

Issue	Appeal Contentions	Staff Response
Aesthetics	EIR does not demonstrate that landscape and tree replacement plans will prevent significant adverse impacts.	The EIR and conditions of approval establish detailed landscaping requirements that will mitigate impacts to a less than significant level, as described below.
	FEIR does not address visual impacts from all locations such as Parrot Drive.	The EIR analysis uses line of site, duration of visibility, proximity of views, and number of viewers impacted to analyze visual impacts. Visual impacts to Parrot Drive residences have been analyzed from the vantage point of northern Parrot Drive looking south, and will be reduced to a less than significant level by landscape screening, a prohibition against accessory structures within the rear setback, and implementation of Design Guidelines.
	The landscape plan is a “moving target” that is “standardless and unenforceable.”	Conditions 8a and 8b require landscape and tree protection plans that involve: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • staff approval of a final landscape plan, following a 30 day public comment period, prior to recordation of the final subdivision map; • use of native, non-invasive vegetation that provides perimeter screening and screening between the project site and residences along the southern side of Parrott Drive; and, • replacement of every significant tree to be removed with three trees.
	No one is responsible for maintaining trees after five years.	Condition 8b, which requires replacement trees to be maintained for no less than two and no more than five years, is supplemented by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition 8t, which requires maintenance of soils and planting within bio-retention areas; • Condition 8u, which prohibits any landscaped areas from being left as bare dirt that could erode; and, • Condition 18, which requires the recordation of CC&R’s that address future maintenance responsibilities for screening trees along the rear of the Parrot Drive lots, and all landscaping installed within common areas per the approved landscape plan.
	No discussion of consistency of landscape plan with Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.	Condition 8a specifies that the Landscape Plan must use native non-invasive species and water efficient irrigation systems. The Landscape Plan’s conformance to applicable water efficient landscape requirements will be confirmed prior to staff approval of the final landscape plan.

	FEIR Does not demonstrate that adherence to Design Guidelines will prevent significant adverse impacts.	The EIR concludes that potentially significant adverse visual impacts can be reduced to a less than significant impact through landscaping and tree replacement. Implementation of the Design Guidelines proposed by the applicant will further reduce these impacts.
	Additional mitigation measures should be required, such as a vegetated buffer zone behind the existing homes on Parrot Drive and a limitation on the maximum square footage of the new homes.	The suggested vegetated buffer zone is provided by conditions that require the installation and maintenance of landscape screening, cited above. Because these measures will reduce visual impacts to a less than significant level, the County has no basis to place an arbitrary limit on the size of the homes, which is controlled by setback requirements, height restrictions, and lot coverage limits.
	Impacts to visual resources should be based on the existing condition of the project site, not a comparison to adjacent residential areas.	As noted by the EIR, approximately 60 percent of the project site is designated as open space, primarily in the areas most visible from surrounding roadways and neighborhoods, which preserves the natural scenic value of the existing site.
Biological Resources	The EIR fails to address impacts on trees by not identifying the number of trees protected by the Significant Tree Ordinance.	The EIR identifies that the project will remove approximately 43 of the 78 trees. The staff report states that 9 of the trees to be removed are significant.
	Measures to mitigate tree removal are inadequate because they will only be implemented to "the extent feasible".	Installation and maintenance of the final approved landscaping plan, which must include at least 3 trees for every significant tree to be removed, for a minimum of 27 trees, is a mandatory requirement.
Air Quality and GHG Emissions	Use of green building strategies and materials is a suggestion, not a requirement.	Green building requirements are established by the County's building regulations, and will be implemented during the County's review and approval of future building permits for the new homes.
	The EIR fails to consider a requirement to use cleaner-burning (Tier 4) diesel engines for construction activities.	The mitigation measures required by the EIR, including the implementation of a fugitive dust abatement program and measures recommended by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Condition 8c), the use of construction Best Management Practices (Condition 8d), and the purchase of CO2e emissions reduction credits (Condition 8e), as well as conditions of approval that require dust control (Condition 16), reduce potential air quality impacts to a less than significant level. Thus, a requirement to use Tier 4 diesel engines is neither necessary nor justified.

Hydrology	The technical report prepared by Lea & Braze regarding the stormwater control system contains discrepancies regarding the system’s ability to prevent a change in the amount and velocity of runoff from the site.	The technical analysis of the stormwater control system has been reviewed and accepted by the staff of the Department of Public Works that have expertise in this issue area. Both they and the project engineers will be present at the public hearing to explain their calculations and respond to questions.
	The hydrology report relies on a “creek” that appears to be nothing more than a shallow indentation to accommodate flows that exceed a 10-year rain event.	The creek referenced by the study is Polhemus Creek, which is a fair distance away from the project site and is the ultimate discharge point of stormwater discharged from the site and the surrounding area. Polhemus Creek has no direct relationship to the sizing of the project’s stormwater system.
Noise	The EIR inappropriately concludes that there is no significant adverse impacts from construction noise because it is exempt from the County’s noise regulations. The County’s failure to analyze the Project’s noise impacts against a baseline of existing environmental conditions is a violation of CEQA.	The conclusion that noise impacts will not have a significant adverse impact is not wholly reliant on the observation that construction noise is exempt from the County’s noise ordinance. Other factors supporting this conclusion includes a finding that construction noise would be less than the significance threshold established by the City of San Mateo (90 decibels at 25 feet), and that the mitigation measures required by condition 8ac, which, among other things, limits construction to weekdays between 7:00 am and 6:00 pm, will reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level.
Traffic	The measure to mitigate the traffic hazard created by the project driveway at its intersection with Bel Aire Drive, which calls for a safe sight distance, is unenforceable and voluntary. The EIR does not contain an analysis of a new design layout for the intersection.	In response to a concern about the proximity of the driveway’s retaining wall to a neighboring property line and trees, the applicant made a slight adjustment to the alignment of the road which does not have a material effect on the location and safety of its intersection with Bel Aire. In order to prevent this new intersection from creating any new significant traffic hazard, condition 8aj prohibits any new walls, fencing, or signs that would obstruct visibility. In addition, shrubs to be planted near the intersection shall be no taller than 3 feet above the roadway surface, and trees shall be planted in a manner that does not create a “wall” effect, and trimmed so that no limbs are lower than 7 feet above the roadway surface. Finally, street parking shall be prohibited within the bounds of the corner sight triangle at this intersection.
Site Stability	There has not been an adequate explanation of the project’s conformance to General Plan	There is no question that the project site has steep hillsides and has experienced erosion problems. These issues, which are addressed by conditions regarding

<p>and Steepness</p>	<p>Policies 15.20(a)-(b), which directs the County to avoid siting structures in “areas where they are jeopardized by geotechnical hazards, where their location could potentially increase the geotechnical hazard, or where they could increase the geotechnical hazard to neighboring properties.”</p>	<p>grading and erosion control (e.g., Condition 51 requiring an erosion correction plan), are separate and distinct from the underlying geologic conditions of the site and its associated stability. The geologic conditions of the project site have been carefully analyzed, as presented by the technical report prepared by Michelucci & Associates, Inc., which found the site to be more stable than the surrounding area, and capable of supporting engineered development without creating a geologic hazard. Assertions to the contrary are anecdotal, and not supported by technical analyses or scientific evidence.</p>
----------------------	---	--