

Midcoast Community Council

*An elected Advisory Council to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
representing Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton, and Miramar*
PO Box 248, Moss Beach, CA 94038-0248 | midcoastcommunitycouncil.org

Gregg Dieguez | **Claire Toutant** | **Dan Haggerty** | **Scott Bollinger** | **Gus Mattammal**
Chair Vice-Chair Treasurer Secretary | **Ann Rothman** | **Kimberly Williams**

Date: June 14, 2023

To: Senator Josh Becker
Assemblymember Marc Berman

From: Midcoast Community Council

Subject: Concerns about SB423 and related legislation affecting Coastal California

Dear Senator Becker and Assemblymember Berman:

The Midcoast Community Council, which represents much of the unincorporated Coastside in San Mateo County, has several concerns about the proposed expansion and extension of SB 35 and other proposals regarding housing development in our area.

We have serious misgivings about any legislation that would sacrifice protections of the Coastal environment. Specifically, CEQA review should be maintained and the jurisdiction of the Coastal Act and the Coastal Commission should be upheld. The ability of local government to require related consultations, design reviews and assessment of community impact should be protected in this sensitive area. Protection of the Coastside consistent with the Coastal Act should be respected even in the face of unknown State or Federal changes.

In addition, any such legislation should provide for a process of review of its effects and the right of the community to pursue legal review of development should not be infringed.

The MCC fully understands the need for affordable housing and we are working with our local leaders to find creative solutions so proposals for affordable housing can be built, especially by supporting projects that include a higher percentage of affordable units. However, we are very concerned that forcing approval of multi-family housing projects without regard to the needs of the community in which these are located, and with no support, funding, or requirement for developers to address neighborhood traffic, parking needs, public works capacity, and other development impacts could negatively impact mobility, emergency evacuation, stormwater runoff, pollution, coastal water quality, and sea level rise mitigation efforts among others.

Extending SB 35 to include the coastal zone doesn't take into account the issues that coastal cities and counties are facing as they work to address the impacts of sea level rise by avoiding development in high risk areas and moving structures and infrastructure out of harm's way. Applying this law to the coastal zone could make it that much harder for the County to plan for and implement local solutions to sea level rise as its impacts accelerate.

We also believe good affordable housing and partnerships can be created without sacrificing our environment and wildlife in California. SB 423 as currently proposed, would compromise our

environmental protections by encouraging and authorizing development on wetlands and protected habitat, including areas currently protecting endangered or threatened species.

Finally, this bill would limit public participation and oversight, mechanisms that our democracy is built upon and that encourage dialogue, cooperation and collaboration, which often leads to better project solutions overall.

We ask you to oppose SB 423 in its current form, and to request a robust review and analysis of the outcomes and impacts of SB 35 to date, before any new legislation is considered or extended.

Sincerely,

Gregg Dieguez, Chair

Claire Toutant, Vice Chair

cc: Supervisor Ray Mueller, San Mateo County, District 3
Governor Gavin Newsom
Chair Donne Brownsey, California Coastal Commission
Speaker Anthony Rendon
Julie Callendar (Rendon)
Joan Dentler (Becker)
Mila Zelkha (Berman)