



COMMITTEE FOR
GREEN FOOTHILLS

October 29, 2015

Summer Burlison Project Planner
San Mateo County Planning and Building
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Re: Plan Princeton – Preferred Plan and Zoning Map

Dear Summer,

Please accept these comments on behalf of Committee for Green Foothills regarding the Preferred Plan and Zoning Map that was presented to the Focus Group on October 13.

The Map proposes to split the inland block bounded by Broadway, Princeton, Columbia, and Harvard into two zoning districts: with CCR fronting Princeton and W (M-3) fronting Harvard. Additionally the Map proposes to rezone the western shoreline block bounded by Vassar, Ocean, West Point including the row of lots west of West Point, and Princeton, from W to CCR. The proposed rezoning would split the adjacent inland block bounded by Vassar, Princeton, West Point and Harvard into two zoning districts, with CCR fronting Princeton and W(M-3) fronting Harvard.

The expansion of CCR and splitting of blocks with proposed boundary lines between zoning districts is likely to be found inconsistent with the Coastal Act.

I have reviewed the Coastal Commission's Staff Report for the San Mateo County LCP Amendment 1-90 in which the County had proposed to amend the LCP Land Use Plan Map and Zoning Map for Princeton to allow approximately five blocks or one-third of the industrial subdivided area of Princeton west of Denniston Creek to be designated as Commercial Recreation and zoned Waterfront Commercial.

The Coastal Commission did not accept this rezoning as submitted. Their Findings for denial of the County's proposed rezoning for visitor serving commercial uses in 1/3 of Princeton included the fact that CCR zoning of this expansive area would be inconsistent with the Coastal Act, which gives highest priority to coastal dependent uses that support the fishing and boating industry at the harbor. The Commission's Findings also determined that there was sufficient land already zoned for visitor serving commercial uses east of Denniston Creek. The Findings noted that as competition for shoreline sites increases, the trend has been to replace low value land uses such as industrial with much more valuable visitor serving commercial uses. Loss of proximate on-shore support facilities limits the ability of the fishing industry to compete with more lucrative land uses, including high priced visitor serving uses such as hotels, restaurants, and other tourist accommodations. In Princeton, we even have illegal residential uses creeping into the industrially zoned land and commanding very high prices for resale.

Uses supportive of commercial fishing and recreational boating activities tend to be industrial in character, some of which are noisy and involve the use of malodorous compounds (e.g. boat repair and fish processing). Other needs for commercial fishing and recreational boating often involve a semi-industrial look, e.g., outdoor gear/boat storage/boat repair/storage of crab pots, etc. The Coastal Commission determined that allowable visitor serving uses (which the certified LCP Amendment limited to the first shoreline block of Princeton west of Denniston Creek) needed to be adequately buffered from the industrial uses, as the two uses are essentially incompatible. The Commission did not support drawing zoning boundary lines along mid-block property lines, due to the lack of adequate buffers between uses on the small lots in Princeton. Instead, the Commission's modifications drew boundary lines between the zoning districts along streets, which also helps support the fundamental priority for marine-related land use in the area.

I believe that these fundamental needs of the area have not changed, particularly the need to continue to provide adequate sites that support the commercial fishing industry. Therefore, I urge that you keep the land use and zoning designations for visitor serving uses limited to the current areas.

I also support the comments of the Midcoast Community Council regarding reducing the height throughout the CCR, M-1 and W Districts and for creating adequate setbacks between the M-1 parcels and the Pillar Ridge Community.

Thanks for considering our comments.



Lennie Roberts