

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

NORTH CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT
45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE AND TDD (415) 904-5260
FAX (415) 904-5400

W9

NORTH CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT DEPUTY DIRECTOR'S REPORT

For the

August Meeting of the California Coastal Commission

MEMORANDUM

Date: **August 11, 2010**

TO: Commissioners and Interested Parties

FROM: Charles Lester, North Central Coast District Deputy Director

SUBJECT: **Deputy Director's Report**

Following is a listing for the waivers, emergency permits, immaterial amendments and extensions issued by the North Central Coast District Office for the **August 11, 2010**, Coastal Commission hearing. Copies of the applicable items are attached for your review. Each item includes a listing of the applicants involved, a description of the proposed development, and a project location.

Pursuant to the Commission's direction and adopted procedures, appropriate notice materials were sent to all applicants for posting at the project site. Additionally, these items have been posted at the District office and are available for public review and comment.

This report may also contain additional correspondence and/or any additional staff memorandum concerning the items to be heard on today's agenda for the North Central Coast District.

NO ITEMS TO REPORT THIS MONTH

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

NORTH CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT
45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219
VOICE AND TDD (415) 904-5260
FAX (415) 904-5400

**Memorandum****August 9, 2010**

To: Commissioners and Interested Parties

FROM: Charles Lester, Deputy Director
North Central Coast District

Re: **Additional Information for Commission Meeting**
Wednesday, August 11, 2010

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
W11a	A-2-SMC-07-001 Sterling, San Mateo Co.	Correspondence, Terrence D. Gossett Correspondence, Deanne K. Spears Correspondence, Denise Rabijs Correspondence, Lennie Roberts Correspondence, Allen Olivo Correspondence, Robin McKnight Correspondence, Katie Sanborn Correspondence, Wendy Lama	1-2 3-4 5 6-7 8-9 10-11 12-13 14-15

W119

Ruby Pap

From: Terrence Gossett [texterry@pacbell.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 05, 2010 6:32 PM
To: Charles Lester
Cc: Ruby Pap; Michelle Jesperson
Subject: Written Comments on August Agenda item 11a--Sterling
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, August 09, 2010 9:00 AM
Flag Status: Red
Attachments: CPRLtrCCC8-5-2010.doc

Dear Mr Lester,

Please find attached the comments from Californians for Property Rights for the August 2010 meeting of the CCC regarding item 11a-- Sterling.

CPR requests that these comments be included in the public record. The increasing concerns that CPR has with the Coastal Commission centers on random initiation of "new" policies beyond that as described in the coastal act or in the certified LCP, and the subsequent unfair implementation of these "new" policies.

It should be noted that the LCP that applies to the Sterlings also did, or should have been that which, applies to Commissioner Blank on the development of his coastal property APN 089-221-090. Yet Agenda item 11a, and Exhibit 14, shows dramatically different conditions applied by the Coastal Commission to the Sterlings versus those applied to Commissioner Blank.

Why is that?

all the best,

terry gossett



Californians for Property Rights, Box 282, Moss Beach, CA 94038
 Phone 650-563-9508 Email texterry@pacbell.net
 Website: www.californiansforpropertyrights.org (or www.c4pr.org)
 "Property rights are civil rights"

August 2010, Agenda Item 11a -- Sterling
 Terrence D Gossett

August 5, 2010

Charles Lester --California Coastal Commission
 45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000
 San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 904-5200
clester@coastal.ca.gov
 SUBJECT --Comments on Appeal No. A-2-SMC-07-01 (Sterling, San Mateo)

RECEIVED

AUG 09 2010
 CALIFORNIA
 COASTAL COMMISSION

Dear Mr Lester,

Californians for Property Rights (CPR) is an educational, public benefit, tax-exempt, non-profit (501c3). Our mission is to educate the public regarding their private property rights as well as constitutional property rights. CPR facilitates public education and assists with information exchange regarding contemporary issues, processes and actions that may affect said rights. CPR requests that these comments be included in the public record.

CPR is concerned that the Commission is pushing policies not required by the Coastal Act, and is not administering those policies fairly for all applicants. The Sterling appeal and staff recommendation is a good example of that unfairness. Commission policies should apply equally to all, but that is not the case.

In staff report W11a-8-2010, Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, the Commission would require the Sterlings to have:
 Originally, an affirmative agricultural easement to be replaced by an agricultural and open space deed restriction
 All residential development inside an area no greater than 10,000 sq feet, and
 Non-reflective earth tone materials.

Yet, when one looks at Exhibit 14 of the staff report, 23 Previous San Mateo County CDPs for single family residences are listed, including one for Commissioner Steve Blank. It is clear that Commissioner Blank does not comply with the conditions placed on the Sterlings, regarding easements or deed restrictions, 10,000 sq feet, or of non-reflective earth tone materials. Commissioner Blank has a 15,780 sq ft home with solar panels, horse stable, barn, and five relocated farm labor housing cabins.

The Commission must fairly allow applicants the same leeway in complying with the Coastal Act as is given to Commissioners.

Respectfully yours,
 Signature on File

Terrence D Gossett
 President, Californians for Property Rights

Directors---
 Don Bacon, Mary Bordi, John Donovan, Dale Dunham, Terry Gossett, Judy Grote, George Muteff,
 Nina Pellegrini, Marta Sehnal

W11a

From: Deanne Spears [mailto:dkspears@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 05, 2010 5:22 PM
To: Charles Lester
Subject: Sterling project, El Granada, CA

Sent from my iPad

August 5, 2010

Agenda Item W11a

Chair Bonnie Neely and Members
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-2219

Re: Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County

Dear Chair Neely and Members of the Commission,

I am a property owner (two parcels) near the site of the Sterling site.

On behalf of Committee for Green Foothills (CGF), I am writing in support of the Staff Recommendation for Approval with Special Conditions **but we take strong exception to Condition 2.A.8**, which would allow consideration of possible further division of this 143-acre agricultural parcel into two lots and construction of an additional single family residence.

It is critical that Condition 2.A.8 be deleted. The County Planning Commission unanimously denied this project due in large measure to the proposed subdivision of the parcel into two, and resulting impacts on the viability of maintaining agricultural land in agricultural use.

The Sterlings appealed the Planning Commission's denial to the Board of Supervisors, and modified the project by deleting any subdivision of the land, and relocating the proposed 6,456 square foot non-agricultural residence to a site that is not visible from Highway One, and would not adversely impact sensitive habitats or prime soils (this same alternative building site is now before your Commission for approval). All other areas of this property are constrained by prime soils, steep slopes, sensitive habitats, and scenic resources, as shown in Exhibit 3, Site Constraints Map.

By allowing any speculative potential for subdivision and development of a second non-agricultural residence, the Commission would be acting contrary to the Findings that staff has carefully and extensively outlined. Moreover, the purpose of the proposed Agricultural and Open Space Deed Restriction would be completely contravened by any further subdivision of the land.

Providing for even the consideration of any land division on this 143-acre agricultural parcel would create false expectations for the landowner, would increase land values far beyond agricultural values, and would violate LCP Policy 1.8.a, (among others) which states in relevant part:

***1.8 Land Uses and Development Densities in Rural Areas:**

a. Allow new development (as defined in Section 30106 of the California Coastal Act of 1976) in rural areas only if it is demonstrated that it will not (1) have significant adverse impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources, and (2) diminish the ability to keep all prime agricultural land and other land suitable for agriculture...in agricultural production.

In 1986, the voters of San Mateo County overwhelmingly passed Measure A, the Coastal Protection Initiative. Policy 1.8, and 36 other LCP policies protecting rural agricultural lands, scenic resources, sensitive habitats, and coastal watersheds were approved by the voters who also mandated that these key LCP policies may not be weakened or discarded by the Board of Supervisors without voter approval.

As one of the authors of Measure A, I was deeply concerned about the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors willingness to discard the policies of our LCP, which had only been certified just six years previously. Measure A's declarations include:

"The purposes of this ordinance are: (1) To protect the farm lands, forests, beaches, scenic beauty and other natural resources of the San Mateo Coast from poorly located, excessive and harmful development, (2) to preserve watersheds, environmentally sensitive areas and wildlife habitats, (3) to maintain agriculture and timber uses on the Coast..."

The Staff Recommendation for Approval with Special Conditions has extensive findings regarding the adverse impacts of large residences being constructed on agricultural land. These impacts include increased conflict between land uses, land speculation and increased costs for agriculture. In order to minimize any potential adverse impacts, both on this property and on other rural farmlands, the proposed Agricultural and Open Space Deed Restriction should not be weakened by opening the door, however slightly, to any future division of the land.

Please delete Condition 2.A.8 and approve the CDP subject to all other Special Conditions, per the Staff Recommendation.

Sincerely,

Deanne K. Spears
130 Navarra Ave.
El Granada 94018

W11a

From: denise rabius [mailto:deniserabius@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 05, 2010 5:01 PM
To: Charles Lester
Subject: Hearing on W11a on Aug 11, 2010

Chair Bonnie Neely and Members
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-2219

W11a

Appeal No. A-2-SMC-07-01 (Sterling, San Mateo Co.)

Correspondent: Denise Rabius

I am writing in support of the Staff Recommendation for Approval with all of the Special Conditions except Condition 2.A.8 which would allow further division of this agricultural parcel into two lots and construction of a second single family residence.

This location is comprised of extremely steep slopes and sensitive habitats. Any development will cause problems in this and surrounding areas. Furthermore, it is my understanding that this land is zoned as agricultural, and was bought as agricultural land in the recent past. The staff analysis points out that agricultural viability is compromised by building a huge 6,456 sq.ft. house - allowing a second large house and land division for same further compromises the agricultural viability. Moreover the location of the proposed house is the ONLY site on the property that does not impact prime soils, sensitive habitats, steep slopes and scenic resources, as the staff correctly points out.

Thank you for your time,
Denise Rabius
106 Navarra Ave, HMB, CA, 94019



COMMITTEE FOR
GREEN FOOTHILLS

W11a

August 5, 2010

Agenda Item W11a
Lennie Roberts

Chair Bonnie Neely and Members
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-2219

RECEIVED

AUG 09 2010

CALIFORNIA
COASTAL COMMISSION

Re: Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County

Dear Chair Neely and Members of the Commission,

On behalf of Committee for Green Foothills (CGF), I am writing in support of the Staff Recommendation for Approval with Special Conditions **but we take strong exception to Condition 2.A.8**, which would allow consideration of possible further division of this 143-acre agricultural parcel into two lots and construction of an additional single family residence.

It is critical that Condition 2.A.8 be deleted. The County Planning Commission unanimously denied this project due in large measure to the proposed subdivision of the parcel into two, and resulting impacts on the viability of maintaining agricultural land in agricultural use.

The Sterlings appealed the Planning Commission's denial to the Board of Supervisors, and modified the project by deleting any subdivision of the land, and relocating the proposed 6,456 square foot non-agricultural residence to a site that is not visible from Highway One, and would not adversely impact sensitive habitats or prime soils (this same alternative building site is now before your Commission for approval). All other areas of this property are constrained by prime soils, steep slopes, sensitive habitats, and scenic resources, as shown in Exhibit 3, Site Constraints Map.

By allowing any speculative potential for subdivision and development of a second non-agricultural residence, the Commission would be acting contrary to the Findings that staff has carefully and extensively outlined. Moreover, the purpose of the proposed Agricultural and Open Space Deed Restriction would be completely contravened by any further subdivision of the land.

Providing for even the consideration of any land division on this 143-acre agricultural parcel would create false expectations for the landowner, would increase land values far beyond agricultural values, and would violate LCP Policy 1.8.a, (among others) which states in relevant part:

***1.8 Land Uses and Development Densities in Rural Areas:**

a. Allow new development (as defined in Section 30106 of the California Coastal Act of 1976) in rural areas only if it is demonstrated that it will not (1) have significant adverse impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources, and (2) diminish the ability to keep all prime agricultural land and other land suitable for agriculture...in agricultural production."

In 1986, the voters of San Mateo County overwhelmingly passed Measure A, the Coastal Protection Initiative. Policy 1.8, and 36 other LCP policies protecting rural agricultural lands, scenic resources, sensitive habitats, and coastal watersheds were approved by the voters who also mandated that these key LCP policies may not be weakened or discarded by the Board of Supervisors without voter approval.

As one of the authors of Measure A, I was deeply concerned about the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors willingness to discard the policies of our LCP, which had only been certified just six years previously. Measure A's declarations include:

"The purposes of this ordinance are: (1) To protect the farm lands, forests, beaches, scenic beauty and other natural resources of the San Mateo Coast from poorly located, excessive and harmful development, (2) to preserve watersheds, environmentally sensitive areas and wildlife habitats, (3) to maintain agriculture and timber uses on the Coast..."

The Staff Recommendation for Approval with Special Conditions has extensive findings regarding the adverse impacts of large residences being constructed on agricultural land. These impacts include increased conflict between land uses, land speculation and increased costs for agriculture. In order to minimize any potential adverse impacts, both on this property and on other rural farmlands, the proposed Agricultural and Open Space Deed Restriction should not be weakened by opening the door, however slightly, to any future division of the land.

Please delete Condition 2.A.8 and approve the CDP subject to all other Special Conditions, per the Staff Recommendation.

Sincerely,

Signature on File

Lennie Roberts, Legislative Advocate
Committee for Green Foothills

W11a

From: allen olivo [mailto:allenolivo@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, August 06, 2010 1:30 PM
To: Charles Lester
Subject: Public Comment on Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County

Charles:
Below is my public comment on Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County. Thank you.

Allen Olivo

August 6, 2010

Agenda Item W11a
Allen Olivo

Chair Bonnie Neely and Members
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-2219

Re: Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County

Dear Chair Neely and Members of the Commission,
My name is Allen Olivo and I co-own property at 531 San Juan Avenue in El Granada directly across the street from this parcel. I am writing in support of the Staff Recommendation for Approval with all of the Special Conditions except Condition 2.A.8, which would allow consideration of further division of this PAD parcel into two lots and construction of an additional single family residence.

The possibility of a subdivision and the possibility of building another residential home on PAD land in the Scenic Corridor remains the source of much concern and discussion for many neighbors, advocates and other citizens. The County Planning Commission unanimously denied this project largely due to the proposed subdivision of the parcel. The Board of Supervisors only then approved a modified project that deleted any subdivision of the land, and relocated the proposed non-agricultural residence to a suitable site not visible from Highway One.

An important question in the future of this parcel remains regarding the actual parcel size and number of verified Density Credits (which determine the number of parcels that can be created under the Planned Agricultural District zoning). During the course of public hearings on the project, there were 8 different acreages presented, ranging from 123 acres to 156 acres, now estimated at 143 acres. One map in particular was first deemed unreliable when it produced 1.4 Density Credits, but later reliable when it produced a credit of over 1.5. That revision was made based on an incorrect Remote Lands calculation which did not recognize that San Juan Avenue was not an all-weather, through public road until 2002, well after the LCP was certified in 1980. This interpretation is not consistent with Table 1.3D and therefore, the revised calculation shouldn't have been used.

Finally, the current proposed location for the one non-agricultural residential building site was determined to be the only suitable location on the property not constrained by prime soils, steep slopes, sensitive habitats, and scenic resources.

I am hopeful that the Commission will find a way for the owners to construct their proposed house on this property while ensuring consistency with the LCP, voter's wishes and prior County decisions. By deleting Condition 2.A.8, you will be able to do so.

Thank you for your work to protect the California coast.

Allen Olivo

531 San Juan

W11a

From: Robin McKnight [mailto:robinmck@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, August 06, 2010 10:03 AM
To: Charles Lester
Subject: Re: Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County

Please confirm receipt of this letter and submit for consideration. Thank you.

August 6, 2010

Agenda Item W11a
Robin

McKnight
Chair Bonnie Neely and Members
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-2219

Re: Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County

Dear Chair Neely and Members of the Commission,

My name is Robin McKnight and I co-own property directly across from the parcel that is the subject of this appeal. I support the staff recommendation for Approval with Special Conditions but am **adamantly opposed to condition 2.A.8**, which would allow consideration and possible further division of this agricultural parcel into two lots and construction of an additional single family residence.

It has not been accurately proven that this parcel warrants two density credits. County records show there are three conflicting density credit analysis on record – yielding vastly different results. In 2003 the applicants challenged the density analysis in San Mateo County. The second analysis (DEN2003-00002) yielded only one density credit.

There has never been a comprehensive topographic and boundary survey done of the property, even though for years both San Mateo County and the Coastal Commission have been asking for one. There is a 20% swing in eight recorded estimates of this property's acreage (from 123-156 acres).

The County Planning Commission unanimously denied this project in 2005, due in large measure to the proposed subdivision of the parcel into two,

and resulting impacts on the viability of maintaining agricultural land in agricultural use. On July 13, 2005, during that meeting, Commissioner Bomberger said, "One of the things that jumped out at me is Policy 1.8, Land Use and Development Density in Rural Areas. And part A of that says we should only allow new development in rural areas if it can be demonstrated that it will not have significant impacts either individually or cumulatively on coastal resources. But point 2 is even more important. It says we can't diminish the ability to keep all prime agriculture land and other land suitable for agriculture and agriculture production. It does not say adjacent parcels, it says all agricultural land. To me when I look at this, we have taken, or are proposing to take, a piece of Planned Agricultural District land and convert it into estate houses - and that is detrimental to the long term usage of agricultural land in the county. It changes the economic equation for everybody. We've done some already and I wish myself not to participate in that anymore. I think it's wrong. If we want to continue to do this kind of stuff, we need to change the general plan - not to continue to erode the meaning of section 1.8. 1.8 was voted on by the public and I think we need to take it seriously."

Providing for even the consideration of any land division on this agricultural parcel would create false expectations for the landowner, would increase land values far beyond agricultural values, and would violate LCP Policy 1.8.a.,

Please delete Condition 2.A.8 and approve the CDP subject to all other Special Conditions, per the Staff Recommendation.

Sincerely,

Robin McKnight
531 San Juan Ave
Half Moon Bay, Ca 94019

From: Katie Sanborn [mailto:Katie.Sanborn@otrglobal.com]
Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 8:12 AM
To: Charles Lester
Subject: Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County

Wlla

Dear Mr. Lester,

We co-own property down the street from the parcel that is the subject of this appeal. We are supportive of the staff recommendation for Approval with Special Conditions, but we are absolutely opposed to condition 2.A.8 , which would allow consideration and possible further division of this agricultural parcel into two lots and construction of an additional single-family residence.

Please see the attached letter to Chair Bonnie Neely and members of the CCC for further detail.

Thank you,

Katie Sanborn
Barbara Wright

El Granada, Calif.

READ THIS © 2010 OTR Global LLC. All rights reserved. This transmission was produced for the exclusive use of OTR Global LLC (OTR), and may not be reproduced or relied upon, in whole or in part, without OTR's written consent. The information herein is not intended to be a complete analysis of every material fact in respect to any company or industry discussed. OTR Global LLC is an investment advisor subsidiary of OTR Global Holdings LLC. OTR Global Trading LLC is a registered broker dealer subsidiary of OTR Global Holdings LLC. The affiliated companies of the OTA Financial Group LP and/or its principals, employees, clients or researchers may have an interest in the securities of issuers discussed herein or in securities of other issuers in other industries.

August 9, 2010

Agenda Item W11a
Katie Sanborn
Barbara Wright

Chair Bonnie Neely and Members
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105-2219

Re: Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County

Dear Chair Neely and Members of the Commission,

We co-own property down the street from the parcel that is the subject of this appeal. We are supportive of the staff recommendation for Approval with Special Conditions, but we are absolutely opposed to condition 2.A.8, which would allow consideration and possible further division of this agricultural parcel into two lots and construction of an additional single-family residence.

We were surprised to see that the issue we had thought was put to rest by the County Commission -- namely that the parcel could not be subdivided -- is being put up for consideration again. At issue is whether one of the two density credits the property may have (and this has never been confirmed) would be assigned to a new parcel that could be carved from the original. First, there are conflicting assessments of the density credits the parcel warrants. Second, we believe subdividing the property violates LCP Policy 1.8.a and Measure A, the Coastal Protection Initiative:

**1.8 Land Uses and Development Densities in Rural Areas:*

a. Allow new development (as defined in Section 30106 of the California Coastal Act of 1976) in rural areas only if it is demonstrated that it will not (1) have significant adverse impacts, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources, and (2) diminish the ability to keep all prime agricultural land and other land suitable for agriculture...in agricultural production."

Measure A:

"The purposes of this ordinance are: (1) To protect the farm lands, forests, beaches, scenic beauty and other natural resources of the San Mateo Coast from poorly located, excessive and harmful development, (2) to preserve watersheds, environmentally sensitive areas and wildlife habitats, (3) to maintain agriculture and timber uses on the Coast..."

Therefore, we respectfully request that you delete Condition 2.A.8 and approve the CDP subject to all other Special Conditions, per the Staff Recommendation.

Sincerely,

Katie Sanborn
Barbara Wright

855 Ferdinand Ave.
PO Box 2693
El Granada CA 94018

WLLa

From: Wendy Lama [mailto:wendylama@coastside.net]
Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 11:48 AM
To: Charles Lester; 'Robin McKnight'
Cc: 'Lennie Roberts'
Subject: RE: Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County

Dear Mr. Lester

I would like to submit the attached letter with regard to Appeal No A-2-SMC-07-001, Sterling, San Mateo County, scheduled for hearing before the Coastal Commission this week. I was unable to fax it to your office last Friday due to an apparently malfunctioning fax in your office.

Thank you very much for accepting my comments by email.

Sincerely, Wendy Lama

Wendy Brewer Lama
Ecotourism Specialist/Consultant
and
Director, KarmaQuest Ecotourism and Adventure Travel
699 Spindrift Way, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Tel: 650 560 0101 / Fax: 712 8164
www.karmaquests.com

August 6, 2010

To: Chair Bonnie Neely and Members
CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
NORTH CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT, 45 FREMONT, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105- 2219

From: Wendy Brewer Lama
699 Spindrift Way, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Re: Appeal No. A-2-SMC-07-01 (Sterling, San Mateo Co.) scheduled for hearing on August 11, 2010

Dear Chair Neely and Commissioners:

I wish to support the staff recommendation for Approval with Conditions of the Sterling proposal for the construction of a residence on a 143-acre Planned Agricultural Development (PAD) zoned parcel at 300 San Juan Avenue, San Mateo County, with the removal of Special Condition #2-A-8.

As a long-time resident of the San Mateo County Coastside and supporter of the Coastal Act, I applaud the staff recommendation requiring an agricultural and open space deed restriction as a condition of development. This restriction is necessary to ensure that the property remains available for agricultural use, and that the residential use serves as a secondary use.

I take strong issue with Special Condition #2-A-8, however, which runs counter to the retention of the property in agricultural use. To suggest that the subdivision of the property could be considered in any way consistent with the San Mateo County LCP suggests that the property may have a future use other than agriculture, thereby lending considerable speculative value to the land and threatening the prospect of it remaining in agricultural use. If the property were to be divided, again there would be expectations to construct a residence on the newly created parcel, whereas it has been demonstrated that no other portion of the existing parcel is buildable in a manner that protects coastal resources and scenic values. The possibility of a land division would set the stage for inflated land value, unrealistic development hopes, and the possibility of a legal challenge to the agricultural and open space deed restriction.

In conclusion, I am very concerned that the approval of the Sterling proposed development with Special Condition 2-A-8 would set a seriously deleterious precedent that would undermine the ability of the County's LCP to protect coastal resources in a manner that supports agriculture, sustainable tourism, natural resources, and scenic values, and exposes the resident of San Mateo County to continue to defend the implementation of coastal protection policies that were widely supported during the LCP process.

Thank you for your attention. Sincerely,

Signature on File

Wendy Brewer Lama