

Pre-Construction
San Mateo County
Environmental Impact Report



Proposed Post-Construction
Rendering



Cowpens Way
as of Jan 13, 2021



Ms. Camille Leung
 Project Planner
 San Mateo County Planning and Building Dept.
 July 2, 2021
 Page 3 of 3

excluded “home sizes.” (Conditions Nos. 1 and 5.) Thus, the Project must follow the requirements of the RM district and include the garage floor area in the calculation.

Table 4
Proposed Setbacks Lots 1 through 11

Zoning District	Lot No.	Front Setback (feet)	Right Side Setback (feet)	Left Side Setback (feet)	Rear Setback (feet)	Total Floor Area
Existing RM		50	20	20	20	None
Proposed RM Text Amendment*		20	10	10	20	None
	Lot 1	20 ^x	10 ^x	18 ^x	46	3,727
	Lot 2	20 ^x	18 ^x	10 ^x	46	3,727
	Lot 3	20 ^x	10 ^x	10 ^x	51	3,874
	Lot 4	24 ^x	10 ^x	10 ^x	20	3,874
	Lot 5	22 ^x	12 ^x	10 ^x	46	2,789
	Lot 6	28 ^x	11 ^x	17 ^x	55	2,789
	Lot 7	40 ^x	10 ^x	10 ^x	56	2,789
	Lot 8	61	36 ¹	10 ^x	58	2,789
	Lot 11	61	23 ¹	74	28	3,518
R-1/S-81		20	5	5	20	
	Lot 9	40	25	16	52	3,390
	Lot 10	24	39	25	44	3,431

*The setbacks are proposed and have not been adopted.
 * Proposed setbacks that do NOT meet current RM Regulations, but comply with the proposed RM Text Amendment.
¹ Lots 8 and 11 contain "No-Build Zones." Per Conditions 8, 9, and 34, setbacks as shown in this table are measured from the edge of "no-build" areas. Right side setbacks would be 36 feet (Lot 8) and 23 feet (Lot 11) for these lots but would still comply with the minimum 20-foot side setback.

IV. Conclusion.

For the reasons raised above, we respectfully request that the County: (1) process this amendment to the grading permit and the Project building permits as required by County Code; and (2) withdraw this CEQA Addendum, address these inadequacies, and recirculate a new CEQA document for public review.

If you have any questions, you may reach me at (916) 456-9595.

Very truly yours,



Daniel S. Cucchi
dcucchi@aklandlaw.com

Enclosures
 DSC

I. The CEQA Addendum Fails To Address The Project's Aesthetics Impacts In Light Of New Information Demonstrating A Substantially More Severe Viewshed Impact Than Previously Analyzed.

The attached picture (also video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TJiK6PQDUSI>) circulating among the community plainly demonstrates the previously undisclosed viewshed impact of the Project and must be analyzed in a Supplemental EIR. (**Attachment 1.**) The Recirculated DEIR reasonably assumed that the impact was less than significant based upon the photo simulations, such as the attached for Lot 11, which depicts that only the roofline would be visible from the street and the viewshed beyond was still largely visible. The reality is so far beyond the simulation that this error cannot be dismissed as just within the range of reasonableness afforded photo-simulations. This now demonstrated fundamental error in the DEIR analysis represents new information of a new significant impact associated with the development of Lots 5-8, since they may also be developed in a manner that relies on this same error, and a Supplemental EIR must be prepared.

II. The CEQA Addendum Relies On An Inaccurate Project Description Because It Fails To Accurately Describe The Amount Of Grading Involved Or The Project Approvals That Are Being Considered.

The CEQA Addendum's Project description identifies only the amount of grading that are accounted for as cut and fill for truck trip related purposes, but fails to describe the total of earthwork that would result from the substantial increase associated with the amount of landslide remediation. Failing to provide this information means that neither the decision makers or the public understand the magnitude of the overall change in the Project. In addition, creating this much more narrow window into the Project changes means the CEQA Addendum has artificially narrowed the impact analysis. The CEQA Addendum should also describe what approvals will be relying on this CEQA Addendum. The failure to disclose those approvals prevents the public from being able to meaningfully comment on the whole of the Project.

III. The Approval Of The Proposed Building Permits For Lots 5-8 Violate The Maximum Floor Area Regulations In The RM Zone And Require Board Approval.

As the County is aware, the Resource Management ("RM") zoning district, which Lots 5-8 are subject to, require the square footage for garages to be included in the Total Floor Area calculation. In addition, the requirements for development within the RM district were already included in the San Mateo County Zoning Code when the Project was approved. The developer is presumed to know and agree to any pre-existing regulations, absent a request to modify those regulations. Any modification of the original Project approval to allow the development of home sizes that are larger than were approved by the Board would be an abuse of the Director's discretion. This is so, because the authority granted to the Director by the Board expressly



July 2, 2021

Via Electronic Mail

Ms. Camille Leung
Project Planner
San Mateo County Planning and Building Dept.
County of San Mateo
455 County Center, Second Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063
cleung@smcgov.org

Re: Objections to Proposed Planning Director's Approval of an Amendment to the Grading Permit and Comments on the Proposed CEQA Addendum for the Chamberlain Highlands Project

Dear Ms. Leung:

This office represents concerned neighbors in the Highlands area, who are concerned about the Planning and Building Department proposal to authorize changes to the grading plan for the Chamberlain Highlands Project ("Project") as "Minor Modifications" despite the express requirements in the San Mateo County Grading Ordinance (the "SMC-GO") requiring a public hearing prior to approval by either the Zoning Hearing Officer or the County Board of Supervisors ("Board").

This follow up letter is to provide additional comments on the adequacy of the CEQA Addendum proposed in support of these decisions, as well as further review of the County Code. For the reasons stated below, we respectfully request that: (1) the amendment to the approved grading plan and approval of Project building permits be processed as required the County Code; and (2) the proposed CEQA Addendum be withdrawn, that the described inadequacies be addressed, and a proper CEQA document, most likely a Supplemental EIR, be prepared due to the new and substantially more severe impacts resulting from the proposed Project changes.