

## RV Notes

### Aesthetics

- “Aesthetically, this is going to be an eyesore. This is the entrance to a quaint group of restaurants and stores. -It isn’t going to look good from highway 1.
  - -it will block the view to the Harbor” ([Barbara Walt](#))
  - “I am befuddled by how anyone might state that a view of an RV park is more aesthetically appealing than a beach scene. This would be for locals and tourists alike.” ([Ingrid Ammondson](#))

### San Mateo County Scenic Corridor

- The issue is not just a question of blocked scenic views. This site is acknowledged as being in the “scenic corridor.” ([Karen deMoor](#), Resist Density)
- The Pillar Point Harbor area has unique coastal character that appeals to residents and visitors alike. Transforming the large undeveloped land area at the entrance to the harbor directly adjacent to this scenic corridor into an RV park is definitely “visually intruding into an area having natural scenic qualities,” adversely affecting the charm that is so unique to the San Mateo County Midcoast. ([Karen deMoor](#), Resist Density)

### Entry to Harbor

- RV park will block the view to the harbor ([Barbara Walt](#))
- I understand that in the long term there is an interest in developing the harbor area for tourist businesses, but this unsightly project seems contradictory to allowing the harbor to be a visually welcoming entrance to the Pillar Point Harbor area. It certainly will detract from the appeal of the El Granada neighborhood. ([Jane Praysilver](#))
- The proposed RV park at Harbor Village will definitely contribute to additional congestion and will be aesthetically detrimental. ([Tommy Ward](#))
- RV parks are unsightly. The existing Harbor Village area could use with aesthetic improvements, not additional distractions. Any new RV parks on the coast should be located in out of the way areas, at least screened from popular recreation, restaurant and such activity areas by significant wooded buffers. ([Tommy Ward](#))
- The project will also likely damage the residents the commercial residents of Harbor Village who would not benefit from an RV park being the first thing visitors see as they are coming into town.
- Put the RV part somewhere but not on a prime real estate location that you could get great tax revenue from that could add to the community not take away from it. ([Tony Lialin](#))
- This significantly intrudes on the natural scenic qualities of the harbor and harms its appeal. ([Karen deMoor](#), Resist Density)
- 

### Close to SR1 and Harbor Entry Road

- I’m concerned that this negative declaration was performed in the absence of a traffic study because this intersection is already a point of major traffic jams on weekends when tourist traffic impacts travel for all northbound and southbound

traffic on Hwy 1. Adding 50 more units will certainly have an impact on the area. ([Keith Anderson](#))

- Our harbor has a lovely hotel - the Oceano - and adding an RV park to the "greeting" space for the harbor is going to be nothing short of an eyesore. Putting in an RV park is not going to help the restaurants that struggle to stay alive in that area ([Lori McCoy](#))
- Appearance - This will negatively impact the appearance of the intersection and local area by making it appear even more touristy ([Neal Schlatter](#))
- I have seen the traffic congestion, in particular, become a massive intrusion, especially in the afternoon heading north on Highway 1 off 92; a hotel and RV park would only compound the problem in both directions ([Ric Bucher](#))
- In addition, the intersection of highway 1 at Princeton is a scenic place. To see a large contingent of RV's parked there would destroy the beauty. And, there are already three RV parks within four miles of the proposed site. The current infrastructure of the Coastside cannot support more vehicles coming here. (Russell Bigelow)
- **First**, the two lanes of Highway 92 from Half Moon Bay to north of Montara are already inadequate for the crowds that flow in from Thursday morning until Sunday night and on holidays. ([Shauna Pickett-Gordon](#))
- The Pillar Point signal is typically where the traffic starts to back up due to the lane reduction, so adding in more traffic and large motor homes doesn't make sense. It's more noise pollution (generators), and environmental pollution that this area doesn't need. ([Shauna Pickett-Gordon](#))
- Adding 50 RV spaces beside one of the Coastside's major intersections will add traffic to that intersection, and in the form of longer, slower vehicles. ([Shauna Pickett-Gordon](#))

### **Ocean/Harbor View**

- "...ask yourself, when you go on vacation at a coastal location, are you searching for rentals with an RV view or an ocean view?" ([Ingrid Ammondson](#))
- I have been a resident for 30 years in El Granada and have watched the decline of the ocean views with continued and unwelcome development. ([Jane Praysilver](#))
- I think most people, if asked if a view of the beach or an RV park is more aesthetically appealing, would agree that a beach scene is more aesthetic. ([Jane Praysilver](#))
- Destroying the aesthetic of the harbor will reduce overall property values and overall attractiveness of the community ([Katherine West](#))
- Recreational vehicles placed between the highway and the ocean/harbor will certainly degrade the aesthetic quality of the area. This is prime territory for residents and tourists passing through the area and is directly blocking views. RVs are generally an eyesore to say the least, ([Keith Anderson](#))
- Meanwhile, the addition of a hotel and slew of RVs would have a tremendous negative impact on the land, air and ocean quality, all of which are already suffering from the onslaught of tourists that visit every weekend. Half Moon Bay's greatest attraction remains its stretches of undeveloped coastline -- reducing it would not be good stewardship. ([Ric Bucher](#))
- I can't think of a worse way to welcome people to Princeton/Half Moon Bay. ([Sean Rollings](#))

- Between a view of the ocean and a view of an RV park, most people would find the ocean view much more aesthetically pleasing. It shouldn't take a public poll to find that out. ([Shauna Pickett-Gordon](#))
- Homes with views of RV parks are not as desirable as homes with ocean or harbor views. ([Shauna Pickett-Gordon](#))
- A view of the beach is objectively more aesthetically appealing than an RV park ([Tyler Stone](#))

### **Coastal neighborhoods**

- RB park will continue to deteriorate coastal neighborhoods ([Barbara Walt](#))
- What makes El Granada charming is the ocean, the eucalyptus groves, the hiking, the kayaking, the plethora of gorgeous dogs, the pumpkins, the Christmas trees...It is not more RV parks (The ones we already have are never full anyhow). ([Bliss Dennen](#))
- The weight of the decisions made impacting the coastsides have finally accumulated to a level that I believe has become intolerable for many. I am fascinated by what the county may be thinking, as we pride ourselves on a caring, forward thinking entity - yet your protection of this valuable asset has failed. ([Ingrid Ammondson](#))
- RV's consume an inordinate amount of petroleum on a per-person basis, clog roads, take far more room to maneuver and turn off our roads, and are simply not ideal in an environment like ours, already clogged and besieged by tourist traffic and overdevelopment. ([Jonathan Dixon](#))
- This is a highly visible piece of real estate that will have drastically negative impacts on property values in El Granada. ([Katherine West](#))
- The coast IS special and it NEEDS you to pay attention to it and protect it. Building RV parks and more housing Big Wave new developments are NOT responsible. They're harming the residents, diminishing quality of life, and doing nothing to reduce overall housing costs. ([Keith Anderson](#))
- 3) Quality of Life - Those of us lucky enough to live on the coast appreciate the more rural and relaxed environment, which is one of the only areas like this in the Bay Area. This park will only be one more step in the commercialization of the area ([Neal Schlatter](#))
- 4) What will this park offer to the local citizens? Perhaps some tax money for the local government (and who knows where and how that is open) but what for lose of us who actually live here and will have to service the eyesore and additional hassle. ([Neal Schlatter](#))
- It is my understanding that the proponents of this project claim the following:
  - It will not increase noise levels significantly
  - It will not have adverse impacts on traffic and land use
  - It will not degrade the quality of the environment in the area
  - These claims are ridiculous. ([Raina Schally](#))
- I understand that there may be financial incentives for approving such a project, but whatever the value of the added revenue it can't possibly outweigh the massive damage it would do to the quality of life, conservation efforts, traffic and safety on the Coastsides. ([Ric Bucher](#))

- We have been living here for the past 40 years. We have watched the Coastside transform from a beautiful and peaceful place to one that is dominated by car traffic. ([Russell Bigelow](#))

### **Environment**

- 101 sewer overflows between 2011-2017; Additional RV's will increase SSO risk; ([Harald Herrmann](#))
- The beaches have become overrun with tourists and the tide pools have degraded so badly that it's challenging to find nearly the same amount of living species in the waters because they are so heavily trodden now they barely support life to the same degree. ([Keith Anderson](#))
- I think the question remains how the bluffs and marine sanctuary will be protected. They are wide open now with very easy access to Ross Cove. Did the CA Coastal Commission come out to understand what they are approving? ([Harald Herrmann](#))
- We are looking at very significant changes on the Coastside and also higher density in close proximity to Pillar Point. The protection of our coastal habitats will become more challenging and will require significant resources. ([Harald Herrmann](#))
- Resist Density, whose mission is to promote sensible development in the San Mateo County Midcoast, believes the proposed 50 Space RV Park will have significant impacts on the environment. ([Karen deMoor](#), Resist Density)