San Mateo and extreme northern Santa Cruz Counties. Prefers lentic habitat during the spring through fall that supports breeding a frog prey with nearby uplands that consist of a mosaic of grassland, scrub and woodland.</td>
<td>Low (project site). Moderate (study area). Suitable habitat present along Pilarcitos Creek and Central Coast Riparian Scrub, and could potentially use Ruderal Herbaceous habitat as upland habitat if present along the creek. Documented along Pilarcitos Creek near the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brachyramphus marmoratus</em> marbled murrelet</td>
<td>FT, SE</td>
<td>Nests in coastal forests from Eureka to Oregon border and from Half Moon Bay to Santa Cruz. Nests in old growth redwood-dominated forests, often in Douglas-fir, up to six miles inland.</td>
<td>None. No suitable nesting habitat present on the project site or study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buteo regalis</em> (wintering) Ferruginous hawk</td>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>Winters in expansive open grasslands; forages primarily on ground squirrels.</td>
<td>Low. Marginal foraging habitat in grassland patches; typically requires expansive grassland areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Circus cyaneus</em> (nesting) northern harrier</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Nests on ground in grassy vegetation, usually in proximity to a marsh or other water body.</td>
<td>Low. Marginal nesting habitat due to regular human use. Could forage on the project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Elanus leucurus</em> (nesting) white-tailed kite</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Open grassland, meadows, or marshes, for foraging, close to isolated, dense-topped trees for nesting and perching.</td>
<td>Low (project site). Moderate (study area). Not expected to use the project site due to human disturbance but may nest along the mature Central Coast Riparian Scrub in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Falco peregrinus annatum</em> Azorean peregrine falcon</td>
<td>FP, BCC</td>
<td>Near wetlands, lakes, rivers, or other water. On cliff banks, dunes, mounds, and human-made structures. Nest consists of a scrape, depression, or ledge in an open site.</td>
<td>Low. No nesting habitat present but expected to be seen infrequently but regularly along coast, including while foraging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Asio flammeus</em> (nesting) short-eared owl</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Nests in emergent wetland vegetation, tall grass, alfalfa fields.</td>
<td>Low. No nesting habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Selasphorus sasin</em> Allen's hummingbird</td>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Nests in narrow coastal belt in woodland and scrub habitats.</td>
<td>Moderate. Suitable nesting habitat present in trees and shrubs on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Picaoides nuttallii</em> Nuttall's woodpecker</td>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Nests in oak woodland and along riparian corridors.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable nesting habitat present in trees on the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Contopus cooperi</em></td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Nests primarily in coniferous forests with open</td>
<td>Low. No nesting habitat on project site or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Typical Habitat</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Olivesided flycatcher</em> (nesting) loggerhead shrike</td>
<td>BCC, SSC</td>
<td>Nests in isolated trees and shrubs; forages in open habitats.</td>
<td>Low. Potential habitat present but uncommon nesting species along coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Basileopus bornatus</em> oak titmouse</td>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Nests in oak, oak-pine and pinyon-juniper woodland.</td>
<td>Low. No nesting habitat on study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Geokichla citrina</em> red-winged blackbird</td>
<td>BCC, SSC</td>
<td>Fresh and salwater marshes. Requires thick, continuous cover down to water surface for foraging; nests in tall grasses, tule patches, and willows.</td>
<td>Moderate (study area). Suitable nesting habitat present along creek in Central Coast Riparian Scrub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ammotocoma savannarum</em> grasshopper sparrow</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Nests in short- to mid-height open grasslands.</td>
<td>Moderate. Potential nesting opportunities present in Ruderal Herbaceous habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Passerella sandwichensis</em> alaudinus Bryant’s savannah sparrow</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Nests in tidally influenced habitats and moist grasslands.</td>
<td>Low. Marginal nesting habitat on study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agelaius tricolor</em> tricolored blackbird</td>
<td>BCC, SSC</td>
<td>Nests in freshwater marsh; forages in grasslands and croplands.</td>
<td>Low. No nesting habitat on study area; may forage in Ruderal Herbaceous habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Riparia riparia</em> bank swallow</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Colonial nester. Nests primarily in riparian and other lowland habitats west of the desert. Requires vertical banks/cliffs with fine textured/sandy soils near streams, rivers, lakes, or ocean to dig nesting hole.</td>
<td>None. No suitable nesting habitat present on the project site or study area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mammals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Typical Habitat</th>
<th>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Neotoma fuscipes annectens</em> San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Riparian, coastal scrub and forest habitats of moderate canopy and moderate to dense understory. Constructs houses of sticks and other material.</td>
<td>Low (project site). Moderate (study area). Not expected on the project site due to lack of cover and excessive human disturbance. Suitable habitat present in Central Coast Riparian Scrub, but this area protected with a 50-foot buffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tusinea tasma</em> American badger</td>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>Most abundant in grassland, scrub and drier, open forest. Preys on burrowing rodents; digs burrows for dens and during foraging bouts.</td>
<td>Low. Marginal habitat on portions of study area but not expected due to regular human use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Antrozous pallidus</em> pallid bat</td>
<td>SSC, WBWG</td>
<td>Roosts in caves, trees and buildings; forages in variety of habitats.</td>
<td>Low. Marginal roosting habitat present in Central Coast Riparian Scrub but this area protected with a 50-foot buffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lastiusi blosevilli</em> western red bat</td>
<td>SSC, WBWG</td>
<td>Roosts in foliage of trees &amp; shrubs in riparian zones during winter months.</td>
<td>None (project site). Moderate (study area). Not expected on the project site due to lack of suitable roosting habitat and human disturbance. Potential roosting habitat present in Central Coast Riparian Scrub but this habitat will not be impacted by the proposed project and protected with a 50-foot buffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Typical Habitat</td>
<td>Potential for Occurrence on Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corynorhisus townsendi</td>
<td>SCT,</td>
<td>Roosts in caves, buildings, hollow redwoods; forage in many habitats.</td>
<td>Low. No suitable roosting habitat is present on the project site or surrounding study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend's big-eared bat</td>
<td>WBWG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myotis thysanodes</td>
<td>WBWG</td>
<td>Found in a wide variety of habitats, optimal are pinyon-juniper, valley and foothill hardwood and hardwood-conifer. Uses caves, mines, buildings, or crevices for maternity colonies and roosts.</td>
<td>Low. Potential foraging habitat present in Central Coast Riparian Scrub but suitable roost sites generally lacking from the study area and this area protected with a 50-foot buffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fringed myotis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myotis volans</td>
<td>WBWG</td>
<td>Roosts in trees, rock crevices, mines and buildings.</td>
<td>Low (project site). Moderate (study area). Not expected on the project site due to lack of suitable roosting habitat and human disturbance. Potential roosting habitat present in Central Coast Riparian Scrub but this habitat will not be impacted by the proposed project and protected with a 50-foot buffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-legged myotis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Status:**

- **BCC** Federal Bird of Conservation Concern
- **FE** Federal Endangered
- **FT** Federal Threatened
- **SE** State Endangered
- **ST** State Threatened
- **SCT** State Candidate Threatened
- **WBWG** Western Bat Working Group: High Priority Species
- **SSC** California Department of Fish and Wildlife Species of Special Concern
- **FP** California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fully Protected Species
- **IB** CNPS Rare Plant Rank of plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
- **2** CNPS Rare Plant Rank of plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California but more common elsewhere
- **3** CNPS Rare Plant Rank of plants for which more information is needed; a review list
- **4** CNPS Rare Plant Rank of plants of limited distribution; a watch list
- **1.1/2/3** Seriously endangered in California/Fairly endangered in California/Not very endangered in California
- **LCP** Listed in the 1993 City of Half Moon Bay LCP

*Appendix A*
Appendix B-1. Ruderal Herbaceous habitat on the project site, with evidence of wildlife use.

Appendix B-2. Central Coast Riparian Scrub along Pilarcitos Creek in background, with Ruderal Herbaceous habitat in foreground.
Appendix B-3. Pilarcitos Creek channel located on the study area north of the project site.

Appendix B-4. Developed/Landscaped habitat on the project site.
Appendix C. Plant species observed on the study area, September 10 and 15, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Alnus rubra</em></td>
<td>red alder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anagallis arvensis</em></td>
<td>scarlet pimpernel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Athyrium filix-femina</em></td>
<td>lady fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Avena sp.</em></td>
<td>wild oats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Baccharis pilularis</em></td>
<td>coyote brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bromus catharticus</em></td>
<td>rescue grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bromus diandrus</em></td>
<td>ripgut brome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bromus hordeaceus</em></td>
<td>soft chess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ceanothus papillosus</em></td>
<td>warty-leaved ceanothus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ceanothus sp.</em></td>
<td>ceanothus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cirsium vulgare</em></td>
<td>bull thistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chenopodium sp.</em></td>
<td>Chenopodium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Conium maculatum</em></td>
<td>poison hemlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Convolvulus arvensis</em></td>
<td>field bindweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cornus sp.</em></td>
<td>dogwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cortaderia sp.</em></td>
<td>pampas grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cyperus eragrostis</em></td>
<td>tall flatsedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dactylis glomerata</em></td>
<td>orchard grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Delairea odorata</em></td>
<td>cape ivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Epilobium ciliatum</em></td>
<td>willow herb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Epipactis helleborine</em></td>
<td>broad-leaved helleborine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Erigeron canadensis</em></td>
<td>horseweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eschscholtzia californica</em></td>
<td>California poppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Festuca myuros</em></td>
<td>rat-tail fescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Festuca perennis</em></td>
<td>Italian ryegrass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Festuca sp.</em></td>
<td>fescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Foeniculum vulgare</em></td>
<td>fennel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Helminthotheca echiorides</em></td>
<td>bristly ox-tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hesperocyparis macrocarpa</em></td>
<td>Monterey cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Heteromeles arbutifolia</em></td>
<td>toyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Iris sp.</em></td>
<td>cultivated iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Juncus effusus</em></td>
<td>soft rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Juncus patens</em></td>
<td>spreading rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lactuca serriola</em></td>
<td>prickly lettuce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lathyrus latifolius</em></td>
<td>everlasting pea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lotus corniculatus</em></td>
<td>bird’s-foot trefoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Malva parviflora</em></td>
<td>cheeseweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Malva sp.</em></td>
<td>mallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Myoporum sp.</em></td>
<td>myoporum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nasturtium officinale</em></td>
<td>water cress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oenanthe sarmentosa</em></td>
<td>water parsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Persicaria sp.</em></td>
<td>smartweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pinus sp.</em></td>
<td>pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polypogon monspeliensis</em></td>
<td>rabbits foot grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polystichum munitum</em></td>
<td>sword fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Populus trichocarpa</em></td>
<td>black cottonwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prunus spp.</em></td>
<td>prunus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudognaphalium luteoalbum</em></td>
<td>cudweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Raphanus sativus</em></td>
<td>wild radish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rosa spp.</em></td>
<td>cultivated rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rubus armeniacus</em></td>
<td>Himalayan blackberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rubus parviflorus</em></td>
<td>thimbleberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rubus ursinus</em></td>
<td>California blackberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rumex sp.</em></td>
<td>dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rumex crispus</em></td>
<td>curly dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salix laevigata</em></td>
<td>red willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salix lasiandra var. lasiandra</em></td>
<td>Pacific willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salix lasiolepis</em></td>
<td>arroyo willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sambucus racemosa</em></td>
<td>red elderberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Scirpus microcarpus</em></td>
<td>small-fruit bulrush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sequoia sempervirens</em></td>
<td>coast redwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Solanum nigrum</em></td>
<td>black nightshade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Spergularia sp.</em></td>
<td>sand-spurrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stachys ajugoides</em></td>
<td>hedge-nettle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Taraxacum officinale</em></td>
<td>common dandelion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trifolium sp.</em></td>
<td>clover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tropaeolum majus</em></td>
<td>garden nasturtium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Urtica dioica</em></td>
<td>stinging nettle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vinca major</em></td>
<td>periwinkle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = non-native species
Appendix D. Wildlife species observed or detected by sign on the study area, September 15, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Larus occidentalis</em></td>
<td>Western gull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Calypte anna</em></td>
<td>Anna's hummingbird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sayornis nigricans</em></td>
<td>Black phoebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poecile rufescens</em></td>
<td>Chestnut-backed chickadee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corvus corax</em></td>
<td>Common raven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Psaltriparus minimus</em></td>
<td>Bushtit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pipilo maculatus</em></td>
<td>Spotted towhee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pipilo crissalis</em></td>
<td>California towhee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Passerella iliaca</em></td>
<td>Fox sparrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Melospiza melodia</em></td>
<td>Song sparrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zonotrichia leucophrys</em></td>
<td>White-crowned sparrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carpodacus mexicanus</em></td>
<td>House finch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thomomys bottae</em></td>
<td>Botta's pocket gopher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Felis catus</em></td>
<td>House or feral cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Canis familiaris</em></td>
<td>Dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Canis latrans</em></td>
<td>Coyote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lynx rufus</em></td>
<td>Bobcat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

ACOE DELINEATION DATA FORMS
WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Arid West Region

Project/Site: 32 Jenna Lane (APN: 056-072-280) City/County: Half Moon Bay/San Mateo Co Sampling Date: 9/10/15
Applicant/Owner: Liu Jie, Yu Xian State: CA Sampling Point: 1
Investigator(s): T. Mahony, Coast Range Biological LLC Section, Township, Range: Mt. Diablo Meridian, T5S,R5W,sec29
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): remnant orchard Local relief (concave, convex, none): none Slope (%): 2
Subregion (LRR): Northwest Forests and Coast-LRR A Lat: 37.467690 Long: -122.437323 Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Denison clay loam, nearly level NWI classification: None

Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes _____ No ___ (If no, explain in Remarks.)
Are Vegetation _____, Soil _____, or Hydrology _____ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ___ No ___
Are Vegetation _____, Soil _____, or Hydrology _____ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydric Vegetation Present? Yes _____ No ___ Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes _____ No ___
Hydric Soil Present? Yes _____ No ___
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes _____ No ___

Remarks:
Ongoing drought. Seasonal wetland hydrology naturally problematic. Located in remnant orchard. No wetland parameters met.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum (Plot size: _________)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>= Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 5')</th>
<th>1. Baccharis pilaris</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>UPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5')</th>
<th>1. Helminthotheca echinoides</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>FACU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Convolvulus arvensis</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>UPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Juncus patens</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Cyperus eragrostis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Festuca myuros</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bromus hordeaceus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Conium maculatum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FACW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>= Total Cover</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: _________)</th>
<th>% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum</th>
<th>% Cover of Biotic Crust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dominance Test worksheet:
Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 1 (A)
Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 3 (B)
Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 33 (A/B)

Prevalence index worksheet:
Total % Cover of: Multiply by:
OBL species x 1 = 64
FACW species x 2 = 64
FAC species x 3 = 148
FACU species x 4 = 175
UPL species x 5 = 175
Column Totals: 104 (A) 387 (B)
Prevalence Index = B/A = 3.7

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:
- Dominance Test is >50%
- Prevalence Index is ≤3.0
- Morphological Adaptations¹ (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation¹ (Explain)

¹Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Remarks:
Scattered hydrophytic species present but sample point not dominated by hydrophytic vegetation.

US Army Corps of Engineers Arid West – Version 2.0
SOIL

Sampling Point: 1

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Redox Features</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>10YR 2/1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-20</td>
<td>10YR 2/1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.  2Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- Histosol (A1)
- Histic Epipedon (A2)
- Black Histic (A3)
- Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- Stratified Layers (A5) (LRR C)
- 1 cm Muck (A9) (LRR D)
- Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)
- Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils:

- 1 cm Muck (A9) (LRR C)
- 2 cm Muck (A10) (LRR B)
- Reduced Vertic (F18)
- Red Parent Material (F2)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if present):

- Type: clay layer
- Depth (inches): 6"

Hydric Soil Present? Yes No ✓

Remarks:

Low chroma matrix likely due to organic matter from vegetation. No redoximorphic features observed, but dark soils make observation difficult.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; check all that apply)

- Surface Water (A1)
- High Water Table (A2)
- Saturation (A3)
- Water Marks (B1) (Nonriverine)
- Sediment Deposits (B2) (Nonriverine)
- Drift Deposits (B3) (Nonriverine)
- Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- Water-Stained Leaves (B9)

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

- Salt Crust (B11)
- Biotic Crust (B12)
- Aquatic Invertebrates (B13)
- Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- Oxygenized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3)
- Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes No ✓ Depth (inches): None
Water Table Present? Yes No ✓ Depth (inches): None
Saturation Present? Yes No ✓ Depth (inches): None

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No ✓

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

None

Remarks:

Located in remnant orchard. No wetland hydrology indicators observed.
WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Arid West Region

Project/Site: 32 Jenna Lane (APN: 056-072-280) City/County: Half Moon Bay/San Mateo Co Sampling Date: 9/10/15
Applicant/Owner: Liu Jing, Yu Xian State: CA Sampling Point: 2
Investigator(s): T. Mahony, Coast Range Biological LLC Section, Township, Range: Mt. Diablo Meridian, T55S,R5W,sec29
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): former ag field Local relief (concave, convex, none): none Slope (%): 0
Subregion (LRR): Northwest Forests and Coast-LRR A Lat: 37.467936 Long: -122.437314 Datum: NAD 83
Soil Map Unit Name: Denison clay loam, nearly level NWI classification: None

Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ☑ No ☑ (if no, explain in Remarks.)
Are Vegetation _____, Soil _____, or Hydrology _____ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ☑ No ☑
Are Vegetation _____, Soil _____, or Hydrology _____ naturally problematic? (if needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☑ No ☑</th>
<th>Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?</th>
<th>Yes ☑ No ☑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydric Soil Present?</td>
<td>Yes ☑ No ☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Hydrology Present?</td>
<td>Yes ☑ No ☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
Ongoing drought. Seasonal wetland hydrology naturally problematic. Located in remnant agricultural field. No wetland parameters met.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum (Plot size: _________)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: _________) |                  |                  |                  |
|                                               |                  |                  |                  |
| 1.                                  |                  |                  |                  |
| 2.                                  |                  |                  |                  |
| 3.                                  |                  |                  |                  |
| 4.                                  |                  |                  |                  |
| 5.                                  |                  |                  |                  |
| = Total Cover                        |                  |                  |                  |

| Herb Stratum (Plot size: _________) | 5' |                  |                  |
| 1. Helminthotheca echoides | 80 | Y | FACU |
| 2. Raphanus sativus | 5  | N | UPL |
| 3. Rumex crispus | 5  | N | FAC |

| Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: _________) |                  |                  |
|                                            |                  |                  |
| 1.                                  |                  |                  |                  |
| 2.                                  |                  |                  |                  |
| = Total Cover                        |                  |                  |                  |

| % Bare Ground in Herb Stratum | 10 | % Cover of Biotic Crust |                  |

Remarks:
Sample point not dominated by hydrophytic vegetation.
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### SOIL

**Profile Description:** (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Redox Features</th>
<th>Texture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>10YR 2/2</td>
<td>100 none</td>
<td>clay loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>10YR 2/2</td>
<td>100 none</td>
<td>clay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. 2 Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

**Hydric Soil Indicators:** (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- Histosol (A1)
- Horizon (A2)
- Black Histic (A3)
- Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- Stratified Layers (A5) (LRR C)
- 1 cm Muck (A9) (LRR D)
- Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)
- Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)

**Restrictive Layer (if present):**
- Type: Clay layer
- Depth (inches): 4"  Hydric Soil Present? Yes No ✓

**Remarks:**
Low chroma matrix likely due to organic matter from vegetation. No redoximorphic features observed, but dark soils make observation difficult.

### HYDROLOGY

**Wetland Hydrology Indicators:**

**Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; check all that apply):**
- Surface Water (A1)
- High Water Table (A2)
- Saturation (A3)
- Water Marks (B1) (Nonriverine)
- Sediment Deposits (B2) (Nonriverine)
- Drift Deposits (B3) (Nonriverine)
- Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- Water-Stained Leaves (B9)

**Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):**
- Water Marks (B1) (Riverine)
- Sediment Deposits (B2) (Riverine)
- Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine)
- Drainage Patterns (B10)
- Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- Shallow Aquifard (D3)
- FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

**Field Observations:**
- Surface Water Present? Yes No ✓  Depth (inches): None
- Water Table Present? Yes No ✓  Depth (inches): None
- Saturation Present? Yes No ✓  Depth (inches): None

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No ✓

**Remarks:**
Located in remnant agricultural field. No wetland hydrology indicators observed.
**WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Arid West Region**

**Project/Site:** 32 Jenna Lane (APN: 056-072-280)  
**City/County:** Half Moon Bay/San Mateo Co  
**Sampling Date:** 9/10/15  
**Applicant/Owner:** Liu Jing, Yu Xian  
**State:** CA  
**Investigator(s):** T. Mahony, Coast Range Biological LLC  
**Section, Township, Range:** Mt. Diablo Meridian, T5S,R5W, sec29  
**Landform (hilislope, terrace, etc.):** slope  
**Local relief (concave, convex, none):** concave  
**Slope (%):** 10  
**Subregion (LRR):** Northwest Forests and Coast-LRR A  
**Lat:** 37.468337  
**Long:** -122.437285  
**Datum:** NAD 83  
**Soil Map Unit Name:** Denison loam, sloping  
**NVI classification:** None  

**Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year?** Yes [ ] No [x]  
(If no, explain in Remarks.)

**Are Vegetation_____, Soil_____, or Hydrology_____ significantly disturbed?** Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes [x] No [ ]

**Are Vegetation_____, Soil_____, or Hydrology_____ naturally problematic?** (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Yes [x] No [ ]</th>
<th>Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?</th>
<th>Yes [ ] No [x]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydric Soil Present?</td>
<td>Yes [x] No [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Hydrology Present?</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
Ongoing drought. Seasonal wetland hydrology naturally problematic. Located in remnant agricultural field dominated by dense Conium maculatum. Due to sloped topography, extensive disturbance, and lack of wetland hydrology and hydric soils, Conium appears to be responding to disturbance and coastal fog/stratus rather than wetland conditions.

**VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum (Plot size: ____________)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
<th>Dominance Test worksheet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Dominant Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 1 (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of Dominant Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100 (A/B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prevalence index worksheet:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total % Cover of:</th>
<th>Multiply by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL species</td>
<td>x 1 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACW species</td>
<td>x 2 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC species</td>
<td>x 3 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACU species</td>
<td>x 4 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPL species</td>
<td>x 5 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Totals:</td>
<td>(A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence Index</th>
<th>B/A =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:**

- [x] Dominance Test is >50%
- Prevalence Index is ≤3.0
- Morphological Adaptations (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation (Explain)

Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

**Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: ____________)**

| % Bare Ground in Herb Stratum | 15% Cover of Biotic Crust |

**Remarks:**
Sample point dominated by hydrophytic vegetation, but appears to be responding to disturbance and coastal fog/stratus rather than wetland hydrology.

US Army Corps of Engineers  
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WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Arid West Region

Project/Site: 32 Jenna Lane (APN: 056-072-280)  
City/County: Half Moon Bay/San Mateo Co  
Sampling Date: 9/10/15

Applicant/Owner: Liu Jing, Yu Xian  
State: CA  
Sampling Point: 4

Investigator(s): T. Mahony, Coast Range Biological LLC  
Section, Township, Range: Mt. Diablo Meridian, T5S,R5W,sec29

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): terrace  
Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave  
Slope (%): 2

Subregion (LRR): Northwest Forests and Coast-LRR A  
Lat: 37.468446  
Long: -122.437260  
Datum: NAD 83

Soil Map Unit Name: Farallone coarse sandy loam, nearly level  

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ☑ No ☑ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation _____, Soil _____, or Hydrology significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ☑ No ☑

Are Vegetation _____, Soil _____, or Hydrology ☑ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Yes ☑ No ☑</th>
<th>Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?</th>
<th>Yes ☑ No ☑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydric Soil Present?</td>
<td>Yes ☑ No ☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Hydrology Present?</td>
<td>Yes ☑ No ☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
Ongoing drought. Seasonal wetland hydrology naturally problematic. Located at edge of Pilarcitos Creek Central Coast Riparian Scrub. Would qualify as Riparian ESFA.

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum (Plot size: 10' )</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Indicator Species?</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Salix lasiolepis</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Y FACW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 5' )</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rubus ursinus</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cover: 80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' )</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Indicator Species?</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conium maculatum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N FACW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Delairea odorata</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N UPL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cover: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: )</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cover: 15

% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum: 5  
% Cover of Biotic Crust:  

Remarks:
Sample point dominated by hydrophytic vegetation.
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Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Redox Features</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>10YR 2/2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clay loam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>10YR 2/2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10YR 5/6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. 
2Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- Histosol Soil (A1)  [Sandy Redox (S5)]
- Histic Epipedon (A2)  [Stripped Matrix (S6)]
- Black Histic (A3)  [Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)]
- Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)  [Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)]
- Stratified Layers (A5)  [Depleted Matrix (F3)]
- 1 cm Muck (A6)  [Redox Dark Surface (F6)]
- Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)  [Depleted Dark Surface (F7)]
- Thick Dark Surface (A12)  [Redox Depressions (F8)]
- Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)  [Vernal Pools (F9)]
- Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils:

- 1 cm Muck (A9)  [LRR C]
- 2 cm Muck (A10)  [LRR B]
- Reduced Vertic (F18)
- Red Parent Material (TF2)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Restrictive Layer (if present):
Type: clay layer
Depth (inches): 12"

Hydric Soil Present?  Yes No ✓

Remarks:

Low chroma matrix likely due to organic matter from vegetation. Very faint redox observed in subsoil. Difficult to observed due to dark soils.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; check all that apply):

- Surface Water (A1)  
- High Water Table (A2)  
- Saturation (A3)  
- Water Marks (B1)  
- Sediment Deposits (B2)  
- Drift Deposits (B3)  
- Surface Soil Cracks (B6)  
- Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)  
- Water-Stained Leaves (B9)  
- Salt Crust (B11)  
- Biotic Crust (B12)  
- Aquatic Invertebrates (B13)  
- Oxygenized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3)  
- Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)  
- Thin Muck Surface (C7)  
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary indicators (2 or more required):

- Water Marks (B1)  
- Sediment Deposits (B2)  
- Drift Deposits (B3)  
- Drainage Patterns (B10)  
- Dry-Season Water Table (C2)  
- Clayfish Burrows (C8)  
- Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)  
- Shallow Aquitard (D3)  
- FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present?  Yes No ✓ Depth (inches): None
Water Table Present?  Yes No ✓ Depth (inches): None
Saturation Present?  Yes No ✓ Depth (inches): None

Wetland Hydrology Present?  Yes No ✓

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

None

Remarks:

Located in sloped remnant agricultural field that appears well-drained. No wetland hydrology indicators observed.
SOIL

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Redox Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Color (moist) %</td>
<td>Color (moist) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>10YR 2/2 100</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>10YR 2/2 99</td>
<td>10YR 5/6 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. 2Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- Histosol (A1) Sandy Redox (S5)
- Histid Epipedon (A2) Stripped Matrix (S6)
- Black Histic (A3) Loamy Mucky Mineral (F'1)
- Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- Stratified Layers (A5) (LRR C) Depleted Matrix (F'3)
- 1 cm Muck (A9) (LRR D) Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- Thick Dark Surface (A12) Redox Depressions (F8)
- Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) Vernal Pools (F9)
- Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)

Restrictive Layer (if present):
Type: clay layer
Depth (inches): 12"

Hydric Soil Present? Yes No ✔

Remarks:
No hydric soil indicators observed.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; check all that apply)
- Surface Water (A1) Salt Crust (B11)
- High Water Table (A2) Biotic Crust (B12)
- Saturation (A3) Aquatic invertebrates (B13)
- Water Marks (B1) (Nonriverine) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- Sediment Deposits (B2) (Nonriverine) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3)
- Drift Deposits (B3) (Nonriverine) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C5)
- Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)
- Water Marks (B1) (Riverine)
- Sediment Deposits (B2) (Riverine)
- Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine)
- Drainage Patterns (B10)
- Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:
Surface Water Present? Yes No ✔ Depth (inches): None
Water Table Present? Yes No ✔ Depth (inches): None
Saturation Present? Yes No ✔ Depth (inches): None

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No ✔

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:
None

Remarks:
Located at edge of Pilarcitos Creek Central Coast Riparian Scrub. No surface hydrology indicators observed. Riparian vegetation likely tapping into creek groundwater.
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April 22, 2016

Mr. Scott Phillips
Associate Planner
City of Half Moon Bay
501 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

RE: Addendum to BRA, 32 Jenna Lane, Half Moon Bay, California

Dear Mr. Phillips:

This letter is an addendum to a Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) report (CRB 2015) previously prepared for the project located at 32 Jenna Lane in Half Moon Bay, California ("project site"). The addendum was requested during a site visit conducted today on the project site by myself, you, City of Half Moon Bay Planning Manager Bruce Ambo, California Coastal Commission staff members Stephanie Rexing, Laurie Koteen, and Patrick Foster, and the project Applicant.

The primary issue discussed during the site visit was the presence of a dense stand (greater than ~80 to ~90 percent cover) of poison hemlock (Conium maculatum) adjacent to Central Coast Riparian Scrub along Pillaritos Creek. Poison hemlock is a moderately invasive (Cal-IPC 2016) non-native herbaceous plant species with a wetland-classified status (FAC in the Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast 2014 Regional Wetland Plant List and FACW in the Arid West 2014 Regional Wetland Plant List) (Lichvar et al. 2014). Therefore, the stand of poison hemlock could meet the "one-parameter" wetland definition in the California Coastal Act (CCA)/Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Program (LCP), where the presence of any one wetland parameter (hydrophytic vegetation, wetland hydrology, or hydric soils) is generally sufficient to delineate an area as wetland. Though the stand of poison hemlock would meet the "one-parameter" wetland definition and would not be directly impacted by the proposed project, the question raised during the site visit was whether a 100-foot wetland buffer should be applied from the edge of poison hemlock or the edge of Central Coast Riparian Scrub.

During the site visit, I mapped the edge of the poison hemlock stand with a Trimble GPS unit and subsequently incorporated it with previous biological data gathered during the preparation of the BRA (CRB 2015) (Figure 1). The location of the poison hemlock stand, adjacent Central Coast Riparian Scrub, and 100-foot buffers from both of these habitats are included in Figure 1. City of Half Moon Bay and CCC staff can use this habitat data to determine appropriate wetland buffers on the project site in conformance with the CCA/LCP.

In addition, the BRA identified potential nesting habitat on the study area (an area extending outward 200-feet from the project site) for white-tailed kite (Elanus leucurus). During a review of the BRA, CCC staff requested a buffer of 500-feet around any nesting raptors. However, due to extensive human disturbance in the area, a reduced buffer would likely be sufficient to protect raptors nesting in the area, and CCC staff concurred that any final buffers around nesting raptors should be determined based on the species present, the location of the nest in relation to project disturbance, and in consultation with the CCC and California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

---

1 Botanical nomenclature follows Baldwin et al. (2012).
2 See CRB (2015) for a detailed discussion of habitats and other descriptions of the project site and surrounding study area.
Please contact me if you have questions or need additional information. I would be happy to discuss these issues with CCC staff, other regulatory agency staff, or other project stakeholders to resolve any concerns regarding biological resources related to the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tom Mahony
Principal/Plant Ecologist
(831) 426-6226
coastrange@sbcglobal.net

REFERENCES


Scott Phillips  
Associate Planner  
City of Half Moon Bay  
501 Main Street  
Half Moon Bay, CA  
94109

Subject: Coastal Commission Staff Comments on Biological Resources Assessment for 32 Jenna Lane (APN 056-072-280) and Associated Extension Grand View Boulevard

Dear Mr. Phillips:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Biological Resource Assessment (BRA) prepared for the development of an 8000 square foot single-family residence and associated infrastructure, including removal of three trees and renovation of an existing residence on the 1.5 acre site, at 32 Jenna Lane, in Half Moon Bay. The BRA presents potential project-related impacts to biological resources, including special status wildlife as well as sensitive habitats. The report also recommends mitigation measures to reduce such impacts to biological resources.

Coastal Commission’s Staff Biologist, Dr. Laurie Koteen, assessed the biological report for adequacy of the analysis and to weigh in on the proposed project, impacts and mitigation measures proposed. Dr. Koteen concluded that the biological assessment did not adequately assess the wetland habitats onsite. Specifically, to clearly identify the extent of wetlands onsite, a formal wetland delineation is required. The BRA contains wetland points, but no mapping of wetlands. Additional points should be surveyed to designate the extent of the wetland along the creek. This will allow an appropriate wetland buffer to be designated that will adequately protect these sensitive habitats, in conformance with LCP Policies 3-3 and 3-5. The delineation should ideally be conducted in spring when plants can be easily identified.

Dr. Koteen also found that the proposed mitigation measures were inadequate. Specifically, she would suggest more detailed measures including but not limited to: a biological monitor checking frequently (not just once) for species the LCP designates as unique, such as California red-legged frogs (CRLF), or rare and endangered, such as and San Francisco garter snakes (SFGS); requiring construction outside of the bird breeding season (March 1 – August 31) until all young of the year have fledged; and setting appropriate buffers from nests if construction must occur during breeding season (and these buffers should be unequivocally specified, it is not adequate to designate “appropriate buffers”). Dr. Koteen also recommends attention to CRLF breeding season (November to April), and SFGS aboveground times (March to November), as well as required protection of gopher burrows, which provide shelter for aestivating snakes.
Further, there should be limits on the times of construction on a daily time scale (e.g., no construction and lighting at night), attention to noise levels, a greater specification about the locations of building materials/staging areas, etc. Overall, the report should recommend a more complete and protective suite of mitigation measures to adequately address protection of the sensitive species on site, the sensitive habitats (wetlands) found there, and in recognition of the wildlife corridor behind the house, where the reports states there is much evidence of wildlife.

This proposed development borders Pilarcitos Creek, a very important riparian corridor that contains sensitive habitats and supports sensitive species. In addition, the buffer areas around the Creek support wildlife dispersal corridor for many unique, rare and endangered species. The current mitigation program recommended does not adequately recognize, or protect, such sensitive habitat and species areas.

If you have any questions regarding these comments or wish to discuss the project further, please contact me at 415-597-5894.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Rexing
North Central District Supervisor
Scott Phillips
Associate Planner
City of Half Moon Bay
501 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA
94109

Subject: Coastal Commission Staff Comments on Biological Resources Assessment for 32 Jenna Lane (APN 056-072-280)

Dear Mr. Phillips:

Thank you for forwarding the response to our previous comment letter regarding the Biological Resource Assessment (BRA) for the subject development at 32 Jenna Lane, in Half Moon Bay. The response submitted by Coast Range Biological (CRB) on December 19, 2015, addresses the Coastal Commission’s assessment of the BRA for adequacy regarding environmental analysis, mitigation, and project design. Coastal Commission’s Staff Biologist, Dr. Laurie Koteen, reviewed the response and subsequently determined that further work is needed to refine wetland delineation, proposed mitigation measures, fencing, and water quality, as well as plans to address sensitive vegetation and wildlife.

Wetland Delineation

According to Coastal Commission policy, points 3 and 4 in the delineation conducted by CRB should be considered wetlands. Unlike the Army Corp of Engineers, Coastal Commission regulations establish a “one parameter definition” that only requires evidence of a single parameter (presence of either (1) hydric soils, (2) hydrophytes, or (3) surface water/saturated substrate) to establish wetland conditions (see 14 CCR § 13577). At both points 3 and 4, hydrophytic vegetation were found and denoted on the wetland delineation sheets. Due to the presence of this single wetland indicator, Dr. Koteen finds that the extent of the mapped wetland area extends along the length of the creek within the property. Moreover, because the delineation was conducted in September in the third of three consecutive drought years, the failure to find hydrology indicators is unsurprising. A further look into the extent of the floodplain at a wetter time of year may well indicate flooded or saturated soils in the vicinity of point 3, between points 3 and 4, or further upland of point 3.

In addition, CRB states that the most protective buffer would be an ESHA buffer, but this is not at all clear. If a wetland exists along the creek at the distance of sampling point 3, or at a greater distance further upland from the creek, it is conceivable that 100 feet extending from that wetland edge would exceed any buffer measured from the creek bank. Recognizing that the portion of the proposed structure closest to Pilarcitos Creek already exists, removal of these structures is not required. However, with regard to new construction, appropriate wetland buffers must be respected. This also applies to new landscaping, which should be limited to
areas outside the buffer zone, with the exception of native, site-appropriate species. To protect this buffer area further, Dr. Koteen strongly recommends a permanent wildlife-friendly fence be built along the wetland buffer margin to limit development to areas outside of this important migration corridor and to maintain at least a visual barrier between human activities and this sensitive region. Please see attached information regarding reptile and amphibian exclusion fencing. No other fencing should be built within the wetland buffer area or within the migration corridor.

Trees and other Vegetation

With regard to trees and other vegetation, Dr. Koteen finds the BRA and response lack a description of what species of trees will be cut down, how large the trees proposed for removal are, whether tree stumps will be left in place or removed, and what other vegetation is proposed for removal. A map of the location of trees and any other vegetation proposed for removal should be provided. Moreover, although no special status plants were found on the study site and are not expected to be found because of soil type and land use history, due diligence should include a survey during the season when plants are blooming. It does appear that this site was used agriculturally until quite recently. CRB states 1991 as a possible end date of farming, however, this site was plowed as recently as 2011 or later, according to Google Earth images. Special status plants can disperse to a new area any time following disturbance, therefore, a reexamination of the site in spring, and perhaps early summer, is highly recommended.

Mitigation Measures

Dr. Koteen also finds that several mitigation measures fail to adequately address environmental impacts. First, it is unclear in the wording of Mitigation Measure 1.a. whether construction personnel will receive a discussion and demonstration of best practices for wildlife avoidance in addition to the written guidelines that will be provided. Providing written copies alone is insufficient. Copies of the guidelines for wildlife avoidance should be posted at the construction site and made available for immediate consultation in the event of a siting of special status wildlife species.

Furthermore, only requiring surveys for the San Francisco garter snake (SFGS) and California red-legged frog (CRLF) two weeks prior to construction is too long an antecedent time period. Depending on the timing of the onset of construction, SFGS or CRLF could appear at any time on the construction site. The Coastal Commission prefers a survey to be performed immediately prior to fencing the area and immediately prior to the onset of construction activities. This area is almost certainly used by CRLF and SFGS, as well as other wildlife species indicated in the BRA, that could potentially become trapped inside the fencing (e.g., Western fence lizard, the gopher snake, Dusky-footed woodrat). A biological monitor should check the construction area each morning, instead of once per week, to ensure no species are trapped inside or caught up in the fencing. Construction personnel alone checking for sensitive species is insufficient. In addition, if there are currently gopher burrows in locations where grading or construction is to occur, these burrows should be carefully excavated prior to construction or grading to ensure that wildlife are not trapped within them. SFGS may be hibernating during winter months and may emerge from the burrows of the abundant Botta’s pocket gopher after the start of construction. CRLF may also take cover in gopher burrows. It may be impossible to fully avoid SFGS and CRLF by simply confining construction to outside the breeding and migrating seasons, therefore, the measures to ensure against accidental take of these species must be strictly applied. This area
is rich with wildlife, protection of which can be compatible with this project, if mitigation and protective measures are carefully implemented.

Landscape and Fencing

Dr. Koteen suggests that the site landscaping, and possibly building construction, may impede on the wetland/wildlife corridor buffer zone. Therefore, mapping and/or project plans documenting any proposed permanent fencing, and any proposed landscaping for this site should be provided in order to conduct proper project evaluation. Landscaping, unless very minimal, and consisting of appropriate native vegetation, should be excluded from the wetland buffer area. A map of the proposed construction fencing is also suggested for evaluation prior to issuance of the permit. This map should include the location and width of the migration corridor, as well as the location of the pocket gopher burrows relative to the proposed location of construction fencing. Fencing should not be located within the 100’ wetland buffer zone. Please review the attached guidelines in considering the type of fencing to be used and its overall specifications, and provide a diagram showing the design of the one-way escape funnels through the fencing.

White-Tailed Kite and other Bird Species

Based on the possible presence of the White-tailed Kite, a survey should be conducted within 500 feet of the site if any construction is to occur within the bird breeding season, from February 1 to August 31. If nesting birds are found to exist within this area and time period, as suggested in the mitigation measures proposed by CRB, all construction should cease until the young of the year have fledged. A construction buffer zone with a surrounding radius of 500 feet around active nests is suggested for raptor species (not 250 feet, as suggested by CRB). For special status birds that are not raptors, a buffer of 100 feet from nests is suggested, while a minimum 50 foot buffer should be provided for all other birds.

Water Quality

Water can become contaminated by various chemicals or additives contained in building materials, sealants, and paints used in large construction projects such as the one planned for this property. Moreover, water contamination can concentrate within small streams due to the placement of building materials and the lack of appropriate drainage associated with a fully-built structure. Dr. Koteen recommends that a drainage and water quality plan be required due to the potential for an extended duration of construction, and because the property is adjacent to a creek that supports many special status species, including a distinct population of steelhead trout. This plan should detail best management practices for drainage during construction and measures to prevent potentially contaminated storm waters from entering Pilarcitos Creek as a special condition of this permit.

If you have any questions regarding these comments or wish to discuss the project further, please contact me at 415-904-5267.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patrick Foster
North Central District Planner
December 19, 2015

Mr. Scott Phillips
Associate Planner
City of Half Moon Bay
501 Main Street
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

RE: Response to BRA Comments from California Coastal Commission, 32 Jenna Lane, Half Moon Bay, California

Dear Mr. Phillips:

This letter addresses comments from the California Coastal Commission (CCC) that were included in a letter dated December 18, 2015 for the project located at 32 Jenna Lane in Half Moon Bay, California. The proposed project on the property involves construction of a single-family residence and associated infrastructure. A Biological Resources Assessment (BRA) report (CRB 2015) was prepared for the project to analyze potential biological issues on the project site (which consisted of the entire 32 Jenna Lane property), the “project footprint” (the location of proposed construction), and a 200-foot “study area” around the project site (Figure 1). Responses to the comments are presented below.

Wetlands

CCC staff requested that a formal wetland delineation be conducted to identify wetlands “onsite.” A formal wetland delineation was conducted on the project site for the BRA, as stated in Section 2.3.2 of the report, and delineation sample point datasheets were included in Appendix E. No wetlands were mapped on the project site during the delineation because no wetlands were identified. Where riparian Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) were identified in Central Coast Riparian Scrub on the project site (such as Sample Point 4), they were mapped as part of the delineation. Wetland delineation sampling did not extend beyond the project site boundary onto the surrounding study area for the following reasons: (1) dense and in some cases impenetrable vegetation in Central Coast Riparian Scrub made access extremely difficult in many areas outside of the project site; (2) the Pilarcitos Creek channel is located off of the 32 Jenna Lane property¹, and delineation sample points were only collected in areas where access was granted as part of the BRA scope; and (3) most importantly, since the closest section of Pilarcitos Creek to the project footprint is ~175 to ~250-feet (depending on a final determination of project ground disturbance and with the incorporation of additional buffering for wildlife corridors, discussed below), the Central Coast Riparian Scrub ESHA buffer extends ~50-feet further onto the project site than would a 100-foot buffer of any Pilarcitos Creek wetlands, as shown in Figure 1 of this letter. Therefore, it was determined during preparation of the BRA that wetland sampling along the creek was logistically challenging and would not result in any additional protective ESHA buffers for the project. No wetlands (or Pilarcitos Creek itself, as discussed for steelhead on page 10 of the BRA) would be directly or indirectly impacted by the project, and any wetlands potentially present in Pilarcitos Creek would have ESHA protective buffers of at least ~175 to ~250-feet (Figure 1).

¹ The 32 Jenna Lane property is considered the “project site” at the request of City of Half Moon Bay staff, but project construction will only occur on a portion of the project site, labeled “project footprint” in Figure 1 of this letter. No plans showing additional areas of ground disturbance, such as construction staging areas, were available for review as part of the BRA and the location of these areas, and analysis of associated impacts, was not possible. Additional measures to address project ground disturbance are included in this letter.
California Red-legged Frog and San Francisco Garter Snake

CCC staff raised concerns regarding California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*) (CRLF) and San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*) (SFGS) on the project site. In particular, CCC staff requested increased biological monitoring for these species during project construction as well as greater attention in the BRA to the CRLF breeding season (November-April) and SFGS aboveground activity period (March-November), and protection of gopher burrows, which could provide shelter for aestivating SFGS, if present.

As stated in the BRA (page 10-11): "The reach of Pilarcitos Creek within the study area does not provide breeding habitat, but the riparian corridor offers appropriate summering habitat for CRLF and foraging and sheltering habitat for some size classes all year round. The project site, and in particular the location of proposed ground disturbance, does not offer aquatic non-breeding habitat. However, CRLF could occur incidentally on the project site during project ground disturbance (primarily in the wet season during dispersal to breeding sites)."

Also, on page 11 of the BRA: "Although the habitat on the project site, and in particular the location of project ground disturbance, is disturbed, high numbers of Botta's pocket gopher burrows are present (which could be used by SFGS for predator protection), and SFGS could occur on the project site during project ground disturbance."

Therefore, the BRA noted that breeding habitat for CRLF is absent from the project site and surrounding study area, but stated that CRLF could occur on the project site during dispersal to breeding sites during the rainy season, and SFGS could also occur on the project site. Due to the November-April dispersal period for CRLF and the March-November activity period for SFGS (though, as discussed in the BRA, the activity period could potentially occur in any season if appropriate temperatures are present), seasonal avoidance during construction for these species would not be possible, since movement by one or both of these species is possible any time of year. Therefore, the BRA recommended exclusion fencing to address potential impacts to these species during construction.

However, to address CCC concerns about CRLF and SFGS on the project site, we recommend the following revisions to Mitigation Measures for CRLF and SFGS that were included in the BRA (only the revised Mitigation Measures are included here):

**Mitigation Measure 1b:** Prior to construction, the project disturbance envelope (encompassing all ground disturbance associated with the project, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, and material storage) shall be clearly identified on project site plans, shall be located as far as feasible from the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor, and shall be located outside of the 50-foot ESHA buffer, as well as the wildlife movement corridor extending 25-feet from the ESHA buffer edge (as described in Mitigation Measure 3). Exclusion fencing shall be installed around the entire work area under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Fencing shall be at least 36 inches above ground level and buried at least 6 inches into the ground, and shall have a gate or similar opening to allow access to the work area, but shall be sealed closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels for snakes. The fencing shall be monitored daily by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist at least once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project. All ground disturbance associated with project construction, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, material
storage, and parking, shall occur within the fenced area, and no construction equipment or personnel shall enter areas outside of the fenced area.

**Mitigation Measure 1c:** A qualified biologist shall monitor all removal of vegetation on the project site. Immediately prior to vegetation removal, the qualified biologist shall survey the work area for CRLF and SFGS. If CRLF and SFGS are observed in the work area, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW contacted for guidance. If no CRLF or SFGS are observed during the vegetation removal effort, then no additional biological monitoring (other than exclusion fence inspections, mentioned above) shall be performed unless a CRLF or SFGS is subsequently reported by construction personnel or others in the area. If a CRLF or SFGS is observed on or near the project site, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted immediately, and they may require daily biological monitoring and other mitigation measures.

**Mitigation Measure 1d:** Exposed trenches resulting from project construction shall be backfilled as soon as work is complete. Open trenches shall have an escape ramp every 50-feet or less (composed of earthen material no greater than 45 degrees) installed at each end before nightfall each work day so that any entrapped wildlife may exit. To reduce impacts to nocturnal species in the area, construction shall be limited to daylight hours and no construction lighting shall remain at night.

**Nesting Bird Species**

The Mitigation Measure for nesting birds is revised as follows:

**Mitigation Measure 2:** If feasible, project construction shall take place outside of the February 1 to August 31 breeding bird season. If project construction must be conducted during the breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey throughout areas of suitable habitat within 250 feet of the project site within 30 days prior to the onset of any construction activity. The qualified biologist shall survey as often as necessary throughout the entire breeding season to ensure that no native species are disturbed during the breeding season. If bird nests are observed, buffer zones shall be established around all active nests to protect nesting adults and their young from construction disturbance. Buffer zone distances, which depend to some degree on the species and shall be established in consultation with CDFW, are typically 25-50-feet around native passerines, 100-feet around special-status passerines, and 250-feet or more around raptors. Work within the buffer zone shall be postponed until all the young are fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.

**Wildlife Corridors**

The BRA identified a wildlife corridor on the study area (page 15): “The study area, including Pilarcitos Creek, Central Coast Riparian Scrub, and adjacent Ruderal Herbaceous habitat, is used as a movement corridor for native wildlife (see Section 3.2). The proposed house will be located adjacent to dense development to the south and east, which impedes wildlife movement, and the Central Coast Riparian Scrub will be protected with a 50-foot buffer. However, a game trail with abundant evidence of wildlife use is present along and within ~25-feet of the 50-foot Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge.”

In addition to the Central Coast Riparian Scrub ESHA and the 50-foot buffer extending outward from the ESHA, which would be protected from any future development, the BRA recommended an additional 25-feet from the ESHA buffer edge (which would extend 75-feet from the ESHA edge itself) as an area where no significant barriers to wildlife movement should be placed in the future. Due to the location of the proposed house, with existing development to the south and east, this should ensure a wildlife corridor of at least ~175 feet wide from the south edge of Pilarcitos Creek onto the project site.
in perpetuity, encompassing the creek itself, Central Coast Riparian Scrub, and Ruderal Herbaceous habitats. However, the following changes are proposed to Mitigation Measure 3 to address CCC’s concerns:

**Mitigation Measure 3:** Any fencing located within 25-feet of the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge (which would extend 75-feet from the edge of Central Coast Riparian Scrub), shall be wildlife friendly (such as split rail or other fencing that allows for the passage of wildlife). No other significant barriers to wildlife movement shall be placed in this area, and this area shall not be located within the area of wildlife exclusion fencing installed during project construction, as described in Mitigation Measure 1b, or otherwise impacted by project construction. Native landscaping in the movement corridor is encouraged to promote native cover, habitat diversity, and to screen the movement corridor from the proposed house, but landscaping shall not be of a type and density to prohibit wildlife movement through the area. In addition, all mammal burrows, including gopher burrows, shall remain undisturbed in this area to provide habitat for SFGS and other wildlife.

Please contact us if you have questions or need additional information. We would be happy to discuss these issues with CCC staff, other regulatory agency staff, or other project stakeholders to resolve any concerns regarding biological resources related to the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tom Mahony
Principal/Plant Ecologist
(831) 426-6226
coastrange@sbcglobal.net

[Signature]

Mark Allaback
Certified Wildlife Biologist*
Biosearch Associates, Santa Cruz
(831) 662-3938

**REFERENCES**

Hello Stephanie,

Attached to this e-mail is the letter from the biologist for this project (Coast Range Biological LLC), whom we all met at the site last week. The project biologist was asked to map the location of the general transition line between the poison hemlock dominated land and land covered by a mixture of ruderal plants. The attached letter identifies that the stand of poison hemlock meets the one-parameter definition of wetland. One unanswered question from our site inspection (and noted in the attached letter) remains that whether the 100-foot wetland buffer should be applied to the identified edge of the hemlock stand.

Bruce and I took a closer look at the City’s LCP in relation to the wetland buffer requirement. In regard to the LUP, Policy 3-11 (Establishment of Buffer Zones) (C) states, “Along lakes, ponds, and other wet area, extend buffer zones 100 feet from the high water point, except for man-made ponds and reservoirs used for agricultural purposes for which no buffer zone is designated.” IP Section 18.38.080(D) contains similar language which states, “The minimum buffer surrounding lakes, ponds, and marshes shall be one hundred feet, measured from the high water point, except no buffer is required for manmade ponds and reservoirs used for agriculture.” As you can see, the LCP policy and ordinance referenced above, both tie the wetland buffer requirement to a “high water point”.

In relation to the vicinity of the hemlock stand that we all inspected at the subject property, such high water mark does not exist. That said, we do not see the wetland buffer requirement applying to this particular project. The 50 foot buffer from the limit of riparian vegetation would, however, apply (IP Section 18.38.075(D)). Ironically, the applicant has designed the footprint 100 feet away from the edge of the hemlock stand as shown on the attached map. The correct interpretation of the wetland buffer requirement within the LCP is still important as it relates to other future projects within the City.

We hope that you and your staff would consider this information in evaluating this project as it relates to the LCP. We appreciate any feedback that you may have. Feel free to contact me and/or Bruce with any questions.

_______________________________________________________

Scott Phillips
Associate Planner
Phone: 650-726-8299
Email: sphillips@hmbcity.com

City of Half Moon Bay
501 Main Street
### Biological Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALG-MM1</strong>: In order to reduce glare and light impacts on the surrounding properties, all new exterior light fixtures associated with the new residence shall be shielded and facing downward. No flood lights would be allowed with the new improvements on the site.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM1a</strong>: Within two weeks prior to the start of construction, a worker education program shall be presented at the project site by a qualified biologist. Associated written material will be distributed. It shall be the onsite foreman’s responsibility to ensure that all construction personnel and subcontractors receive a copy of the education program. The education program shall include a description of the CRLF and SFGS and their habitat, the general provisions of the Endangered Species Act, the necessity of adhering to the Act to avoid penalty, measures implemented to avoid affecting CRLF and SFGS specific to the project and the work boundaries of the project.</td>
<td>Prior to start of construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, &amp; Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM1b</strong>: Prior to construction, the project disturbance envelope (encompassing all ground disturbance associated with the project, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, and material storage) shall be clearly identified on project site plans, shall be located as far as feasible from the Pilarcitos Creek riparian corridor, and shall be located outside of the 50-foot ESHA buffer, as well as the wildlife movement corridor extending 25-feet from the ESHA buffer edge (as described in Mitigation Measure 3). Exclusion fencing shall be installed around the entire work area under the supervision of a qualified biologist. Fencing shall be at least 36 inches above ground level and buried at least 6 inches into the ground, and shall have a gate or similar</td>
<td>Prior to start of construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, &amp; Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opening to allow access to the work area, but shall remain closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels for snakes. The fencing shall be monitored daily by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist at least once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project. All ground disturbance associated with project construction, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, material storage, and parking, shall occur within the fenced area, and no construction equipment or personnel shall enter areas outside of the fenced area.

**BIO-MM1c**: A qualified biologist shall monitor all removal of vegetation on the project site. Immediately prior to vegetation removal, the qualified biologist shall survey the work area for CRLF and SFGS. If CRLF and SFGS are observed in the work area, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW contacted for guidance. If no CRLF or SFGS are observed during the vegetation removal effort, then no additional biological monitoring (other than exclusion fence inspections, mentioned above) shall be performed unless a CRLF or SFGS is subsequently reported by construction personnel or others in the area. If a CRLF or SFGS is observed on or near the project site, work shall cease and the USFWS and CDFW shall be contacted immediately, and they may require daily biological monitoring and other mitigation measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opening to allow access to the work area, but shall remain closed when not in use, particularly overnight. Fencing can be made of plywood and/or erosion mesh (or other suitable materials, as determined by a qualified biologist), and shall contain one-way escape funnels for snakes. The fencing shall be monitored daily by construction personnel and inspected by a qualified biologist at least once per week (after the fence is installed and functioning, the fence monitoring schedule can be adjusted based on the recommendations of a qualified biologist), and shall remain intact for the duration of the project. All ground disturbance associated with project construction, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, staging, material storage, and parking, shall occur within the fenced area, and no construction equipment or personnel shall enter areas outside of the fenced area.</td>
<td>Prior to removal of vegetation and during the removal of vegetation.</td>
<td>Project Biologist, &amp; Construction Manager</td>
<td>Project Biologist Log and Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM1d</strong>: Exposed trenches resulting from project construction shall be backfilled as soon as work is complete. Open trenches shall have an escape ramp every 50-feet or less (composed of earthen material no greater than 45 degrees) installed at each end before nightfall each work day so that any entrapped wildlife may exit. To reduce impacts to nocturnal species in the area, construction shall be limited to daylight hours and no construction lighting shall remain at night.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager, and Project Biologist</td>
<td>Project Biologist Log and Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM2</strong>: If project construction is conducted during the February 1 to August 15 breeding bird season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction breeding bird survey throughout area of suitable habitat within 300 feet of the project site within 30 days prior to the onset of any construction activity. If bird nests are observed, an appropriate buffer zone shall be established around all active nests to protect nesting adults and their young from construction disturbance. Buffer zones shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with CDFW based on the site conditions and the species potentially impacted. Work within the buffer zone shall be postponed until all the young are fledged, as determined by a qualified biologist.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-MM3</strong>: Any fencing located within 25-feet of the Central Coast Riparian Scrub buffer edge shall be wildlife friendly (such as split rail or other fencing that allows for the passage of wildlife). No other</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant barriers to wildlife movement shall be placed in this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR-MM1:</strong> Pursuant to Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, and Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California, in the event of the discovery of human remains during construction, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains. The County Coroner shall be notified and shall make a determination as to whether the remains are Native American. If the Coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his authority, he shall notify the California Native American Heritage Commission who shall attempt to identify descendants of the deceased Native American(s). If no satisfactory agreement can be reached as to the disposition of the remains pursuant to this State law, then the permittee shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR-MM2:</strong> If subsurface historic or archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect archaeological resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALEO-MM1: If subsurface geologic and/or paleontological resources are uncovered during construction, all work shall stop, the applicant shall notify the Community Development Director and retain a qualified geologist and/or paleontologist to perform reconnaissance and identify any mitigation measures required to protect such resources. Subsurface excavation shall not resume until expressly authorized by the Community Development Director.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ-MM1: Prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit, the applicant will be required to submit plans demonstrating on-site detention limiting storm water discharge from the site to pre-development levels in conformance with City standards. The impact would be less than significant.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WQ-MM2: Compliance with the City’s NPDES (storm water control) requirements and SWRCB’s General Construction Permit for erosion and sedimentation control during the construction period will be required throughout the construction process.</td>
<td>Throughout construction</td>
<td>Property Owner, Construction Manager</td>
<td>City Inspector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A: Comment Letters A
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

The Notice of Intent was distributed in compliance with California Administrative Code, Section 15072, advertising the public comment period from June 22, 2016 to July 11, 2016, requesting comments on the adequacy of the Draft Initial Study (IS)/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). One comment e-mail was received during this comment period.

One comment e-mail was received during the statutory comment period under CEQA. This Response to Comments document lists the individual who provided comments on the Draft IS/MND during the Notice of Intent public comment period. The City of Half Moon Bay, the lead Agency for this project, has responded to the comments received on the adequacy of the Draft IS/MND and other concerns related to the project.

SECTION 2: LIST OF COMMENTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Matt Berman</td>
<td>July 11, 2016</td>
<td>July 8, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 3: RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

The City is providing this response to comments as a courtesy and in hopes that the responses resolve the questions posed. A comment number that corresponds to the letter and specific comment the response addresses identifies all responses. The comment letters are provided in Appendix A.

Response to Comment Letter A: California Coastal Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>This comment states that an existing hedge and trees along the eastern property line and driveway easement is overgrown and out of compliance with applicable zoning regulations. A request is also indicated within the comment letter, requesting that all of the vegetation along the eastern side of the subject property and access easement be removed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This comment is not related to the adequacy of the draft CEQA document but expresses concerns related to the overgrown hedge and trees along the eastern property line and eastern side of the access easement. Trimming of the hedge along the corner of the easement will be required prior to the final inspection for the project. Standard Condition of Approval #A7 requires that landscaping comply with the Line of Site requirement at all times.

The comment also references an agreement that was discussed during the City Council review of an appeal of the Planning Commission’s decision to approve a new residence along Jenna Lane. The agreement was between the developer and appellants. The appealed projects along Jenna Lane included new residences at 12 and 28 Jenna Lane and not the subject property. The appeal was withdrawn without the referenced agreement added as an additional Condition of Approval or recorded at the County Recorder’s Office. Therefore, the City does not have the authority to enforce such agreement.
Scott Phillips

From: Matt Berman <matt@mattshouse.net>
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2016 11:16 AM
To: Scott Phillips
Cc: Deborah Penrose; John Muller; Marina Fraser; Debbie Ruddock; Rick Kowalczyk
Subject: Response to File No. PDP-15-051

Dear Mr. Phillips and Members of the City Council,

This letter is in response to File No. PDP-15-051. Coastal Development Permit, Use Permit and Architectural Review to allow the construction of a new two-story 8,290 square-foot single-family residence, including a three-car attached garage, remodel of the existing guesthouse on the site and associated site improvements. The project area is located on 32 Jenna Lane (APN 056-072-280), which is at the northern terminus of Jenna Lane at Cypress Avenue, north of Kelly Avenue and approximately 0.20 miles west of Highway 1 (Cabrillo Highway) in the City of Half Moon Bay. The project area encompasses the entirety of APN 056-072-280.

I’d like to point out several problems with this project and this property, aside from the glaringly obvious point that the mammoth size of this project is wildly out of any pretense of scale with the neighborhood.

First, this property currently is, and has been for some time, in violation of numerous Zoning Codes, the city’s LCP, California Civil Code, HMB Municipal Code, San Mateo County Code, and the Specific Plan (see below for details on all of these). An escallonia hedge, that grows to 30 ft. tall, and a row of fast-growing evergreen trees, have been planted along the east property line of 32 Jenna Lane, and along the east side of their driveway easement, in violation of the codes cited below.

Second, an agreement was reached before the City Council on September 18, 2001, between the neighbors of Pilarcitos Park and Bob Williamson, the developer who wanted to build houses on the Matteucci Tract. The agreement, made at the urging of the Council and with the participation of its members, including the Mayor, and read into the minutes of the Council meeting, was made in good faith by all parties, and was to be attached to the property folder in the City records, be provided in the disclosure packet with each property going forward, and travel with the property to each successive owner. As each of the Jenna Lane houses went up for sale I checked with the listing agents to make sure the agreement was in the disclosure packets. It was. As I got to know each new Jenna Lane neighbor I asked if they were aware of it. They were. City Staff reports stated that the agreement is valid and must be enforced. The hedge runs right down the middle of the easement granted to the city in that agreement.

I request, before the approval is granted, that the hedge along the east side of the property, and the row of trees behind it, be removed, and that the project be adjusted to conform to all of the codes and CDP below, and to the Matteucci Agreement.

Sincerely,

Matt Berman
445A Cypress Ave.
Half Moon Bay, California

The original CDP contained 2 conditions for approval:

1. FENCING. All fencing in and around the property shall be of open design. Fencing in the front yard setback shall be limited to four feet in height.

2. LANDSCAPING / VIEW CORRIDOR. No landscaping over seven feet in height shall be permitted between the subject building and the adjacent houses to preserve a view corridor between buildings.

The specific zoning codes involved are:

18.06.040.B.4. - Within the Sight Distance of any corner ... shrubs must be trimmed to a maximum height of three feet.
18.06.040.C.2.a. - Fences, walls, and hedges located within a required front yard setback area or within the Site Distance area ... shall be limited to a maximum height of three feet.
18.21.030.A2: The design and aesthetic compatibility with neighboring properties and uses including visibility and effect upon view at all site lines.
18.37.010 - The specific purpose and intent of these visual resource protection standards are to:
- Protect the scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas as a resource of public importance.
- Ensure that new development is located so as to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas.
18.37.030.2. - A landscaping plan shall be provided which incorporates landscaping species which, when mature, will not interfere with public views of the ocean.
18.37.050.F. - In general, trees and large shrubs should be planted a minimum of fifteen feet away from any major structure.

California Coastal Act Section 30251:
The scenic and visual qualities of the coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas ... New development ... shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.

The Statewide Interpretive Guidelines adopted by the California Coastal Commission establish the Coastal Act’s concern with “the protection of ocean and coastal views from public areas. As such, the Land Use Policies of Chapter Seven of the City’s Land Use Plan specifically address views of scenic areas and visual resources that are visible from public roads and trails.

California Civil Code Section 841.4
Any fence or other structure in the nature of a fence unnecessarily exceeding 10 feet in height maliciously erected or maintained for the purpose of annoying the owner or occupant of adjoining property is a private nuisance. Any owner or occupant of adjoining property injured either in his comfort or the enjoyment of his estate by such nuisance may enforce the remedies against its continuance prescribed in Title 3, Part 3, Division 4 of this code. See, Wilson v. Handley, 97 Cal.App.3d 1301 (2002), where the Appellate Court ruled that a row of trees planted in the nature of a fence along the property line does constitute a "structure" under California Civil Code Section 841.4, could be deemed a spite fence and hence illegal.

Half Moon Bay Municipal Code
18.06.040 Specific development standards.

C. Height of Fences, Walls, Gates and Hedges. The height of a fence, wall or hedge shall be measured vertically from the natural or finished existing grade, whichever is lower, at the base of the fence, wall or hedge to the top of the fence, wall or hedge above that grade. The following specific criteria shall apply in all residential districts:

1. Driveway Gates. Decorative gates may extend up to one foot higher than the fence height permitted that location.
2. Maximum Height. The maximum height of a solid fence, wall or hedge shall be as follows:

   - Front Limited Height. Fences, walls, and hedges located within a required front yard setback area within the site distance area as defined herein shall be limited to a maximum height of three feet.
   - Rear Limited Height. Fences, walls, and hedges located to the rear of the required front yard setback area shall be limited to a maximum height of six feet, unless this area is also within the site distance area as defined herein, in which case the maximum height shall not exceed three feet in the site distance area.
   - Trellis or Rails. An additional one foot of fence or wall height is permitted on front yard, rear yard and interior side yard fences, only if the added fencing has openings comprising at least fifty percent of the added area (such as lath trellis or rails).
   - Retaining Wall Fence. Where a retaining wall protects a cut below existing grade or contains a fill above the existing grade and is located on the line separating lots, such retaining wall may be topped by a fence, wall or hedge with the maximum total height not to exceed six feet.

County of San Mateo
27.84 Fences, Trees and Hedges
Chapter 27.84
FENCES, TREES AND HEDGES
27.84.010 FENCES — HEIGHT LIMITATION. No fence, wall or similar structure exceeding six (6) feet in height shall be erected, constructed or maintained on a property line or within a required yard area as defined in Title 27, except in the following instances:
(a) Street Yards. The maximum height within a front yard or street side yard, as defined in Title 27, shall be three (3) feet, except that:
(1) Fence or wall posts not more than 12 inches wide may be 42 inches (3-1/2 feet) tall, and
(2) Entry structures, such as trellises, over pedestrian gates may be eight (8) feet tall and not more than five (5) feet wide.
(b) Street Intersections and Driveways. The maximum height of fences and hedges near street intersections and driveways shall be limited to three (3) feet when located:
(1) Within the triangular area of private property formed by the extension of intersection curb lines, or pavement edge where no curb exists, and the diagonal line connecting the point on each of the two streets at a distance of forty-five (45) feet back from the intersection, as illustrated hereafter, or
(2) Within the triangular area of private property formed by lines ten (10) feet in length from the point of intersection of the edge of driveways on the subject property or adjacent properties and the edge of the sidewalk closest to the private property, as illustrated hereafter.
(c) Side and Rear Property Line Fences. The maximum height along interior side or rear property line outside of required front or street side yards shall be eight (8) feet provided that:
(1) A building permit, applied for by all property owners abutting the property line fence, is issued pursuant to Title 23, and
(2) Fifty (50%) percent of the fence above six (6) feet in height shall be open.

From the Matteucci Agreement:
9. No trees or shrubs to exceed 7 feet in height in view corridor between any of the houses.
12. Delineate and dedicate a multi-use path easement in perpetuity along the east side of #1 as mentioned in version of the PUD. Both easements shall not have perimeter fencing and/or hedges that block views.

From the Matteucci Specific Plan
IV. J. Fencing. A fencing plan for the individual parcels must be approved by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit to ensure that all urban uses are maintained on the subject parcel. Side yard fences shall meet the standards set forth in Chapter 18.06.
BUSINESS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF HALF MOON BAY

AGENDA REPORT

For meeting of:  July 11, 2017

TO:  Honorable Chair and Planning Commissioners

FROM:  John Doughty, Community Development Director
        Jill Ekas, Planning Manager

TITLE:  Local Coastal Land Use Plan: Coastal Access and Recreation

RECOMMENDATION:
Continue review of the Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the June 2017 Planning Commission Working Draft Local Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP).

BACKGROUND:
This item will bring forward input from the last session and provide an overall structure and work plan for the remaining July and August Planning Commission meetings.

DISCUSSION:
The Local Coastal Land Use Plan will be agenized for both the July and August Planning Commission’s July and August meetings. During the next three sessions, the Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP will be further considered. This phase of the Planning Commission’s review of this chapter is anticipated to conclude on August 8th. New chapters will be brought forward for Planning Commission review and input in advance of the August 25th session. The following summarizes the sequence for these sessions.

July 11, 2017: Because regular business is scheduled for the July 11, 2017 session, the Coastal Access and Recreation agenda item may be time limited. Staff encourages Commission members to provide feedback about the draft document and any clarifications or questions they would like to have resolved prior to the next session. The following materials will be summarized at the July 11th session:

- Responses to General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) and community comments on the 2016 First Public Draft Coastal Access and Recreation section of the LUP (Attachment 1)
- Summary of Planning Commission and Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) input from the June 27, 2017 Joint Study Session (Attachment 2)
- Preparation for forthcoming session on Coastal Recreation: Preparation materials include the following:
June 2017 Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP (previously provided for June 27, 2017 session)

- California Coastal Commission LCP Update Guidance – Section 2 (previously provided for May 23, 2017 session)
- Malibu Local Coastal Land Use Plan – Chapter 2 – Public Access and Recreation (previously provided for June 13, 2017 session)

Other relevant documents include the following:

- General Plan Park and Recreation Element (Available via the City web site: www.hmbcity.com – under the City Services tab, select Planning; and in the green left-hand menu, select Advanced Planning. A link to the document is provided near the bottom of the page.)
- 2016 First Public Draft Conservation and Open Space Element (previously provided)
- 2016 First Public Draft Healthy Community Element (previously provided)

Note: Please contact staff if you need a hard copy of any of the materials listed above.

July 25, 2017: This session will include a Joint study session with the Parks and Recreation Commission with focus on Coastal Recreation. The session will be structured similarly to the joint study session with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee on June 27, 2017 and has a similar intention. The Parks and Recreation Commission is working on the Parks Master Plan, which is a strategic plan for identifying needs and prioritizing implementation. Staff believes that it will be helpful to the Parks and Recreation Commission to hear Planning Commission input at a policy level; and that the Parks and Recreation Commission’s project level perspective will inform the Planning Commission’s consideration of coastal recreation policies.

Blue Point Planning has been hired by the City to prepare a Parks Master Plan. Blue Point will present an overview of the Parks Master Plan scope and process. They will also summarize their assessment of existing conditions. Following the Joint study session, the Planning Commission may continue their discussion of the entire Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP as time allows.

After this session, each Planning Commissioner is encouraged to submit any detailed comments they have on the working draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP, ideally, by July 27th. The comments will be made part of the Planning Commission packet for the August 8th session. Staff intends to distribute this packet early (by July 28th) to allow Commissioners and community members time to review the record as a whole with respect to Coastal Access and Recreation, including detailed comments provided by individual Commissioners.

August 8, 2017: This session is reserved solely for the Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP. Presentation will be limited to providing clarifications, responding to questions, and any other matters that the Planning Commission has requested be resolved prior to the session.
Detailed Planning Commission input on Coastal Access and Recreation will be the focus of the session. It is anticipated that this session will conclude this phase of input on the Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter. A revision incorporating Planning Commission direction will be prepared. This work will be coordinated with input received on other portions of the LUP in an iterative fashion to ensure that potential policy conflicts are identified and resolved.

**August 22, 2017:**
Moving forward, new working draft chapters of the LUP will be provided to the Planning Commission in advance of future sessions. At this time, staff is preparing both the Coastal Hazards and Scenic and Visual Resources LUP Chapters for distribution to the Planning Commission in advance of the August 22nd session where they will be discussed. Staff does not anticipate the need for additional joint study sessions with other committees and commissions at this time. Thus, the August 22nd session will set off a series of meetings hosted solely by the Planning Commission and will help establish the appropriate pace for review of the future working draft chapters of the LUP through the end of 2017.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Responses to Coastal Access and Recreation Comments – Excerpt from Consolidated Comments: First Public Draft Local Coastal Plan and General Plan Update, June 21, 2017

2. Planning Commission – Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Joint Study Session June 27, 2017 – Comments on June 2017 Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP
### 2.3 LCLUP Coastal Access and Recreation

#### 2.3.1 Coastal Act Framework

**Coastal Access**

- Page 2.3-2 & 14 - Neither of these subsections sufficiently describe the threats to (or caused by) public access and coastal recreation, nor key issues related to providing, protecting and maintaining these. Clear from the policies that these issues were discussed and explored extensively in the community engagement workshops and meetings, and have been captured in the Synthesis reports, but needs to be integrated into the narrative to provide a basis for the proposed policies.

- Page 2.3-3 - Suggest pulling description of the CCT out of this box, and making that content a subsection under Bicycle and Pedestrian Coastal Access. If keeping box, use space.

  The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP addresses both of these comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Polgar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Page 2.3-5 - 1) Could not find in narrative an explanation of what a "Coastal Access Improvement Area" is. (2) Figure needs better labeling. It is referenced multiple times in the narrative and policies as having various pieces of info, but are not distinguished in figure, so reader has to guess which map features are being referenced. E.g., Policy 2.3-I.34 says that the map includes improvements identified in the CBPP-- Which are these?; Policy 2.3-I.35 references this figure for improvements identified in CTMP -- what are these?; Policy 2.3-I.37. Reference to highway crossings in existing Circulation Element - Assuming purple rings are proposed crossings, but would be nice to have it called out in the narrative and as marked up on the relevant maps. CTMP references are all removed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Polgar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The California Coastal Act, Section 30001.5 states (emphasis added): “The legislature further finds and declares that the basic goals of the state for the coastal zone are to: . . . (c) Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with sound resources conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners.” Beaches comprise a majority of the public access along HMB’s coastline, yet this section does not discuss these public trust lands. This section should provide a clear explanation of public access along beaches, including: the common law Public Trust Doctrine which protects lands held in trust by California for the public and what this means for public access on the beach; California’s use of the mean high tide line to demarcate the limit of public ownership on Language about public trust lands from the Malibu Local Coastal Land Use Plan was added to the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP, see page 1. This language can be amended to more specifically pertain to Half Moon Bay, however, it clearly articulates the concept of public trust lands and is pertinent to the Coastal Act Framework discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Polgar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.3.2 Public Coastal Access**

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Circulation/Infrastructure**
• Page 2.3-10 - Implications of the use of Delay Index Standard (DIS) instead of LOS needs to be explained. An example of how this would change the assessment of traffic should be provided. Not possible to determine if DIS is appropriate standard to use

• Page 2.3-10 - Widening HWY 1 to four lanes on both sides of Poplar Street wouldn't help congestion which is caused by northbound traffic backing up from signalized intersections at Kelly and 92. Widening the highway here makes it even less safe for bike/pedestrian HWY 1 crossing at Poplar light. I know people who have been nearly run over while crossing at pedestrian signal on way to school because impatient drivers won't wait for us to cross 3 lanes of highway. Making the highway wider only increases crossing length, and with small children, more difficult. Widening will cause more speeding during non-congested times, which will lead to more red light running - a frequent problem.

The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP includes more explanation of alternate performance standards. Also note that the Town Boulevard concept has been added and will be further developed by the Planning Commission. This approach to HWY 1 will address how and when to widen, or narrow, spans of the highway.

8/24/2016
Email
GPAC Member
Sara Polgar

• Page 2.3-14-16 - These "potential improvements" from the San Mateo County CTMP should be removed from LCLUP. They are generically stated (e.g., "signalization of two additional intersections") even though they pertain to specific locations. Also, seem to be conflating the 2 performance standards (DIS and LOS) with some of these potential improvements. Lacking a clear explanation of the CTMP performance standards and how they relate to LOS, and without identifying where and demonstrating how the "potential improvements" actually work, these do not merit inclusion in LCLUP. The farthest that the LCLUP should go in terms of including these is to identify the CTMP as a potential resource for identifying future.

All references to the CTMP were removed from the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP.

8/24/2016
Email
GPAC Member
Sara Polgar

A Kehoe crosswalk could help other neighborhoods. High visibility crosswalks design with lights built into road is a possible solution.

The First Public Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP, as well as the Circulation Element, included potential crossings in this span of Highway 1. The Planning Commission Working Draft brings in the GPAC's Town Boulevard concept and will further develop criteria and locations for these types of improvements.

6/2/2016
GPAC Meeting #10
GPAC Member
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

Concern about the provision of bike lanes on Highway 1 and potential for conflicts with emergency response vehicles that use the roadway shoulder to travel during traffic
Answer provided at the GPAC session: County staff explained that in the concept plan for bike lanes on Highway 1, the lanes would not be located in the shoulder and an adequate shoulder would be maintained. Staff also noted that they are considering the feedback regarding Naomi Patridge Trail, especially as it accommodates the bicycle mode on the west side of the highway. Note: At subsequent sessions, the GPAC made a consensus statement regarding the "Eastside Parallel Trail" which would extend from the north to south city limits adjacent to the east side of HWY 1 as a class 1 dedicated bike/pedestrian facility. The Eastside Parallel Trail is included in the Planning Commission Work Draft Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP - see page 21 for narrative and pages 23 and 24 for policies.

2.3-3

4/28/2016
GPAC Meeting #9
Community Member
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

Described the trail that will be part of the Pacific Ridge open space conservation easement and that this trail is worthwhile on its own even if it cannot be connected to other parts of the trail system. Of further note, the GPAC made a consensus statement (with dissenting opinion) regarding a trail in this part of the community, as potentially connecting to the Pacific Ridge Trail. The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP includes the concept for a "Half Moon Bay Vista Walking Trail" to bring the GPAC's direction forward. The narrative and policy (pages 33-34 and 42-42 respectively) note the potential to connect to the Pacific Ridge Trail, but also clearly site constraints, including ESHA and erosion.

2.3-2

1/11/2017
GPAC Meeting #15
Community Member
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

How will the forthcoming trails plan be included in the LCP and General Plan updates?
Answer provided at the GPAC session: Trails will be included in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan which is currently being initiated. This Master Plan will focus on implementation more so than vision. Significant input has been received through the LCP and General Plan update process to support the master plan and it is unlikely that the master plan will bring forth concepts significantly divergent from the LCP and General Plan. If that occurs, the LCP and/or General Plan can be revised appropriately – either as drafts or after adoption through an amendment.

2.3-3

10/13/2016
GPAC Meeting #12
GPAC Member
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

Look into bike and walking areas, safe routes and connectivity are needed.
The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP includes detailed narrative and policies for expanding and enhancing the bicycle and pedestrian network to be better connected and safer.

2.3-2

6/2/2016
GPAC Meeting #10
GPAC Member
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

New trails proposed are ok; however, existing trails have deficiencies and need improvement.
The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP includes policies about trail maintenance. At the same time, the City is developing a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan which will include detailed assessment of existing facilities and describe needed maintenance and priorities for additional routes and connections.

### 2.3-2

**6/2/2016**  
GPAC Meeting #10  
GPAC Member  
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

**Potential for more hiking and biking trails? Another GPAC member asked about how the Parks Master Plan will be addressed in the element.**

**Answer provided at GPAC session: Staff noted that both the forthcoming Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and the Parks Master Plan will address these topics from an implementation perspective.**

### 2.3-3

**10/13/2016**  
GPAC Meeting #12  
GPAC Member  
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

**Sand Hill Road in Palo Alto is an example of a high volume four-lane roadway that also has bike lanes and pedestrian crossings. 7 Community members and GPAC discussed the quality and function of this roadway and cited positive aspects (e.g. good example of complete streets) as well as observations that it is currently causing backups onto HWY 280. Subsequent to the GPAC discussion, the GPAC made a consensus statement to set aside any planning for a parallel roadway, including the former concept for Foothill Boulevard which was deemed to be infeasible and no longer desired.**

### 2.3-8

**10/13/2016**  
GPAC Meeting #12  
GPAC Member  
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

**The assertions regarding Poplar Street in this section are inaccurate, and, more importantly, the identified goal of encouraging coastal visitors to walk to the coast can be achieved with much less cost than the approach proposed here and in policy 2.3-1.38, while maintaining residents’ safety and preserving visual resources that help create the beautiful character of Poplar Street. First, the access issues along Kelly Ave and Poplar Streets cannot be lumped. Compared to Kelly Ave, relatively few coastal visitors use Poplar Street to bike or walk between Poplar Beach and downtown because it is a quite a long distance from downtown. Furthermore, when the parking at the end of Poplar Street fills up, cars do not park very far down Poplar St (as is the case on Kelly Ave). Instead, the parked cars are clustered around the corner of First and Poplar. As a result, these visitors are generally not walking long distances along Poplar from their cars as they often do along Kelly. (Not to mention that the entire last 1/4 mile of Poplar Street to the beach already has a separated bike/ped trail.) These are relevant considerations because to implement "complete streets" for Poplar would inevitably involve cutting down the multiple large trees that are in the right-of-way currently which would have serious negative impacts on residents’ safety, not to mention destroying the visual resources that these mature roadside trees provide. To cite a clear example, since large trees in the right-of-way were cut down between 3rd Ave and 2nd Ave, (approximately 5-6 years ago) along Poplar Street, cars accelerate through this un-treed area faster than before, and faster than the locations where there are still trees. The fact of the matter is that the trees make the road narrower which leads the vast majority of drivers to go slower to avoid an accident. This phenomenon is well-documented for local streets such as Poplar (examples: http://plannersweb.com/2013/09/wide-neighborhood-street-part-2/, http://massengale.typepad.com/venustas/files/SwiftSafetyStudy.pdf, https://www.lgc.org/street-design/)**

In the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP, Narrative and policy relevant to Kelly and Poplar have been updated - see page 23 and page 26, policy 61. Furthermore, explanation of the flexibility with which complete streets can be implemented is added. Staff further notes that there is no intention to remove significant stands of heritage trees for street improvement projects. Such trees can benefit the design and a grant for a complete streets approach to Poplar has been secured by the City and design will involve extensive neighborhood input.
2.3.7  
8/24/2016  
Email  
GPAC Member  
Sara Polgar  

**What is the Parallel Trail?**  
Answer provided at GPAC session: A planned separated bike/pedestrian route running from Devil’s Slide to the southern Half Moon Bay city limits.

| 2.3-2 |  
| 4/28/2016  
GPAC Meeting #9  
Community Member  
Speaker at GPAC Meeting |

**California Coastal Trail**  
Does the Connect the Coastsides Plan include an assessment of the California Coastal Trail bridges ex. Seymour?  
Answer provided at GPAC session: This level of detail will come at a future implementation stage.

| 2.3-3 |  
| 4/28/2016  
GPAC Meeting #9  
Community Member  
Speaker at GPAC Meeting |

**California Coastal Trail**  
Make sure that the California Coastal Trail is eligible for grant funding support from various sources.  
Answer provided at GPAC session: The trail is a designated Priority Conservation Area through ABAG/MTC. This status is significant for available funding. The City also has a complete streets policy in the 2013 Circulation Element of the General Plan which recognizes alternate transportation modes consistent with Caltrans. The Coastal Trail is part of the City’s transportation network serving alternate modes.

| 2.3-3 |  
| 4/28/2016  
GPAC Meeting #9  
Community Member  
Speaker at GPAC Meeting |

**Coastal Access**  
- On page 2.3-3, what is meant by “formal access”? Does it mean “approved” access? What does it mean the ADA access is also included to “varying degrees”? Are any coastal access points or multi-use trails ADA accessible? If so does access include curb cuts on public streets? ADA access should be a Guiding Policy and a User Group in Section 2.3-1.21  
- It seems the city is difficult for physically disabled people to navigate. Is there an adequate definition of the scope of the problem in the draft plan and any remedies?

ADA access is more generally addressed in the narrative and policies of the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP. With the exception of recreational trails and beach access points with steep grades due to topographical constraints, all new trails and facilities are intended to provide access to users of a wide range of abilities, including those with disabilities.

| 2.3-3 |  
| 5/31/2016  
E-Mail  
Community Member |
Paul Grigorieff

- With regard to Redondo Beach Rd access: How can the public be assured that the proposed coastal access will be adequate to provide the necessary access to this area?
- Redondo Beach Rd is a historic coastal access point and needs to be addressed comprehensively in the new plan
- Plan needs to expand the role that Redondo Beach Rd will serve to enhance coastal experiences.
- Figure 2.3-1: Should be amended to show opportunities for public access on Redondo Beach Rd.
- Policy 2.3-G.12: The plan needs to address and find creative ways to retain Redondo Beach Rd for coastal access
- Policy 2.3-1.2 The new plan needs to retain Redondo Beach Rd as a coastal access as per this policy.

The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP addresses the access point at Redondo Beach Road on page 7. The draft plan indicates that the existing informal access point, which is actively eroding, will be replaced with a new access point to the north in the North Wavecrest Restoration Area. The new access point will provide lateral and vertical access to Redondo Beach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/28/2016</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>San Mateo Land Exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2016</td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #12</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Speaker at GPAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/18/2016</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Steven Patton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2016</td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #10</td>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the City coordinated with Connect the Coastside, the County’s transportation planning effort for the unincorporated Midcoast.

Answer provided at the GPAC session: Staff noted that the City has tracked the Connect the Coastside project and is in contact with the County colleagues working on that project. Staff further noted later in the session that a number of concepts coming out of Connect the Coastside appear to be well developed and worthy of the City’s consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential pedestrian crossings in Figure 2.3-1 appear to be indicated for every neighborhood on the east side of HWY 1 except for Spindrift Way - a very dangerous crossing. If so, this would be the only neighborhood without a proposed safe crossing - an oversight and liability for the city.

Staff agrees with need to address the safety and mobility needs of the east side neighborhoods including Sea Haven. The Circulation Element draft will include additional options and policies for addressing a number of connectivity, multi-modal mobility and safety issues including options for Spindrift.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coastal Access

Keep reference to Poplar and Kelly as linkages between Downtown and the beach more general; e.g. concern about provision of sidewalks, etc.

The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP includes narrative on page 23 and policy on page 26 (#61) differentiating between Poplar and Kelly and clearly noting that pedestrian facilities need not be sidewalks, but must be compatible with the neighborhood and environmental setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Document: Plan Half Moon Bay First Public Draft - June 20, 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Document: Plan Half Moon Bay</th>
<th>Page 7</th>
<th>Consolidated Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Public Draft - June 20, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Coastal Land Use Plan Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coastal Recreation

- **Responses to comments shaded in light gray.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3-14</td>
<td>(1) The subsections under this main heading need more fleshing out. Ex. The subsection needs to discuss threats to/issues caused by, coastal recreation. (2) Where’s the agriculture? Policy 2.2.1.22 about visitor-serving commercial specifically includes promotion of agritourism. Agricultural resources are not discussed in this section, Agritourism was added to the narrative and policies of the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2016</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Polgar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There have been significant challenges with trail users’ dogs accessing farmland and habitat areas and that this is a topic for community information and education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2017</td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
<td>Speaker at GPAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emergency Response

- There is a need for traffic control personnel during peak weekend times to improve safety and service levels at busy intersections, especially Highway 1 at SR 92.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3-8</td>
<td>Answer provided at GP session: Personnel are in place during key peak times such as pumpkin season. County staff noted the comment for their record and will consider it. Note that this concept is included in the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP, see page 18, policy 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2016</td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Speaker at GPAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HWY 1

- Potential for a roundabout at HWY 1 and SR 92 even if multi-lane. Pedestrian crossings could be grade separated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3-7</td>
<td>Answer provided at GPAC session: The Circulation Element intends to provide flexibility and staff encourages a range of solutions to be studied going forward. Note also that the Planning Commission Working Draft brings in the GPAC’s Town Boulevard concept and will further develop criteria and locations for these types of improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2016</td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
<td>Speaker at GPAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Request for clarification about future signal at Terrace Avenue on Highway 1 and the number of Highway 1 lanes to be reconfigured.
Answer provided at GPAC session: City staff described the basic components of planned improvements including provisions for room to merge in areas of configuration that transition from a 4 to 2-lane Highway 1 segment. Community members were invited to view plans under development at City Hall. Note, subsequent to this GPAC meeting, City Council directed revisions to the plans to ensure that the four-lane segment would taper back to two-lanes before Grandview. The plans have been amended; and furthermore, the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP brings forward the GPAC’s consensus statement for further consideration of a “Town Boulevard” concept which is intended to result in a roadway more suited to the small town configuration with slower speeds, safe crossings and other aesthetic and multi-modal amenities for Planning Commission to further develop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC Meeting #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker at GPAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parks and Open Space**

- Trails must be located outside riparian areas and not adjacent to ongoing ag operations. What are the implications of policy language "Use HMB's creek system as the armature to form a system of pedestrian and bicycle trails linking the city's parks/open space recreation areas and providing coastal access?"
- Need clearer definitions on Open Space Reserve and Urban Reserve
- Parks not recognized on map: (1) lot on Seymour (2) 1.9 acre park on Pacific Ridge property
- Need correction on ESHA map showing all riparian areas
- Need map of already documented wetlands that have been delineated as part of development project applications

The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP addresses the Coastal Access and Recreation related comments. With respect to trails near riparian areas and agriculture, see page 25, policy #54; Magnolia Park (on Seymour and Magnolia) is mapped and the map has been marked up to indicate that the Pacific Ridge open space amenities will be added to the map; the ESHA map is being updated and it will be incorporated into other maps as relevant. The comment about Open Space Reserve and Urban Reserve will be address in the Land Use chapter of the LUP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/14/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lennie Roberts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community member commented on the Pacific Ridge open space as having not been accepted by the City and will need to be managed by the home owners association.

Staff confirms the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC Meeting #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker at GPAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traffic Management**

- Plan should reflect increasing traffic problems for residents trying to reach basic supplies during regular afternoons. Ex. access to Strawflower area off HWY 1 involves gridlock starting as early as 3pm on weekdays lasting until 6pm+. Travel time vs shopping time seems out of balance. In Section 2.3-1.45 what are the definitions of LOS E, peak

LOS definitions are fully described in the Circulation Element. With respect to traffic and congestion generally, the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP acknowledges the challenges and emphasize alternate modes as well as a new approach - Town Boulevard - to the character and function of Highway 1 as put forth by the GPAC and further assessed by the Planning Commission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to comments shaded in light gray.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**2.3-8**
5/31/2016
E-Mail
Community Member
Paul Grigorieff

**Transit**

*How can we get benches at transit stops?*

*Answer provided at GPAC session: Samtrans has criteria for providing benches and shelters based on daily boardings - City could provide benches in cases where criteria is not met.*

**2.3-14**
4/28/2016
GPAC Meeting #9
Community Member
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

*Is there another coastal city that has a shuttle such as what has been described for weekday service for residents to run errands and weekend service for visitors? Members of the public also noted that marine, Capitola and Santa Barbara have shuttles. Another GPAC member noted that this pertains to the Coastal Access section of the LUP and that*

*Answer provided at GPAC session: Staff confirmed the comments. Also note that shuttles and transit are addressed in the Planning Commission Working draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP.*

**2.3-14**
10/13/2016
GPAC Meeting #12
Community Member
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

*Providing for visitor access from the Bay side ex. Weekend transit service from under-utilized parking lots near Highway 280 from community colleges (Skyline, San Mateo and*

*Answer provided at the GPAC session: A relevant suggestion noted by San Mateo County Connect the Coastside staff. Note, this suggestion is included in the Planning Commission Working Draft of the Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP: see page 29 for narrative and page 30, policy #72.*

**2.3-14**
4/28/2016
GPAC Meeting #9
Community Member
Speaker at GPAC Meeting

**Vehicle Circulation**

*Concern that a solution for HWY 1 and SR 92 is conspicuously absent from the Circulation Element. The specific issue is that backups from the intersection of these roadways during peak periods will discourage visitors from coming back to Half Moon Bay because getting out of Downtown can be so difficult due to severe congestions.*
Answer provided at GPAC session: Staff encourages GPAC and community members to consider the improvements proposed in the forthcoming Circulation Element and to continue to provide suggestions and feedback and proposed solutions. Also see the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP: pages 5-6 and 13-15 for narrative; and pages 17-19, 23-27, and 29-31 for relevant policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting #</th>
<th>Member Type</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2016</td>
<td>GPAC #12</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Congestion is a big concern and was a stated goal for the plan update. Need to be honest that cannot fix the traffic problem. It is incumbent upon us to not make the problem worse. The concept of jobs: housing balance is concerning. Build out to the 2040 projections will result in new residents commuting out and employees of new commercial See the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP: pages 5-6 and 13-15 for narrative; and pages 17-19, 23-27, and 29-31 for relevant policies. In and out commuting statistics can be added to this chapter; however, they are most pertinent to the Circulation and Healthy Community Elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2016</td>
<td>GPAC #10</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Do the Connect the Coastside staff know if Coastside residents have commute mode choices? Driving is the only option for many Coastside residents who work over-the-hill. Answer provided at GPAC session: County staff do not have the specific data, but are aware it’s an important consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2016</td>
<td>GPAC #9</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Importance of evaluating the cumulative condition of transportation system performance in traffic impact analysis. Answer provided at GPAC session: Staff confirmed the comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2016</td>
<td>GPAC #12</td>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
<td>Potential for use of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a performance measure instead of level of service (LOS). Later in the discussion this topic came up again and a community Answer provided at GPAC session: Staff noted that the State has been considering requiring VMT as a performance standard, but that it has not been concluded. Staff explained that VMT is referenced in the Healthy Community Element and as a performance measure it is a good way to assess the City’s trip making behavior as a whole, but that it does not provide any assessment of specific portions of the transportation network that may be affected by new development or a change in configuration. Also note that the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP includes alternate performance standards including VMT, see page 14 for narrative and page 18 policy #30.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Document: Plan Half Moon Bay
First Public Draft - June 20, 2017
Consolidated Comments
Local Coastal Land Use Plan Update
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Community Member</th>
<th>Speaker at GPAC Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
<td>Speaker at GPAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2016</td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #9</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Speaker at GPAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #12</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2016</td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #10</td>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
<td>Speaker at GPAC Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signal timing question**

Answer provided at GPAC session: City staff are coordinating signal timing at Highway 1 and SR 92, SR 92 and Main Street, and Highway 1 and Main Street (North)

**The planned new traffic signal at HWY 1 and Terrace Avenue is not a done deal and that there are alternatives to it. Because the signal is to serve new development at Pacific Ridge, there are other options that should be considered such as using Lewis Foster Drive or Silver Avenue with right turns in and out with a place to make U-turns farther north**

Answer provided at GPAC session: The City is working on engineering design for the signalization of HWY 1 at Terrace Avenue and expects future approval of the design by Caltrans. This new intersection will also incorporate an extension of Frontage Road on the west side of HWY 1, provide new pedestrian crossings and bicycle facilities. Lewis Foster Drive is a private street; not City right-of-way. Note also that subsequent to this GPAC meeting, City Council directed revisions to the plans to ensure that the four-lane segment would taper back to two-lanes before Grandview. The plans have been amended; and furthermore, the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP brings forward the GPAC's consensus statement for further consideration of a "Town Boulevard" concept which is intended to result in a roadway more suited to the small town configuration with slower speeds, safe crossings and other aesthetic and multi-modal amenities for Planning Commission to further develop.

**There is a conflict with respect to promoting tourism but not considering how tourists get to Half Moon Bay.**

The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP includes several policies pertaining to tourist circulation including one for a visitor serving transit hub with bike sharing and other amenities, page 30, policy #70.

**Traffic is not being adequately addressed. As the City continues to grow, how will Half Moon Bay deal with traffic when it is a regional focal point? Why aren't we discussing mass transit (e.g. a train or tram)? Would self-driving cars resolve traffic issues? The plan needs to consider future innovations.**

The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP includes narrative and many policies pertaining to traffic. Information about current study of the effects of autonomous vehicles is noted on page 29; transit and shuttles are discussed on pages 28-29; and relevant transit policies are included on pages 29-31. Staff notes that with respect to "mass transit" that the City's current transit ridership typically does not yet meet SamTrans thresholds for the provision of bus shelters or even benches; and thus the focus for this 2040 plan horizon is on more affordable and flexible transit options such as shuttles and support facilities - e.g. transit hub, bike share, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/2/2016</td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #10</td>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
<td><strong>Traffic is unavoidable and only going to get worse. The best solution is to improve active transportation options – make bike and pedestrian modes more useful.</strong> See the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP: pages 5-6 and 13-15 for narrative; and pages 17-19, 23-27, and 29-31 for relevant policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/2016</td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #9</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td><strong>What is the effect of more lanes (widening from 2-4 lanes in some segments) on Highway 1 at pedestrian crossings?</strong> Answer Provided at GPAC session: Best practices regarding walk time accommodate slower walking speeds and include a refuge area midway. See the County’s Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index (PEQI) performance standard for further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/2016</td>
<td>GPAC Meeting #12</td>
<td>GPAC Member</td>
<td><strong>With respect to the potential new 4-lane HWY 1 segment (between Central and Seymour and shown on the draft circulation improvements map) concern about the potential conflict between having a wider roadway with higher traffic speeds. This could affect the safety and function of the signalized intersection and crossing at Poplar.</strong> Answer provided at the GPAC session: This stretch of HWY 1 is located in between two segments that are already four lanes. The width of the pavement area is already four lanes wide. Any changes to lane configuration would result in upgrades to the pedestrian and bicycle facilities at the associated signalized intersection. The comment is appreciated and in fact pertains to a key policy choice with respect to the character of HWY 1. Also note that the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP brings forward the GPAC’s consensus statement for further consideration of a “Town Boulevard” concept which is intended to result in a roadway more suited to the small town configuration with slower speeds, safe crossings and other aesthetic and multi-modal amenities for Planning Commission to further develop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3.3 Coastal Recreation

**Document Construction**

- Issues and resources that are connected and/or interdependent are artificially separated between and within sections. Ripple-effect on the policies which have been written to address single issues, ignoring the connections and dependencies they have with other policies and issues covered in the LUP and GP elements. Creates problems for achieving the goals and complying with Coastal Act requirements. Ex. Coastal Recreation resources (i.e. the subheadings on pp. 2.3-14-16) are treated as if they each exist (and function) in a vacuum. Efforts to "tighten up" the sections have exacerbated the problem. Example is the Shoreline Management Planning and Plans policies (2.4-I.133 and 2.5-I.18) that are not linked at all. Full text of the relevant Coastal Act policies has been included in the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP. With respect to the cross-cutting aspects of the LUP topics, iteration through document revision will address the comment.
### Erosion

- Although the draft Coastal Hazards element addresses coastal/shoreline armoring in multiple policies, Coastal Access and Recreation and Coastal Resources draft elements are silent on coastal/shoreline armoring. Hardening the shoreline is the knee-jerk response for protecting development. Practice is destructive to sandy beaches and leads to theft of public trust lands and uses of the shoreline. Impacts to coastal access and recreation, and coastal resources should be clearly laid out in sections 2.3.3. Coastal Recreation (e.g. under subheading Public Coastal Recreation Areas and/or Recreational Beach Use) and 2.4.4 Shoreline Conditions. For policies related to coastal/shoreline armoring, I fine to keep them where they are in the Coastal Hazards element, but narrative should be revised to describe how these practices negatively impact our sandy beaches and sea cliffs and bluffs. (Coastal Engineer, Bob Battalio (Pacifica) is a good resource)

Because sea level rise is addressed in every chapter of the LUP, policy coordination will need to be iterative. Policies for planning for the expected loss of some access and recreation areas are included in the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP; and will need to be coordinated with those included in Coastal Hazards, Coastal Resources, and other sections.

**2.3-14**

### Open Space

- 2.3-15 - (1) The LCLUP and the General Plan should use the definition of "open space" provided in the CA Public Resources Code Section 65560.
- (2) The open space section is inadequate; open spaces are a huge component of coastal recreation in HMB. This section needs a comprehensive description of these areas and their critical importance to the City’s capacity to meet Coastal Act requirements for coastal access and recreation. And, should recognize that provision of recreation opportunities for the public in open space must be compatible with protection of open space resources. (3) Section should identify that the critical resources/services -- in addition to coastal access and recreation -- that open space provides (e.g., threatened species habitat etc.), and include impacts that coastal access and recreation activities have on open space resources, and identify conflicting goals for open space. For example: off-trail use/access in open space areas can harm habitat, endangered species and wildlife, and exacerbate erosion, etc.; non-compatible uses such as flying drones that disturb birds. (4) This section should also acknowledge threats that development, pollution, erosion and sea level rise pose to open space, and, as such, coastal access and recreation

The open space definition was added per the comment and more background about open space, threats, uses, etc. - has been added to the narrative of the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP.

**2.3-15**

### Parks and Open Space

Is Magnolia Park included in the parkland inventory? Another GPAC member asked if the new open space area to be established from the Pacific Ridge development was included. Another GPAC member asked if the beaches are included in the inventory. A GPAC member also noted that the Coastal Act does not allow beach lands to be counted

Answer provided at GPAC session: Yes, Magnolia Park is included. No, Pacific Ridge is not included, but staff will look into it. No, the beaches are not included, the inventory included only City owned and managed parklands which are subject to parkland standards, Quimby Act, etc. Note that the maps in the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP are marked up to include the Pacific Ridge trail and open space areas in future revisions.

**2.3-15**
Visitors Serving

- Page 2.3.14-16 - Each of the subsections under Visitor-Serving Commercial Recreation needs revision to take into consideration issues for public safety and natural resources (as noted in the first sentence under 2.3.1 Coastal Act Framework, pg. 2.3-1). (1) Equestrian access along the beaches accelerates bluff erosion at access points and is a health/water quality concern due to horse droppings on beaches. Narrative should recognize the fact that almost all equestrian use within HMB is by two named private businesses. Coastal impacts are caused almost entirely by these two businesses. (2) The Golf Courses section should acknowledge significant amounts of water to maintain, and water quality problems due to use of chemicals on the golf courses. Most do not help the City meet obligations under the Coastal Act, Section 30213 for protecting, encouraging or providing lower cost visitor and recreational facilities. (3) Campground section is misleading. Many of the RV sites are permanently occupied by long-term tenants. I think that these permanently occupied sites should be identified for what they are: low-cost housing and should not be counted towards the City's number of available campsites. The City should find out how many of the RV sites are not changing occupancy on a regular basis, and subtract this from the campsite numbers to provide more accurate "supply" in With respect to equestrian and golf course uses, the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP includes narrative and policy addressing this topic, see page 37 and page 44 - policies # 105 and 106. With respect to RV, campgrounds, and hotels, the requested information will be obtained if feasible and incorporated into the next draft.

2.3.15

8/24/2016
Email
GPAC Member
Sara Polgar

2.3.4 Policies

Coastal Access

exceptions included in this section but not others? Does this power apply elsewhere?

The statement was revised and no longer includes this reference in the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP.

2.3.23

5/31/2016
E-Mail
Community Member
Paul Grigorieff

Policies

- Page 2.3-23 - RE: Policy 2.3-1.9 Italicized text should be part of the policy/revise to reflect Coastal Act requirements in Section 30212: (a) Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where: (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources, (2) adequate access exists nearby, or, (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. • Page 2.3-33 - RE: Policy 2.3-1.10 Recommend adding that design of public access ways should account for likely access uses (e.g., pedestrians, bicyclists, equestrian) and current and future hazards (e.g., erosion, sea level rise)

- Page 2.3-23 - RE: Policy 2.3-1.14 Not quite the same as what is stated in Section 30212 of the Coastal Act: "Dedicated access way shall not be required to be opened to public

In the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP, all of the noted policies were updated pursuant to the comments.

2.3-23

8/24/2016
Email
GPAC Member
Sara Polgar

- Page 2.3-24 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.19 Typo: "include should be "including"
- Page 2.3-24 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.20 Understand the intent of the phrase "environmentally conscious" but it is odd language for a policy
- Page 2.3-24 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.21 What is meant by "appropriate resources for each trail type or user group"? Does it mean having the appropriate amenities like benches, etc.?
- Page 2.3-25 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.24 What does "sustainable implementation" mean? If it means leaving space to accommodate erosion and sea level rise, the policy should explicitly state this
- Page 2.3-25 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.27 After "bluff top" add "edge"
- Page 2.3-26 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.33&34 Would like to see provision of safe routes to school included in these policies
- Page 2.3-26-27 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.35 Remove specific references to HWY 1 Safety and Mobility Study. This is the first mention it and without context and justification for its inclusion, LCLUP policies should not specifically recommend implementation of its findings

In the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP, all of the noted policies were updated pursuant to the comments. Note that the focus of former policy 2.3-I.24 was not sea level rise or erosion. Those subjects are addressed in other policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2016</td>
<td>2.3-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Email
GPAC Member
Sara Polgar

- Page 2.3-31 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.68 Typo: "Identify opportunities to replace recreation..."
- Page 2.3-31 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.70 Intent of policy prioritizes protection of free/low-cost visitor and rec facilities, unclear what these should be protected from; is there an example? Entire policy should move under Coastal Rec subheading because focus is not actually Commercial Rec and Visitor-Serving Commercial Uses. Recommended revisions: "No- and Lower-Cost Visitor and Recreation Facilities": "Protect no- and lower-cost visitor and recreation facilities along the coastline... These include major no-cost

The typo was corrected and former policy 2.3-I.70 was revised in the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP, see page 43-44, policy #99.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2016</td>
<td>2.3-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Email
GPAC Member
Sara Polgar

- Page 2.3-32 - If the city does not have sufficient resources to quantify and thoroughly evaluate these impacts (e.g. water quality impacts of equestrian uses and golf courses) for the LCLUP update, a new policy should be added that requires the city to do this study and use this to inform future decisions regarding these types of Commercial Recreation. While I don't think that this information could be used (via the LCLUP or GP) to impose new permit requirements or mitigation measures on existing

The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation Chapter of the LUP includes narrative and policy addressing this topic, see page 37 and page 44 - policies # 105 and 106.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2016</td>
<td>2.3-32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Page 2.3-44 - RE: Policy 2.2.1.7 This policy should be included in the Coastal Access and Recreation policies. Also, need discussion of maritime uses in the Land Use or Coastal Access and Recreation elements that provides the justification
- Page 2.3-27 - RE: Policy 2.3.1.38 Revise to require east-west pedestrian connections: "Develop strong pedestrian east-west connections between Downtown and Francis State Park Beach and Poplar Beach." If the policy must remain specific, remove Poplar Street from this draft policy as currently proposed. Add a sentence to address pedestrian access to Poplar Beach: "Install wayfinding signage (at 3rd Ave and Poplar Street) that directs coastal visitor bike and pedestrian traffic, only, from the Poplar/Hwy 1 crossing to one block north along Spruce Street which is has much less car traffic and already has sidewalks along it's entirety between 3rd Ave and Railroad Ave."

In the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP, with respect to maritime uses are addressed with new narrative provided on page 36 and a policy related to 2.2.1.7 on page 44, policy 102. Policy 2.2.1.7 is specifically drafted as a land use policy and is proposed to remain in that chapter of the LUP. Narrative and policy relevant to Kelly and Poplar have been updated - see page 23 and page 26, policy 61.

| 2.3-44 |
| 8/24/2016 |
| Email |
| GPAC Member |
| Sara Polgar |

| 16/30 |
| Page 2.3.20 - 1993 LCLUP Policy 2-1 concerning open space acquisition should be reinserted. It may seem cleaner to only include this policy in the Open Space GP Element, but open space is a significant resource for coastal access and recreation, and removal of this policy from this section is problematic. Namely, issues and resources that are connected and/or interdependent are artificially separated between and within sections. Causes ripple-effect on the policies which have been written to address single issues, ignoring the connections with other policies and issues covered in the LCLUP and GP elements. |
| Page 2.3.23 - RE: Policy 2.2.1.8 1) Not sure figures (3-1 and 3-2) are correct re: specific routes that they indicate. Since intent is to ensure signage for access routes and not to establish what the routes are, should revise language to: "Work with Caltrans to provide coordinated signage program along Highway 1, identifying the access routes shown on the figures..." (2) Delete "unfamiliar" in the next sentence |

In the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP, all of the noted policies were updated pursuant to the comments.

| 2.3-26 |
| 8/24/2016 |
| Email |
| GPAC Member |
| Sara Polgar |

Remove all references to the Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan (CTMP). For multiple reasons the CTMP should not be included in the policies in the LUP and GP elements.
First and foremost, throughout the review period for these draft LUP elements, the CTMP has not been available to the public as a finalize plan, and while it is possible that the draft plan will remain much the same with respect to recommendations for Half Moon Bay, there is no way to know this. (I am not certain about this, but it is possible that this lack of transparency would open the door to a future procedure challenge to the LUP which would be bad for everyone.)
Second, the draft CTMP was prepared pursuant the 2012 Midcoast Update to San Mateo County's Local Coastal Program, and as a result, it does not necessarily sufficiently
All references to the CTMP were removed from the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP.

| 2.3-26 |
| 8/24/2016 |
| Email |
| GPAC Member |
| Sara Polgar |
Unclear why the last sentence is italicized. Is this part of the policy? If so, use of an alternative standard should not be a discretionary decision for the city staff; this decision could have significant impacts on what and how traffic improvements are implemented. My feeling is that the public should be able to provide input on this and the City Council through adoption of this plan update or at a subsequent time for the evaluations more relevant to the standard. These standards may also become adopted in some form as CEQA thresholds. See page 14 for narrative and pages 17 and 18 for policies #29 and 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8/24/2016</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>GPAC Member</th>
<th>Sara Polgar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Text Corrections**

- Page 2.3-26 - RE: Policy 2.3 - I.32 (1) The sentence starting with "Lateral trails..." should not be removed from this policy, and (2) it should be moved to just after the sentence starting "For all new development...". (3) The added text "ensure that" should be removed from the sentence beginning "At a minimum..." and (4) this sentence should be formatted as a separate paragraph to help the reader understand that this part of the policy applies to both types of easements described here -- i.e., on the bluff tops, and on the beach seaward of the base of the bluffs -- and add to the end of this sentence: "and to accommodate landward realignment needed for erosion and sea level rise impacts."
- Page 2.3-29 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.60 Why is the last sentence, beginning "In no case..." italicized? It should be part of policy as in the existing policy 2-7

In the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP, all of the noted policies were updated pursuant to the comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8/24/2016</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>GPAC Member</th>
<th>Sara Polgar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Visitor Serving**

- Page 2.3-31 - RE: Policy 2.3-I.72 Policy should be deleted. (1) No discussion of where/why to prioritize location of visitor-serving commercial development in the Land Use and Coastal Access and Recreation elements. Without this basis, policy has no justification. (2) Confusing how this policy appears to parse out hospitality visitor-serving commercial development (as indicated by the deleted text from the original 1993 LCLUP policy 2-29) from visitor-serving commercial recreation which is dealt with in the following policy (2.3-I.73), but the narrative of the Coastal Access and Recreation element discusses both of these under the one heading of "Visitor-Serving Commercial Recreation" (pp. 2.3-17-19). The narrative and policies need to be clear and consistent with use of language; could

The Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP includes revisions to former policy 2.3-I.72 - see page 44, policy 101. With respect to narrative, improvements were made to more specifically describe hospitality visitor-serving uses and commercial recreation uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8/24/2016</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>GPAC Member</th>
<th>Sara Polgar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Page 2.3-31 - What are the intent and implications of the statement that new commercial development should be located in Wavecrest area?

The statement was revised and no longer includes this reference in the Planning Commission Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5/31/2016</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPAC Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Etherton</td>
<td>Supports the road diet comments. The &quot;Town Boulevard&quot; concept could incorporate a road diet approach. What will happen to the Eastside Parallel Trail if the City does not receive the grant that is now being considered to fund that portion of the north HWY 1 project involving the Terrace Avenue signalization. Staff noted that even without the grant, the City is committed to providing the trail. At a minimum, the project will retain necessary space for the trail and will also include environmental review of the trail for future implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Murray</td>
<td>Trail interruptions, e.g. such as those along the Naomi Patridge Trail, are challenging. How can they be reduced? The concern about interruptions is understood. Staff noted that the Eastside Parallel Trail will have fewer cross streets north of SR 92. Other approaches, such as co-locating trails along frontage roads, can help reduce the impact of interruptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlene Foldenauer</td>
<td>Where we cross HWY 1 - make high visibility crossings. This is an issue with the Naomi Patridge Trail. The Coastal Trail is a great trail for cyclists and the Eastside Parallel Trail will be key for school commuting and the northeast neighborhoods. High visibility crossings can be emphasized as part of the Town Boulevard concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Brown</td>
<td>Everything is connected - traffic/parking/transit - also addressing Main Street is integral in this as well. All modes including transit, and support facilities including parking can be considered in the Town Boulevard approach. Main Street's interface with HWY 1 and SR 92 as well as its own function can also be part of the context for the Town Boulevard approach. SR 92 between HWY 1 and Main Street is an important element of the Town Boulevard concept. SR 92 between HWY 1 and the City limits to the east can be treated similarly to HWY 1 as part of the Town Boulevard approach. What is a class 4 bike facility? The City Traffic Engineer described Class 1, 2, 3, and 4 facilities. Noting that Class 4 is a facility separated from a roadway with a barrier. With respect to the Eastside Parallel Trail along HWY 1, what is the retaining wall for in the section north of Terrace Avenue? the City Traffic Engineer described the grade changes between the HWY and the adjacent shoulder area and beyond within the r-o-w and how a retaining wall is needed to establish a flat grade for the future class 1 trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Rendon</td>
<td>The Town Boulevard concept should be applicable to both HWY 1 and SR 92.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SR 92 between HWY 1 and the City limits to the east can be treated similarly to HWY 1 as part of the Town Boulevard approach.

**Michelle Dragony**

Why aren't we considering the California Coastal Trail as the primary north south connection and for commuting, for which it is under-utilized?

Input from the community and GPAC indicates that the Coastal Trail is well regarded as the primary north-south connector; however, it does not serve the eastside neighborhoods and many residents would also like a more direct route for commuting and running errands than the Coastal Trail provides. The intent is not to diminish the usefulness of the Coastal Trail, but rather to add more facilities in a connected network.

**Paul Gaiter**

Coming into town from the south (via bike) is very dangerous.

The Eastside Parallel Trail, Town Boulevard concept and HWY 1 signalization at South Main Street can all address this concern.

How do we promote use of these trails?

A number of ideas were discussed and they are details that can be addressed in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Supports improvements to South Main Street at HWY 1 and at SR 92.

Comment noted with respect to the HWY 1 south project going forward for a signal at South Main Street and HWY 1.

What about round-abouts?

Staff noted that the "Town Boulevard" concept could incorporate round-abouts. They are not precluded by that approach, but more study is needed. It was also recognized that the San Mateo County connect the Coastside planning effort may include round-abouts north of HMB.

**Planning Commissioner**

**Brian Holt**

Consider electric bikes and other modes outside of car commuting.

This specific mode can be added to the working draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP.

Consider extra alternative transportation options.

The topic is included in the working draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP. Additional direction for this section is welcome.

Defers on the question of HWY 1 with 2 or 4 lanes. Wants the safest and otherwise optimized approach and will see what is studied.

Note that alternatives will need to be studied at a future date for the sake of environmental review assessment.

For coastal access: focus on Downtown access and how to connect between Downtown and the coast.

The working draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP includes policy for the connection using Kelly and Poplar. Also, signage, wayfinding, and other design considerations are included, but can be further developed.

For the Town Boulevard concept: Fully supports slowing down traffic, the focus on the sense of place and beautification. Utilize signage and other signals to indicate the presence of the community.
Comment noted - these parameters and essential to the concept.

Fully supports the Town Boulevard and Eastside Parallel Trail concept.

Noted and part of Planning Commission motion to support GPAC consensus on these topics.

Half Moon Bay needs to have a good trail infrastructure as the backbone system.

The Planning Commission is encouraged to continue to provide input on the concept and to encourage community participation in the discussion for improving trails - to be addressed in LUP policy and/or the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

How is SR 92 being addressed in the Town Boulevard concept?

SR 92 between HWY 1 and the City limits to the east can be treated similarly to HWY 1 as part of the Town Boulevard approach.

Improved connections between neighborhoods and Downtown for bikes and pedestrians are needed; e.g. Arleta Park example as challenging; however, not nearly as much as for the eastside neighborhoods north of SR 92.

The Eastside Parallel Trail is especially suited to improving access for eastside neighborhoods. For Arleta Park and Alsace Lorraine, concepts for improving Kelly Avenue and Poplar Streets are both including in the Working Draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP.

Naomi Patridge Trail safety is a concern.

Safety concerns about this trail are noted and can be addressed through implementation of draft policy in the working draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP. They can also be specifically considered in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Commission Consensus

Support the Town Boulevard Concept; the Eastside Parallel Trail, and the pursuit of other trail opportunities as cited in the working draft LUP. These elements will be maintained in the draft documents and further developed as needed.

Jimmy Benjamin

Consider the end-to-end travel time of HWY 1 and how it is affected by pinch points along the roadway - Suggested looking at the Great Highway in San Francisco as an example. A boulevard approach could include ways to reduce the points of friction.

This comment relates to the potential for a road diet or use of round-abouts in the Town Boulevard concept.

Drainage needs to be managed in the Town Boulevard concept. Liabilities could be treated as assets - e.g. biofiltration inland could make better quality wetlands, thus roadway runoff could be a resource to that end.

Green infrastructure is included in the first public draft Circulation Element and Healthy Community Element. It could be further explored in other portions of the policy documents. Also note that the City is preparing a Green Infrastructure Plan for adoption in mid 2019.

Half Moon Bay is an intermediate space between SR 92 and unincorporated coastal areas to the north and south. Need to be respectful of maintaining that capacity.
This statement recognizes the need for context sensitivity of the State roadway facility which happens to travers a small town as its main arterial. Noted that there are good ideas coming from the group discussion about improving crossings and the need for drivers to have an advance indication of a cyclist on the Naomi Patridge Trail before turning off HWY 1. Also consider locating the cyclist path further away from HWY 1 such as with the Frontage Road.

These comments could be addressed through implementation of draft policy in the working draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP. They can also be specifically considered in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

What about considering a reduction in lanes on HWY 1 (e.g. a road diet) instead of widenings?

The "Town Boulevard" concept could incorporate a road diet approach.

What do we want as a community for Half Moon Bay’s Town Boulevard? Design features such as the beautiful sculpted cypress trees have been a key aesthetic element in the city. Can they be considered.

Signature landscaping features, including cypress tress have excellent potential for incorporation into the Town Boulevard design.

What does multi-modal include? It should be considered in a broad way. For example, some kinds of motorized vehicles are allowed by right on different facilities.

The working draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP acknowledges many modes, including low speed motorized vehicles that may be appropriate on some facilities for bicycles and pedestrians.

What is the HWY 1 north project’s lane configuration at Grandview?

The City Traffic Engineer reviewed the lane configuration and confirmed that pursuant to City Council direction the four-lane segment at Terrace would taper back down to two-lanes before Grandview.

What types of high visibility pedestrian crossing would Caltrans allow?

Staff explained that they have been accepting a range of options on State roadways as part of their context sensitive design approach and requirement to implement complete streets.

**John Evans**

How is design speed considered? For example, how far is the trip vs. how long will it take via different modes?

Specific examples have not been studied; however, the working draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP includes options for adopting additional or alternative performance standards such as those that consider overall trip time (e.g. delay index) or a specific quantitative and qualitative measure of another mode such as a pedestrian environmental quality index (PEQI).

Need better definitions of what pedestrians and bikes mean; e.g. it relates to speed and scale. These two modes are not always compatible on the same facility.

The comment is appreciated. The Town Boulevard concept could include shoulders along HWY 1 for faster traveling commuter cyclists who prefer more direct routes to recreational trails. Separation of bikes and pedestrians in other locations is also considering the the LUP and can be addressed in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.
The Town Boulevard concept - with a slower tempo, size and pace - is a great opportunity.

The Planning Commission is encouraged to continue to provide input on the concept and to encourage community participation in the discussion.

When focusing on problem solving, note that HWY 1 is the transportation spine for a small space. Half Moon Bay has the best beach access in this area - must travel 11 miles south for another opportunity to get to the beach. Also SR 92 and HWY 1 are the crossroads which support the basic necessities. Thus, the City functions similarly to an event with a limited parking supply such as for a large concert with a parking garage. It is geographically confined space and people keep coming (they do not need a concert ticket). The number of cars that gridlock the town is quantifiable. The typical solutions for this type of congestion apply to larger scale places and do not work here.

The event - parking garage analogy was well received by members of the pubic attending this Planning Commission meeting. Although a specific answer to the the problem is not evident, the analogy points to a range of approaches for addressing the concerns, including several that are included in the working draft Coastal Access and Recreation chapter of the LUP - interlinked transit hubs, bike share, signage and public information, shuttles, etc.