County of San Mateo - Planning and Building Department

ATTACHMENT B

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21,000, et seq.), that the following project: *Amendment to the Subdivision Ordinance to modify the lot dimension requirements by eliminating the minimum and maximum lot depth standards in areas outside of the Coastal Zone*, when adopted and implemented, will not have a significant impact on the environment.

FILE NO.: PLN 2013-00221

OWNERS: Not Applicable

APPLICANT: Shahram Zomorrodi

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: Not Applicable

PROJECT LOCATION: Unincorporated areas of San Mateo County outside of the Coastal Zone

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations that only applies to areas outside of the Coastal Zone. The proposed change to the text will modify Section 7020: *Standard Subdivision Design Requirements* within Article 2: *Subdivision Design and Layout*. Subsection 2.c of Section 7020 currently reads:

The minimum width of each parcel shall conform to the requirements of the Zoning Regulations, but in no case shall be less than 50 feet, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements for road purposes. The minimum depth shall be as necessary to provide the minimum parcel size for the zoning district, but in no case shall be less than 100 feet, nor greater than three times the width, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements necessary for road purposes.

The project will strike the minimum and maximum lot depth requirement for areas outside of the Coastal Zone. It will read:

For areas outside of the Coastal Zone, the minimum width of each parcel shall conform to the requirements of the Zoning Regulations, but in no case shall be less than 50 feet, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements for road purposes. The minimum depth shall be as necessary to provide the minimum parcel size for the zoning district, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements necessary for road purposes.

For areas within the Coastal Zone, the minimum width of each parcel shall conform to the requirements of the Zoning Regulations, but in no case shall be less than 50 feet, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements for road purposes. The minimum depth shall be as necessary to provide the minimum parcel size for the zoning district, but in no case shall be

less than 100 feet, nor greater than three times the width, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements necessary for road purposes.

This amendment would not change the minimum lot size required by the applicable zoning districts, and it would not reduce the minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet required by Subsection 7020(2.b) of the Subdivision Regulations. In no case would a subdivision be allowed that exceeds the site's designation on the General Plan Land Use Map.

FINDINGS AND BASIS FOR A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The Current Planning Section has prepared the initial study for the above project and, based upon substantial evidence in the record, finds that:

1. The project will not adversely affect water or air quality or increase noise levels substantially.

2. The project will not have adverse impacts on the flora or fauna of the area.

3. The project will not degrade the aesthetic quality of the area.

4. The project will not have adverse impacts on traffic or land use.

5. In addition, the project will not:

    a. Create impacts which have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.

    b. Create impacts which achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

    c. Create impacts for a project which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

    d. Create environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The County of San Mateo has, therefore, determined that the environmental impact of the project, as mitigated, is not significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES included in the project to avoid potentially significant effects:

No significant effects were identified. No mitigation measures are proposed.

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY CONSULTATION

Referrals sent to: None

INITIAL STUDY

The San Mateo County Current Planning Section has prepared the Environmental Evaluation of this project and has found that probable environmental impacts, as mitigated, are not significant. A copy of the initial study is attached.

REVIEW PERIOD: October ~~21~~ 23, 2013 – November ~~19~~ 22, 2013.

All comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of this Negative Declaration must be received by the County Planning Department, 455 County Center, Second Floor, Redwood City, no later than **5:00 p.m., November ~~19~~ 22, 2013**.

CONTACT PERSON

Steven Rosen, Project Planner
650/363-1814
srosen@smcgov.org

Steven Rosen, Project Planner

SBR:fc – SBRX0707_WFH.DOC
FRM00013(click).doc
(1/11/07)

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST
(To Be Completed by Planning Department)

1. **Project Title:** Subdivision Ordinance Amendment

2. **County File Number:** PLN 2013-00221

3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** San Mateo County, 455 County Center, Second Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063

4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Steven Rosen, 650/363-1814

5. **Project Location:** Unincorporated areas of San Mateo County outside of the Coastal Zone

6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** Not applicable

7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Shahram Zomorrodi, 5636 Stevens Creek Boulevard, #376, Cupertino, CA 95014

8. **General Plan Designation:** Not applicable

9. **Zoning:** Not applicable

10. **Description of the Project:** The project is an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations that only applies to areas outside of the Coastal Zone. The proposed change to the text will modify Section 7020: *Standard Subdivision Design Requirements* within Article 2: *Subdivision Design and Layout*. Subsection 2.c of Section 7020 currently reads:

    The minimum width of each parcel shall conform to the requirements of the Zoning Regulations, but in no case shall be less than 50 feet, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements for road purposes. The minimum depth shall be as necessary to provide the minimum parcel size for the zoning district, but in no case shall be less than 100 feet, nor greater than three times the width, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements necessary for road purposes.

    The project will strike the minimum and maximum lot depth requirement for areas outside of the Coastal Zone. It will read:

    For areas outside of the Coastal Zone, the minimum width of each parcel shall conform to the requirements of the Zoning Regulations, but in no case shall be less than 50 feet, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements for road purposes. The minimum depth shall be as necessary to provide the minimum parcel size for the zoning district, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements necessary for road purposes.

    For areas within the Coastal Zone, the minimum width of each parcel shall conform to the requirements of the Zoning Regulations, but in no case shall be less than 50 feet, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements for road purposes. The minimum depth shall be as necessary to

provide the minimum parcel size for the zoning district, but in no case shall be less than 100 feet, nor greater than three times the width, exclusive of rights-of-way or easements necessary for road purposes.

This amendment would not change the minimum lot size required by the applicable zoning districts, and it would not reduce the minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet required by Subsection 7020(2.b) of the Subdivision Regulations. In no case would a subdivision be allowed that exceeds the site's designation on the General Plan Land Use Map.

11. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** Not applicable

12. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None

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		Climate Change		Population/Housing
	Agricultural and Forest Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Public Services
	Air Quality		Hydrology/Water Quality		Recreation
	Biological Resources		Land Use/Planning		Transportation/Traffic
	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
	Geology/Soils		Noise		Mandatory Findings of Significance

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appro-

priate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources. Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1.	**AESTHETICS**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
1.a.	Have a significant adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. There will be no aesthetic impacts associated with this project. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.					

1.b.	Significantly damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 1.a. **Source:** Not applicable.					
1.c.	Significantly degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 1.a. **Source:** Not applicable.					
1.d.	Create a new source of significant light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 1.a. **Source:** Not applicable.					
1.e.	Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 1.a. **Source:** Zoning and Parcel Maps.					
1.f.	If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?				X
Discussion: This project does not exempt subdivisions from conforming to the Zoning Ordinance, General Plan, Design Review Guidelines, or any other regulations. **Source:** Project description.					
1.g.	Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 1.a. **Source:** Not applicable.					

2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of forestland, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
2.a.	For lands outside the Coastal Zone, 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?				X

Discussion: The parcels which will gain the potential to be subdivided are not on farmland. The methodology described in the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model precludes these sites from being deemed agricultural resources. The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map lists all sites as Urban Land and Other Land.

Source: California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model and Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map.

2.b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X

Discussion: The proposed Subdivision Text Amendment applies to urban parcels, which would not be under Williamson Act contracts. San Mateo County Williamson Act contracts are in PAD, RM, and RM-CZ zones only.

Source: Zoning Maps and List of Parcels with New Subdivision Potential.

2.c.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?				X

Discussion: The proposed project is applicable to urban lands on the Bayside only, as such it will not result in the conversion of timberland or farmland.

Source: List of Parcels with New Subdivision Potential.

2.d.	For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?				X
Discussion: This project excludes the Coastal Zone. **Source:** Project scope.					
2.e.	Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?				X
Discussion: The parcels with new potential for subdivision are not agricultural land. **Source:** List of Parcels with New Subdivision Potential.					
2.f.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? *Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.*				X
Discussion: The parcels with new potential for subdivision are in developed urban areas, not timberland. None are in or near the TPZ District. **Source:** List of Parcels with New Subdivision Potential and Zoning Maps.					

3.	**AIR QUALITY**. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	***Potentially Significant Impacts***	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
3.a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
Discussion: BAAQMD's guidelines say that, in order to make the required determination for plan-level impacts, lead agencies could consider the following questions. *1. Does the project support the primary goals of the Air Quality Plan (AQP)?* *The primary goals of the 2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan (CAP), the current AQP to date, are to:* • *Attain air quality standards;*					

- *Reduce population exposure and protecting public health in the Bay Area; and*
- *Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and protect the climate.*

The project will allow the creation of 103 new building sites for 101 single-family residences and 2 two-family residences in areas already developed with similar housing. These areas are within a region that suffers a housing shortage and to which people commute. The new housing units provide opportunities to people employed in the region to live in the region, reducing vehicle miles travelled and making the use of alternative modes of transportation more likely. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction supports the primary goals of the CAP.

2. *Does the project include applicable control measures from the AQP?*

Agencies approving projects should require that they include all of the 55 air pollution control measures listed in the CAP that can feasibly be incorporated into the project design or applied as mitigation, or justify the reasons, supported by substantial evidence, why a measure or measures are not incorporated into the project. Projects that incorporate all feasible air quality plan control measures may be considered consistent with the 2010 CAP.

This project implements BAAQMD's Transportation Control Measure D-3: Local Land Use Strategies. It states, "Local governments are encouraged to update general plans and area plans to promote infill development and support land use that allows residents and workers to walk, bicycle, and take transit to reach destinations, instead of relying on private automobiles." The limited scope of this project will result in limited benefits when compared to a general plan update, but it will provide the tangible reductions in air pollutants discussed above. Other control measures do not apply to this minor amendment to the Subdivision Regulations.

3. *Does the project disrupt or hinder implementation of any AQP control measures?*

If approval of a project would not cause the disruption, delay or otherwise hinder the implementation of any air quality plan control measure, it may be considered consistent with the 2010 CAP. Examples of how a project may cause the disruption or delay of control measures include a project that precludes an extension of a transit line or bike path, or proposes excessive parking beyond parking requirements.

This project does not hinder the implementation of any other AQP control measures. Regarding land use: It will not change the character of the neighborhoods in which the new subdivisions would be, and it would not change the uses allowed on the sites. Regarding construction impacts: The unincorporated communities that will be affected by this project already have many dividable lots, so the project would not be introducing the potential for new construction projects into places where there was none.

Source: BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines.

3.b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X

Discussion: This project will not increase VMT. It will not cause population growth, but will accommodate it in areas closer to employment centers than far-flung exurbs. It will not introduce the potential for new construction projects in areas where there was no potential before. Construction-level impacts will be assessed during the project level environmental review.

Source: Project scope.

3.c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
Discussion: The resulting increase in potential density in the region is negligible. There are 2,097,834 housing units in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin. This project creates the potential to develop 105 new housing units. Housing units are not significant emitters of ozone precursors or particulate emissions. **Source:** Census, GIS Analysis.					
3.d.	Expose sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations, as defined by BAAQMD?				X
Discussion: This is a site-specific impact. It is impossible to study the impact of individual subdivisions at this time. Each subdivision will be a project subject to CEQA. **Source:** Project scope.					
3.e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a significant number of people?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 3.d. **Source:** Project scope.					
3.f.	Generate pollutants (hydrocarbon, thermal odor, dust or smoke particulates, radiation, etc.) that will violate existing standards of air quality on-site or in the surrounding area?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 3.d. **Source:** Project scope.					

4.	**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
4.a.	Have a significant adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in				X

	local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. There will be no impacts to wildlife or habitat associated with this project. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.					
4.b.	Have a significant adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 4.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
4.c.	Have a significant 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?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 4.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
4.d.	Interfere significantly with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 4.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
4.e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?				X

Discussion: See discussion under Question 4.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
4.f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 4.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
4.g.	Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 4.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
4.h.	Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 4.a. **Source:** Project scope.					

5.	**CULTURAL RESOURCES**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
5.a.	Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. There will be no impacts to cultural, historical, or archaeological resources associated with this project. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.					
5.b.	Cause a significant adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?				X

Discussion: See discussion under Question 5.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
5.c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 5.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
5.d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 5.a. **Source:** Project scope.					

6.	**GEOLOGY AND SOILS**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
6.a.	Expose people or structures to potential significant adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				X
	i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other significant evidence of a known fault? *Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.*				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. There will be no increase in exposure of people or structures to geological hazards associated with this project. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.					

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 6.a.i. **Source:** Project scope.				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 6.a.i. **Source:** Project scope.				
iv. Landslides?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 6.a.i. **Source:** Project scope.				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion? *Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).*				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 6.a.i. **Source:** Project scope.				
6.b. Result in significant soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. There will be no change to landforms that will result in adverse effects resulting from this project. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.				
6.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, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 6.a.i. **Source:** Project scope.				
6.d. Be located on expansive soil, as noted in the 2010 California Building Code, creating significant risks to life or property?				X

Discussion: See discussion under Question 6.a.i. **Source:** Project scope.					
6.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?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. There will be development resulting from this project. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.					

7.	**CLIMATE CHANGE**. Would the project:	***Potentially Significant Impacts***	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
7.a.	Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				X
Discussion: The County of San Mateo Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Plan and the Energy and Climate Change Element of the General Plan were developed based on the land use designations in the Land Use Element of the General Plan. Because this project will not result in development that exceeds the density limits in the Land Use Element, the analysis of and mitigation for greenhouse gas emissions have already been completed. This project may result in a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. It will allow this region to accommodate more of the people who work here. This would reduce commute distances, reducing VMT and increasing the likelihood of the use of alternative means of transportation. **Source:** Project scope.					
7.b.	Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X
Discussion: This project does not conflict with the County of San Mateo Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan. **Source:** CSMEECAP.					

7.c.	Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. There will be conversion of forestland, GHG release, or reduction of GHG sequestering, associated with this project. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.					
7.d.	Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. This project will not result in increased exposure to sea level rise or flooding associated with global warming. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.					
7.e.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 7.d. **Source:** Project scope.					
7.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 7.d. **Source:** Project scope.					
7.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 7.d. **Source:** Project scope.					

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
8.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. This project will not impact public safety by creating or increasing exposure to hazards or hazardous materials. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.				
8.b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.				
8.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.				
8.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?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.				

8.e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
8.f.	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
8.g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
8.h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
8.i.	Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.					

8.j.	Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
8.k.	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?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
8.l.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 8.a. **Source:** Project scope.					

9.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**. Would the project:	***Potentially Significant Impacts***	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
9.a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. This project will not impact hydrology or water quality. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.					

9.b.	Significantly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere significantly 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)?			X	
Discussion: The project would not significantly deplete groundwater supplies. It would create the potential to develop 101 new single-family residences and two new duplexes on the entire Bayside of the County. These 103 parcels would result in a 0.9% increase over the 9,902 existing and 1,382 potential lots that currently exist in the areas studied, and an insignificant increase over the tens of thousands of parcels Countywide. This increase in impervious rooftops and driveways will have an insignificant effect on groundwater recharge. The 105 new housing units that could be built will not exceed the water usage expected in the General Plan. **Source:** General Plan Land Use Element, GIS Analysis.					
9.c.	Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in significant erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 9.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
9.d.	Significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or significantly increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 9.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
9.e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide significant additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 9.a. **Source:** Project scope.					

9.f.	Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 9.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
9.g.	Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 9.a. **Source:** Project scope.					

10.	**LAND USE AND PLANNING**. Would the project:				
		Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
10.a.	Physically divide an established community?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. This project will not impact circulation or communication within any established community. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.					
10.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?				X
Discussion: The project will increase the development potential very slightly in certain unincorporated communities. The Planning Department used GIS to make a list of all parcels equal to or greater than twice the minimum parcel size and checked the dimensions of each parcel to determine how many would be divisible only if the ordinance amendment is approved. In no case would the new potential density of any unincorporated community exceed the density limits in the General Plan Land Use Element. In many cases, the existing and current potential densities allowed by the Zoning Regulations are less than the minimum density described in the General Plan. The slight increases in potential density created by this project would allow development to inch closer to attaining the minimum density. **Source:** General Plan, Density Analysis.					

10.c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. This project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.				
10.d. Result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. This project will not result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.				
10.e. Result in the introduction of activities not currently found within the community?				X
Discussion: This project will not change the zoning of any parcel. The uses allowed on each parcel with increased potential for subdivision will remain the same. **Source:** Project scope, List of Parcels with Increased Potential for Subdivision.				
10.f. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?			X	
Discussion: The parcels with new development potential are all within developed areas. In the affected areas, the mean increase in potential density is 0.05 dwelling units per acre. The density permitted would in all cases be less than the maximum allowed by the General Plan Land Use Element, and in some cases would be below the minimum allowed by the General Plan Land Use Element. Public facilities are sized to accommodate the maximum intensity allowed by the General Plan. Therefore, the increase in density is not significant. **Source:** Density Analysis.				
10.g. Create a significant new demand for housing?				X
Discussion: The project only affects residentially zoned parcels. It would create housing. **Source:** Project scope.				

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
11.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. This project will not impact mineral resources. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.				
11.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?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 11.a. **Source:** Project scope.				

12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
12.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?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. This project will not result in noise impacts. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.				
12.b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 12.a. **Source:** Project scope.				

12.c. A significant permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 12.a. **Source:** Project scope.				
12.d. A significant temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 12.a. **Source:** Project scope.				
12.e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 12.a. **Source:** Project scope.				
12.f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 12.a. **Source:** Project scope.				

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
13.a. Induce significant population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	

Discussion: The project will not result in any unincorporated community exceeding the density limits in the General Plan Land Use Element. A maximum of 105 new housing units could be created as a result of this project. San Mateo County currently has 271,031 housing units. This increase is less than 0.04%.

Source: 2010 Census, GIS Analysis.

13.b. Displace existing housing **(including low- or moderate-income housing)**, in an area that is substantially deficient in housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion: The project will allow the subdivision of 105 small lots that were not able to be divided before. In many cases, division of land requires that the existing housing unit be removed. However, the land would then be developed with a greater density of housing units, so the removal of the original unit would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Source: Project scope.

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in significant adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the 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:

	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
14.a. Fire protection?			X	
14.b. Police protection?			X	
14.c. Schools?			X	
14.d. Parks?			X	
14.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?			X	

Discussion: The greatest increase in the number of lots in any of the unincorporated communities affected by this ordinance amendment would be a maximum of 2.9% in Devonshire. In no place would the General Plan Land Use Element density limit be exceeded. There is no evidence to suggest that the potential modest increase in the total number of housing units would significantly impact public services.

Source: GIS Analysis.

15. RECREATION. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
15.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that significant physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
Discussion: The project will allow the construction of new housing units, which will bring new park users into the unincorporated communities. The increase will be less than significant. If deterioration of park facilities is directly correlated with the number of users, then Devonshire, the unincorporated community with the greatest increase in the number of lots over the existing number of lots, will see a 2.9% increase in the deterioration of its recreational facilities. The other affected communities will see a lower increase in the rate of deterioration. **Source:** GIS Analysis.				
15.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
Discussion: The project will not require the construction or expansion of recreation facilities. The growth will be within the levels planned for in the General Plan and the development will be within existing communities served by existing facilities. **Source:** GIS Analysis, General Plan.				

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
16.a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				X

Discussion: The project will not allow development beyond that planned to be accommodated by the General Plan Transportation Element. **Source:** GIS Analysis.				
16.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?				X
Discussion: The project does not conflict with these standards. It allows the creation of a small number of lots scattered throughout the Bayside of the County that continue the existing pattern of development and allow the communities to be developed up to the density called for in the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The Transportation Element was developed alongside the Land Use Element to accommodate the transportation demand generated by the development envisioned in the Land Use Element. Therefore, the effect on level of service (LOS) will not conflict with the plan. The project does not entail any construction near roads named in the Transportation Element as congestion areas. **Source:** Transportation Element.				
16.c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in significant safety risks?				X
Discussion: This project does not entail changes to the air transportation system. **Source:** Project scope.				
16.d. Significantly increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. This project will not result in changes to the circulation system. Each subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.				
16.e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 16.d. **Source:** Project scope.				

16.f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X
Discussion: Subdivisions are an opportunity for the County to demand dedications and improvements to the right-of-way and to transportation systems. Potential for improvements will be analyzed for each subdivision application. **Source:** Project description.				
16.g. Cause noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 16.d. **Source:** Project scope.				
16.h. Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
Discussion: This change to the code will not allow development that does not conform to the Zoning Regulations parking requirements. **Source:** Project scope.				

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
	Potentially Significant Impacts	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
17.a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
Discussion: The sites with new potential for subdivision are found in different utility and service districts. It is impossible to study the impact of individual subdivisions at this time. Each subdivision will be a project subject to CEQA. **Source:** Project scope.				
17.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?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 17.a. **Source:** Project scope.				

17.c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
Discussion: The sites are in various locations with varying topography. It is impossible to study the impact of individual subdivisions at this time. Each subdivision will be a project subject to CEQA. **Source:** Project scope.					
17.d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitle-ments and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 17.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
17.e.	Result in a determination by the waste-water 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?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 17.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
17.f.	Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 17.a. **Source:** Project scope.					
17.g.	Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
Discussion: This is a site-specific impact. It is impossible to study the impact of individual subdivisions at this time. Each subdivision will be a project subject to CEQA. **Source:** Project scope.					
17.h.	Be sited, oriented, and/or designed to minimize energy consumption, including transportation energy; incorporate water conservation and solid waste reduction measures; and incorporate solar or other alternative energy sources?				X

Discussion: Each subdivision will be a project subject to CEQA. The orientation, siting, and design of each subdivision will be analyzed when submitted. **Source:** Project scope.					
17.i.	Generate any demands that will cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity?				X
Discussion: See discussion under Question 17.a. **Source:** Project scope.					

18.	**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**.	***Potentially Significant Impacts***	***Significant Unless Mitigated***	***Less Than Significant Impact***	***No Impact***
18.a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, significantly 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?				X
Discussion: The proposed project is a Subdivision Text Amendment. No physical development is proposed. This project will not result in environmental degradation, destruction of habitat, threats to the wild animal and plant life in the region, or the destruction of artifacts of California history. Every subdivision is a project pursuant to CEQA and will be analyzed upon application. **Source:** Not applicable.					
18.b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" 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.)				X
Discussion: This project makes a small change to the lot dimension standards in the Subdivision Ordinance. An analysis of all lots over twice the minimum lot size determined that the result would be that 101 single-family residence lots and 2 two-family residence lots could be created that could					

not be created before. These lots would be in communities already categorized by these types of development. The analysis concluded that, if every subdividable lot in these communities were divided to create as many lots as possible, including both the lots affected by this ordinance and the lots currently subdividable, the resulting density would be below maximum densities allowed by the General Plan in each of these communities. Therefore, the cumulative effect would not be considerable, and the effect has already been studied and mitigated for in the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the General Plan.

Source: GIS Analysis, General Plan, General Plan EIR.

18.c.	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause significant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Discussion: The project will change the lot dimension requirements in the Subdivision Regulations, resulting in the potential to develop 103 sites scattered throughout the Bayside's unincorporated communities to the potential density allowed by the General Plan Land Use Element and Zoning Code. These sites are within existing neighborhoods developed with lots of a similar size to the lots that would result from the newly allowed subdivisions. The effect of single-family houses or duplexes built in neighborhoods composed of other single-family houses or duplexes at the resulting density is less than significant. The effect of construction on the people nearby can be studied and mitigated better during the environmental review for each individual project based on each site's specific setting.

Source: Project scope, GIS Analysis.

RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES. Check what agency has permit authority or other approval for the project.

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)		X	
State Water Resources Control Board		X	
Regional Water Quality Control Board		X	
State Department of Public Health		X	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
CalTrans		X	
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		X	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		X	
Coastal Commission		X	

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
City		X	
Sewer/Water District:		X	
Other:			

MITIGATION MEASURES		
	Yes	No
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.		X
Other mitigation measures are needed.		X
The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:		

DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

X I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared by the Planning Department.

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 of the mitigation measures in the discussion have been included as part of the proposed project. A 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.

Steven Rosen

(Signature) Steven Rosen

10/18/13

Date

Planner

(Title)

SBR:fc – SBRX0706_WFH.DOCX
Initial Study Checklist 09.30.2013.docx

Unincorporated Community	General Plan Land Use Designation	General Plan Density	Current Density if All Lots Were Developed with a Single-Family Residence (Two-Family Residence in R-2 Zones)	Potential Density if All Currently Subdividable Lots Were Divided and Developed	Potential Density if All Currently and Newly Subdividable Lots Were Divided and Developed	Current Total of Existing and Potential Lots	New Lots Possible If Project Approved	Percentage Increase in Number of Lots	New Dwelling Units Possible if Project Approved
Los Trancos Woods	Low Density Residential	0.3-2.3 dwelling units/acre	0.87 du/ac	1.16 du/ac	1.18 du/ac	425	9	2.1%	9
San Mateo Highlands	Low Density Residential	0.3-2.3 dwelling units/acre	1.23 du/ac	1.84 du/ac	1.89 du/ac	42	1	2.4%	1
Devonshire	Medium-Low Density Residential	2.4-6.0 dwelling units/acre	0.56 du/ac	1.74 du/ac	1.80 du/ac	31	1	3.2%	1
Ladera	Medium-Low Density Residential	2.4-6.0 dwelling units/acre	2.27 du/ac	2.30 du/ac	2.30 du/ac	553	1	0.2%	1
Palomar Park	Medium-Low Density Residential	2.4-6.0 dwelling units/acre	2.03 du/ac	3.40 du/ac	3.45 du/ac	302	4	1.3%	4
San Mateo Highlands	Medium-Low Density Residential	2.4-6.0 dwelling units/acre	3.34 du/ac	3.88 du/ac	3.93 du/ac	1713	21	1.2%	21

West Menlo Park	Medium-Low Density Residential	2.4-6.0 dwelling units/acre	2.99 du/ac	3.50 du/ac	3.51 du/ac	328	1	0.3%	1
Broadmoor	Medium Density Residential	6.1-8.7 dwelling units/acre	4.94 du/ac	5.41 du/ac	5.42 du/ac	1462	2	0.1%	2
Devonshire	Medium Density Residential	6.1-8.7 dwelling units/acre	2.77 du/ac	5.51 du/ac	5.67 du/ac	803	23	2.9%	23
Sequoia Tract	Medium Density Residential	6.1-8.7 dwelling units/acre	4.78 du/ac	4.85 du/ac	4.92 du/ac	1314	21	1.6%	21
Weekend Acres	Medium Density Residential	6.1-8.7 dwelling units/acre	2.26 du/ac	4.93 du/ac	5.02 du/ac	299	6	2.0%	6
West Menlo Park	Medium Density Residential	6.1-8.7 dwelling units/acre	5.15 du/ac	5.33 du/ac	5.37 du/ac	1169	8	0.7%	8
North Fair Oaks	Single Family Residential (15du/ac to 24du/ac)	15-24 dwelling units/acre	5.00 du/ac	5.67 du/ac	5.68 du/ac	1987	3	0.2%	3
North Fair Oaks	Multi Family Residential (24du/ac - 60du/ac)	24-60 dwelling units/acre	13.09 du/ac	13.36 du/ac	13.39 du/ac	841	2	0.2%	4
Totals							103		105

Unincorporated Community	Current Total of Existing and Potential Lots	New Lots Possible If Project Approved	Percentage Increase in Number of Lots
Broadmoor	1462	2	0.13%
Devonshire	834	24	2.88%
Ladera	553	1	0.18%
Los Trancos Woods	425	9	2.12%
North Fair Oaks MFR	841	2	0.24%
North Fair Oaks SFR	1987	3	0.15%
Palomar Park	302	4	1.32%
San Mateo Highlands	1755	22	1.25%
Sequoia Tract	1314	21	1.60%
Weekend Acres	299	6	2.01%
West Menlo Park	1497	9	0.60%

County of San Mateo - Planning and Building Department

ATTACHMENT C

COMMITTEE FOR
GREEN FOOTHILLS

April 21, 2014

Dave Pine, President and
Members of the Board of Supervisors
400 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063

Re: Proposed Amendment to the County Subdivision Ordinance to eliminate the minimum lot depth standards in areas outside the County Coastal Zone (PLN2013-002221)

Dear President Pine and Supervisors,

The above-referenced Amendment is scheduled for hearing by your Board at your May 6, 2014 meeting. On behalf of Committee for Green Foothills (CGF) I am writing to support the Amendment to eliminate the minimum lot depth standards as unanimously recommended by the Planning Commission. CGF understands that the applicant proposing the Amendment will meet all of the setback requirements, daylight plane, FAR, etc. in the zoning district for the two homes he is proposing to build.

CGF also strongly supports the unanimous decision by the Planning Commission to retain the important 3-1 lot depth to width ratio that had initially been recommended by Planning Staff for deletion. This important subdivision design requirement provides that the depth of lots shall not be "greater than three times the width, exclusive of rights of way or easements necessary for road purposes". It has been in place for many years and helps ensure that new lots are reasonably proportional and don't create long, skinny lots that resemble a bowling alley. Several cities and towns have similar provisions.

CGF also requests that your Board give direction to Staff to initiate an amendment to the Subdivision Ordinance to eliminate the exception provision from Section 7020 – 2-K (1) that reads: "The parcels are located on or adjacent to steep hillsides, rivers, or creeks". By removing this exception you will eliminate a loophole that allows applicants to use unbuildable areas such as areas within creeks, cliffs, and other hazardous areas that can be used to enable them to subdivide.

The County recently had an unfortunate experience where an applicant was able to subdivide a parcel in Stanford Weekend Acres. The Applicant, Dr. Ramin Shahidi, was able to subdivide an already developed parcel into two, despite the fact that a significant portion of this land was within the banks of San Francisquito Creek. After a long, contentious, divisive battle, Dr. Shahidi was allowed to subdivide his parcel, tear down a modest single-family dwelling and cottage, and replace them with two new large houses. Dr. Shahidi had claimed he needed to subdivide in order to finance the two new homes, which were intended to be a "family compound" with his mother-in-law living in the second home.

To the surprise of almost no one, upon completion of the homes, they were put on the market, and have now sold for $2,150,000 and $2,245,000. The County lost two relatively affordable homes,

COMMITTEE FOR
GREEN FOOTHILLS
3921 E. Bayshore Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
650.968.7243 PHONE
650.968.8431 FAX
info@GreenFoothills.org
www.GreenFoothills.org

the neighbors have to live with the results of a speculator who had no regard to community concerns, and the home closest to the creek has a deck that invades the agreed upon setback of 12 feet from the top of the bank.

In summary, CGF (1) supports the elimination of minimum lot depth requirements, (2) requests that the maximum lot depth to width design requirements be retained, and (3) requests that the exception that allows unbuildable areas to be included as a means to subdivide be deleted from the subdivision regulations as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely,

Lennie Roberts
San Mateo County Legislative Advocate