

**Public Comment - Housing Element  
August 7, 2024 City Council Meeting  
07/17/2024 to 08/07/2024**

1. Margaret Gossett #1
2. Margaret Gossett #2
3. Hazel Joanes
4. Jim Sutro
5. Father Jose – Our Lady of the Pillar
6. Archdiocese of San Francisco
7. Our Lady or the Pillar Petition Letter
  - Letter with 645 signatures are available at City Hall, due to the lack of time of submittal, staff was unable to redact all of the personal information for public view.

**From:** Margaret Gossett

**Date:** Jul 19, 2024, 11:36 AM -0700

**To:** City of Half Moon Bay Community Development Department

**Subject:** Does Measure D Constrain Housing or Are We Just Mis-Using It?

Does Measure D Constrain Housing in Half Moon Bay or Are We Just Mis-Using It?

### **Overallocation of Measure D Certificates for 555 Kelly Avenue Affordable Housing Project**

The City Council of Half Moon Bay approved the 555 Kelly Avenue Affordable Housing Project in 2024. This project aims to provide affordable housing on a City-owned parcel at 555 Kelly Avenue. The proposal received conditional approval by the Planning Commission on May 14, 2014. The City received one submittal for this project from a two-agency team comprised of Mercy Housing and Ayudando Latinos A Soñar (ALAS). The goal was to maximize the number of affordable housing units. The project has faced community feedback and appeals, but it represents an effort to address housing needs in the area.

Regarding Measure D allocations, the City council ratified the January 2024 allocations in December, 2023 as required by the Subdivision Ordinance. The new planner (consultant) for the 555 Kelly Avenue Affordable Housing project allocated an additional 10 Measure D Certificates in 2024 using the Super Density Bonus Law as stated in the staff report to the Planning Commission April 23, 2024. However, it appears that enough Measure D Allocations had been set aside in 2022 and 2023 based on disclosure by Community Development at the February 7, 2023 City council meeting. Whether this constitutes overallocation for 555 Kelly Avenue would depend on the specific details and context of the allocations. Further, who has the authority to reserve Measure D certificates for future projects that may or may not come to fruition, possibly denying other applicants?

In summary, while the project aims to address affordable housing needs, the Measure D allocations may require further examination to determine if there was an overallocation for 555 Kelly Avenue Affordable Housing Project impacting other applicants that may have been denied Measure D certificates in 2022 and 2023. The situation involves complex factors, and a thorough transparent review would be necessary to assess the potential impact.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Gossett

**From:** Margaret Gossett

**Sent:** Friday, July 19, 2024 11:40 AM

**To:** Housing Element

**Subject:** Measure D Constraints in Half Moon Bay Draft Housing Element

### **Measure D Constraints in Half Moon Bay Draft Housing Element**

All discussions about amending the voter initiative Measure D ordinance in 2024 and 2026 should be removed from the Draft Housing Element. The Half Moon Bay City Council decided not to add an amendment for Measure D on the November 5, 2024 ballot at the July 16, 2024 City Council Meeting. Administrative actions to enhance the program's utility for Regional Housing Needs Assessment do not require an amendment to the ballot. Additionally, the ordinance amendment is no longer a City priority, and City staff should avoid making false assertions in the Draft Housing Element.

Regarding the analysis and statement of fact about whether State legislators can overturn Measure D in the coastal zone, it is not explicitly provided in the available documents.

Respectfully submitted,  
Margaret Gossett

**Hazel Joanes**  
229 Valdez Ave  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

---

August 7, 2024

Submitted via: [housingelement@hmbcity.com](mailto:housingelement@hmbcity.com)

Mike Noce  
City of Half Moon Bay  
Housing Programs Manager  
501 Main Street  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

RE: Second HCD Draft Cycle 6 Housing Element

Dear Mike Noce:

I reviewed the Second HCD Draft Cycle 6 Housing Element for the City of Half Moon Bay and respectfully submit these comments to encourage the City to encompass robust programs to encourage availability for all Half Moon Bay residents in a fair and equitable manner with an aim to integrate all housing types into all areas of the City for every resident regardless of their socio-economic status.

I encourage the City to engage in a comprehensive data collection of the City's demographic and unique character, circumstances and issues rather than relying on outdated San Mateo County data or on information that is relevant to other cities in San Mateo County.

I present my comments in the spirit of improving the data and analysis used by staff and consultants in identifying realistic goals and relevant programs for the Housing Plan.

## **I. REVIEW AND REVISION**

In the introduction section of the Housing Element, the City highlights that the senior household population on a fixed income is vulnerable to rising rents and increasing maintenance costs as a concern, but the City must also recognize that this senior population may also require housing choices that support their Activities of Daily Living (ADL). The statement "*Senior households on a fixed income in the lowest income categories are also vulnerable to rising rents and/or increasing maintenance costs*" is pointless if it does not acknowledge the realities and needs of the City's aging population. This statement and the identified programs should

**Hazel Joanes**  
229 Valdez Ave  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

be revised to encompass the different types of special housing needs that seniors might need i.e., independent retirement housing, assisted living, and memory care living or convalescent housing. The City could consider adding programs that would provide accommodations to facilitate the senior population housing needs.

In the Appendix A the City is illuminating farmworkers as the only special housing needs group but is not acknowledging other groups that are in need, spotlighting this segment of the population implies that the City believes farmworkers are the only group who need housing. While showcasing the needs of farmworker in the Housing Element might be conducive to achieving an approval from the State, the unintentionally, the City encourages systemic and structural racism, as not all farmworkers need housing. The City should consider refining the statement “*Additionally, farmworkers are considered a special housing needs group, which the City is working to support through the use of City-owned land for farmworker housing opportunities*”, by stating which subset of the City’s farmworker demographic the City supports with the commitment of using City-owned land, or expanding the statement to encompass other groups within the City’s population that need affordable housing such as the developmentally disabled, the physically challenged, and student population, and other race and ethnic groups.

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) requests that the City provide an explanation or summary of the effectiveness of its past goals. The City’s response in Appendix F lacks specificity of the City’s direct and active involvement that achieved the goals noted in the past housing element cycle. For example, the City does not explain actions undertaken to support agricultural landowners to develop farmworker housing. There has been public testimony from certain agricultural landowners that the City rejected their request for support to construct farmworker housing on their agricultural land.

Additionally, the City neglects to provide details on its supportive actions for converting the Coastside Inn to a homeless shelter. According to Life Moves, Coast House (previously the Coastside Inn), provides interim housing for families, couples, and individuals experiencing homelessness. This type of housing is considered temporary until its clients can return to their homes. The City should explain the details surrounding its support for the conversion of the hotel and provide specifics on how interim housing but not a homeless shelter lends toward the goals of the past cycle.

Other statements in this section include the City’s financial support for house repairs and rental assistance, however, the statement does not clearly explain how the rehabilitation grants and the use of money from the Affordable Housing Fund meet the housing needs of the special- needs populations. Likewise, the City should explain whether the 91 households and the 12 unsheltered that received support through the City’s Affordable Housing Fund were for households within the City’s jurisdiction.

Moreover, the City should clearly explain how its Affordable Housing Fund supports the proposal for the 40 units of farmworker housing and reveal how this satisfies the goals of the past cycle. The City should make known the number of farm workers who work on farms within the City boundaries would be guaranteed housing.

## **II. HOUSING NEEDS, RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS**

### Local Data and Knowledge, and Other Relevant Factors

The City’s justification to support the requirements of Chapter 15 (commencing with Section 8899.50) of Division 1 of Title 2...shall include an assessment of fair housing in the jurisdiction. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (c)(10)(A). The City’s discussion in Appendix D does not reference nor include local data, knowledge, or relevant factors that support the City’s assertion of tensions between coastal preservation, visitor-serving, and farming preservation. These types of statements tend to incite and enable social and public conflicts.

The residents of Half Moon Bay have a long rich history of mutual respect between farmers, ranchers, farm workers, and visitors. They embrace diversity and inclusion of all nationalities and ethnic backgrounds. The City should explain how the Coastal and Williamson Acts influenced the City’s land use plan rather than providing unsubstantiated statements claiming that there exist tensions between use-based zoning segregations that have caused a dramatic impact on social interactions within the City.

The City’s statement in Appendix D that “Some racial and ethnic minority populations are disproportionately impacted by low household incomes, and overcrowding, and are more likely to be denied a home mortgage loan” but the city fails to describe within the City, are considered in those racial and ethnic minority groups. Should the City not also address whether young adults residing in the City between the ages of 18 and 24 and adults beyond the age of 25 are also likely to be denied a home mortgage loan regardless of their ethnic background or minority status?

The City could and must investigate whether the City’s young adult population should be seriously considered for city-supported housing programs. Appendix A – Housing Needs Assessment could also incorporate statistics and trends on whether the City’s young adults regardless of ethnic background, where they currently live, whether their living conditions are crowded, are susceptible to displacement, are in the low or extremely low-income bracket, etc.

The City’s statement in Appendix D, relative to its seasonal and permanent farm workers lacks specificity. The city should distinguish the difference between a seasonal farm worker and a permanent farm worker and analyze which of the two groups requires housing urgently.

**Hazel Joanes**  
229 Valdez Ave  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Additionally, the City should research, evaluate, and document the ethnic backgrounds of all groups of farm workers. The City should ascertain the special housing needs of the various Asian and Pacific island workers and the farmworker populations from each Meso-American and South American region. The City should also aim to understand and respect cultural differences within each population for example there are cultural differences between Guatemalans, Salvadorans, Mexicans, etc. and comprehend that within those cultures there are indigenous ethnic differences the Zapotec. Should the City wish to address housing meaningfully, the City should include a discussion of all the populations that work on farms within the City.

The tragic January 2023 shootings took place at Concord Farms and Terra Garden farms situated in the County of San Mateo. The statement included in Appendix D describing the farmworker community living on the farm leads the reader to assume that those workers lived within the jurisdiction of the City of Half Moon Bay when it appears, Concord Farms and Terra Garden where those workers lived are in the jurisdiction of the County of San Mateo.

The statement about the shooting is not beneficial in supporting Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) or contributing to the justification demonstrating integration and segregation. It is, instead, an insensitive statement that can be viewed as an exploitation of the victims and their families to further the City's approval of its Housing Element. All references to the January 2023 shooting should be stricken from the Housing Element.

#### Integration and segregation

The text in the Introduction lacks context with relationship to Appendix D. As written, the newly inserted text conveys subjective opinions and the writer's perceived beliefs about certain areas/populations within the City's jurisdiction. Without providing evidence through known studies, assessments or data collection sources, the inserted text should either be deleted or reworded to summarize factual and relevant information responding to the HCD's concerns and without casting subjective perspectives.

The Housing Element lacks a complete analysis of both integration and segregation and therefore cannot holistically evaluate the patterns and practices to better identify and prioritize contributing factors to fair housing issues. The City's opportunity sites in Appendix C appear to concentrate very low and low-income housing in only a few focused areas within the City. This model would create and enhances socio-economic, ethnic and racial segregation in the City.

Additionally, the City must determine if concentrating high-density housing in focused areas within the City would in the future require the City to redraw the City's current district maps to comply with the California Voting Rights Act (CVRA).

The City must justify why it believes that creating centers of low-income multifamily housing within a certain area of the City would not result in socio-economic segregation. The City must determine if the creation of low-income centers would harm residents in and of itself, whether neighborhood effects can leave families vulnerable. According to the Office of Policy Development and Research, studies have illustrated that crime and delinquency, education, psychological distress, and various health problems, among many other issues, are affected by neighborhood characteristics. The City must study the effect of the interaction between vulnerable families and their neighborhoods, specifically the City should understand more about the process on neighborhood transitions and, similarly, how that process influences individuals.

#### Disparities in Access to Opportunity

There is new text inserted in Appendix D, however the information is missing the comprehensive analysis of the local and regional disparities HCD requests the City to provide. For example, the City does not represent resident needs collected through local surveys. A complete holistic analysis of the residents residing within the City's boundaries would address the trends, patterns, policies, practices, and conditions in combination with other relevant factors to summarize issues and better inform goals and actions in the housing element.

Regarding educational opportunities, the Housing Element should fully describe the differences among the City's independent and public schools, their proximity of proficient and less proficient schools to areas of segregation and racial and ethnic concentrated areas of poverty within the City and determine if there exists disparity in access to educational resources and opportunity.

For employment opportunities, the Housing Element should include discussion about whether disparities exist in access to jobs by protected groups and evaluate the employment trends by the protected groups residing within the City limits.

Within the City's jurisdiction, there are numerous persons with disabilities however, the unique needs and barriers faced by persons with disabilities and whether those persons with disabilities can access housing choices and services in an integrated community-based setting is not adequately addressed in Appendix D.

#### Extremely Low Income

The HCD requests the City to "Include an analysis of population and employment trends and documentation of projections and a quantification of the locality's existing and projected needs for all income levels, including extremely low-income households. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(1).) Include an analysis and documentation of household characteristics, including level of payment compared to ability to pay, housing characteristics, including overcrowding, and housing stock condition. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(2).) and Analyze any special housing needs such as elderly; persons with disabilities, including a

developmental disability; large families; farmworkers; families with female heads of households; and families and persons in need of emergency shelter. (Gov. Code, § 65583, subd. (a)(7).)”, the proposed revisions to the draft Housing Element in Appendix A does not sufficiently respond to HCD’s request. While the added text on in Appendix A incorporates specific data about low-income households, the source of that data is not cited. Either footnote this data identifying the data source or provide an explanation in the text as to age of data, where this data originates and add additional breakdown about the 285 ELI households i.e., clearly state the number of Mobile Home Units, Single Family Houses, Town Houses etc. Likewise, text added on page A-3 states that 1,123 of the City’s 1,943 lower-income households (58%) are overpaying for housing, here again the source of this data should be cited.

### Overpayment

The added text in Appendix A “Therefore, renter households are more likely to experience challenges with housing security and an increased risk of becoming homeless”, appears subjective. If the City has specific data that clearly substantiates the overpayment or overcrowding situation in the City of Half Moon Bay, the City should state how this information is known. If the information is derived from County statistics the City should make that known to HCD

### Special Needs Housing

The newly added text in Appendix A providing information relative to the number of large households, does not offer context on the types and size of dwellings that are owner occupied households. Without providing perspective on the characteristics of the type housing, it is unclear the extent of overcrowding that is currently occurring within households in the City.

Additionally, the City asserts that in the past, there were 221 female head of households, but does not clearly give details about the current number of female households existing today.

In Appendix A the City explains that staff received information regarding situations of overcrowding through community outreach. However, there are no details given as to the type of community outreach staff conducted or whether the staff vetted the information to confirm the information received.

### Seniors

The added text in Appendix A contains valuable information on the resources for seniors, however it does not provide an analysis of the resources to assess the gaps.

Likewise, there is valuable information about the Coastside resources available to people with disabilities and the unhoused. However, program 3-1 does not

**Hazel Joanes**  
229 Valdez Ave  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

actively seek concrete measures promoting various types of senior housing needs. The City must define its specific activities it will undertake to “Encourage” development of housing for seniors and the disabled.

Regarding Program 3-2 rather than qualifying that the City will “assist” only when it is feasible to address special needs housing, the City must define actionable tasks it will undertake to continuously and actively pursue other agencies serving Half Moon Bay to address special needs housing.

### Farmworkers

The added text in Appendix A regarding farmworkers relates to outdated Countywide 2016, data and does not specifically represent the current needs of farmworkers who work on farms within the City’s jurisdiction. This section should address relevant analysis based on current data on the existing farms in the City of Half Moon Bay. The City’s programs to address farmworker needs should be designed for all workers employed on farms within the City of Half Moon Bay but not on farms located the unincorporated areas of San Mateo County.

The document makes a bold statement that “*Finding decent affordable housing is challenging ...*,” however, city staff does not provide a definition on what the City considers as “*decent*” housing. The term **decent** must be adequately defined to ensure that everyone including HCD understands the living standards that the City believes would be decent for persons of each race, ethnicity, religion, age group, gender and socio-economic status.

### Persons with Disabilities

The added text in Appendix A delineates households considered large, but does not describe information about households consisting of persons with disabilities living within the City’s jurisdiction. HCD specifically states that the City must analyze the housing needs for persons with disabilities.

### Inventory of Land Suitable and Available for Residential Development

HCD specifically requires the land inventory to identify specific sites that are suitable for residential development to compare the local government’s regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) with its residential development capacity. HCD recommends that in preparing the site inventory through a two-part process inclusive of a parcel specific inventory of sites and a site suitability analysis. For each site on the inventory, the suitability analysis must entail a “requisite analysis” to consider Government Code Section 65583.2(b)(4) requiring evaluation of any environmental constraints to the development of housing within the jurisdiction and consideration of Government Code Section 65583.2(b)(5) requires a description of existing or planned water, sewer, and other dry utilities supply, including the availability and access to distribution facilities. Parcels included in the inventory must have sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities supply available and accessible

to support housing development or be included in an existing general plan program.

#### Realistic Capacity & Environmental Constraints

The housing element fails to include sufficient detail to determine whether the service levels of water delivery/treatment systems and sewer treatment facilities are sufficient and have the capacity to accommodate development on all identified sites to accommodate the RHNA. For example, the element does not adequately explain if the water supply is a reliable supply meeting the recent state water restrictions on portable water supply purveyors and agencies.

The analysis should also indicate whether the housing development potential would require expansion or improvement of existing facilities or new infrastructure development, and should identify the requirements of all applicable agencies, including special districts. Where mitigation of infrastructure constraints is beyond the capacity of the local government alone the housing element should describe what role, the local government is or will be playing to support mitigation of the constraint.

It is widely known that the Sewer Authority Mid-Coast (SAM) is currently undergoing legal issues that have yet to be resolved. If this requisite infrastructure capacity is not available upon adoption of the housing element, the housing element must include program actions (e.g. implementation of capital improvement plans, financing through general obligation or special district bonds, etc.) to address infrastructure capacity limitations or shortfalls.

The City's draft housing element must include details to determine whether the service levels of water delivery/treatment systems and sewer treatment facilities are sufficient to accommodate development on the identified sites and must also discuss any other known conditions such as the shape, easements, contamination, coastal policies to preclude development.

#### City Owned Sites

The draft element includes the 555 Kelly site as a project in the pipeline for completion in 2026, however, the City must disclose to HCD that this site is facing opposition from the public and is likely to be delayed due to community concerns about the safety of the site. The City must update this section of the element to discuss if this project is on schedule with relation to Mercy Housing grant funding approvals from HCD, state tax credits and the finalization of the City's land lease agreement. The City should consider revising Program 3-1 objectives to incorporate specific actions that constitute "priority processing" for the 555 Kelly Project and identify additional actions that might be necessary to support this program.

### Privately Owned Sites

The draft element does not adequately describe specific actions the City has taken for its outreach with property owners. There are certain property owners that repeatedly requested the City to remove their site from the land inventory. The City must disclose this information to the HCD and provide the reasons why those sites remain in the draft element. Additionally, the draft element includes a pipeline project that has among other issues an easement constraint. The City must disclose those issues to HCD and update the project timeframes in the housing plan implementation. The City could consider incorporating a program that would assist in resolving easement and contamination constraints. Table C-4 must be revised to reflect realistic timelines.

### Analysis of Potential and Actual Governmental Constraints

Government Fees discussed in Appendix B references that projects sites are presumed to be in the City's sewer assessment district. The element assumes that there is only one sewer assessment district, but the City must make it clear to HCD that there is more than one sewer assessment district within the City's jurisdiction. Table B-11 and B-12 must be revised to account for both sewer districts.

Moreover, the City claims that its fees are in line with the neighboring jurisdictions within San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties even though the City's demography, geographic location, land use plan, transit, recreational facilities, traffic circulation, stormwater conveyance and drainage are significantly different than any other City in San Mateo, and Santa Clara counties. If the City has no other means of justifying whether the fees for multifamily projects are a constraint the City must at the very least, rationalize why the fees are reasonable based on other coastal cities with similar characteristics instead of a comparison against Cities and Counties that bear no similarity with the City Half Moon Bay.

### Water & Sewer Priority

Government Code section, 65589.7 requires water and sewer service providers must establish specific procedures to grant priority water and sewer service to developments with units affordable to lower-income households. The City is required to immediately deliver the housing element to water and sewer service providers but has not. The City should explain why through Program 6-5 it is delaying action to deliver the housing element to these providers until after certification. Program 6-5 should be revised to include proactive actions that comply with Government Code section, 65589.7 and provide the draft housing element to the water and sewer providers before HCD certification.

The City should consider adding programs to work in coordination with those providers continuously, to ensure that objectives for water and sewer connections are met throughout the housing element cycle.

*Hazel Joanes*  
229 Valdez Ave  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

### III. HOUSING PROGRAMS

#### Growth Control

The City acknowledges that through the implementation of Measure D there will be more than adequate allocations to accommodate the 480 units of the City's share of regional housing needs which implies that the Measure D is not an obstacle especially when Measure D ensures that any new housing will be adequately supported by available infrastructure such as water delivery/treatment systems and sewer treatment facilities. The City must explain how Measure D is a measured growth initiative to accommodate the needs future residents with the appropriate level of infrastructure including consideration of safe evacuation and emergency response during disaster events.

Regarding Measure D allocations, the City must conduct an audit on how it administers the implementing regulations of Measure D and determine if the City staff is proficient in applying the regulations consistently and whether it was necessary to set aside allocations for the for the 555 Kelly project in 2022 and 2023 as reported by the then Community Development Director.

An audit of the process City staff uses to administer Measure D regulations would identify whether there was an overallocation for 555 Kelly Avenue Affordable Housing Project that caused denials of allocations for other applicants 2022 and 2023.

The City must disclose to HCD that at the July 16, 2024, Half Moon Bay City Council Meeting the City Council decided not to add an amendment for Measure D on the November 5, 2024, ballot. All discussions about amending the voter initiative Measure D ordinance in 2024 and 2026 should be removed from the Draft Housing Element.

Instead of amending Measure D through a ballot measure, the City should consider adding a program to conduct an independent evaluation of the City staff Measure D implementation process to determine where improvements can be made to streamline the procedures.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

*Hazel Joanes*

Hazel Joanes

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 6, 2024 5:14 PM

**To:** Housing Element

**Cc:** OLP

**Subject:** Opportunity Site # 3, Our Lady of the Pillar

This is to request the permanent removal of Our Lady of the Pillar's unbuilt lands from Opportunity Site #3 of the Housing Element.

I was actively involved in the design and planning of a church-based elementary school several years ago; this effort had to be curtailed due to the death of our primary champion and benefactor. Plans and proposals are again under consideration, indeed a school is now in operation.

You will note that school buildings require less real estate than their recreation and sports areas. Our Lady of the Pillar needs to retain total control of all of the undeveloped land owned by the church. Our established mission for over 150 years is sacramental and religious education, we leave housing to others.

If there is such a crying need for housing, I would personally suggest condemning the proposed hotel property south of Seymour St between Main and Cabrillo Highway. That site would accommodate a great number of low-rise multi-family dwellings, and eliminate all the controversy about the height and low occupancy of the hotel. It's right on the bus line, and close to the Senior Center.

I have been a parishioner and member of OLP since I arrived on the Coastsides in the mid 1970s, a member and Past Grand Knight of the Knights of Columbus, I managed our Artichoke Booth at the Pumpkin Festival for over 4 decades, and was a founding partner in The Bell Building.

Thank you for your consideration.

jsutro

**From:** Rev. Margarito (Jose) Corral  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 7, 2024 3:45 PM  
**To:** Housing Element  
**Cc:** finance  
**Subject:** Our Lady of the Pillar Housing Element Respond

Dear Council Members:

My name is Fr. Jose Corral, and I am an employee of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, assigned to Our Lady of the Pillar Church as the Pastor. I would like to address the portion of the housing element report that describes the church property, referred to as Site 3.

Under the heading “Owner/Developer interest”, Paragraph 2 states “City staff has met with the owner of the property (the SF Archdiocese) who indicated interest in future affordable residential development on this property.” Who at the City held this meeting, and with whom did this meeting take place? We have spoken with the Archdiocese Legal Dept and the Archdiocese Real Estate Support Corp, the fee owner of the property whose letter was read into the record earlier. None were party to such a meeting. In any case, this statement is a bold misrepresentation of the property owner’s intentions and must be eliminated.

Also, the graphic provided on page C-20 of the report showing the available parking highlights a significant portion of the church parking as "underutilized". This statement is false, as it is the primary parking available for use by our parishioners to attend services and functions at the Church, the Bell Building, the Church Office & Rectory, and the New Hall where the school currently resides. That mischaracterization should also be eliminated from the record.

The mission of the Church and the Priests at Our Lady of the Pillar should be to support the spiritual growth of our Parishioners, which includes the spiritual education of their children and the children of the greater community of our Parish. We need to remain in control of future development to help achieve that goal.

I have submitted 2 letters to the city indicating that our intentions for that land is for Catholic education, not housing. The fee owner of the property has submitted a letter indicating the same. I am asking you to remove our church property from the Housing Element report before approving it.

Thank you,

Fr. Jose Corral

Pastor

Our Lady of the Pillar





ARCHDIOCESE OF  
**SAN FRANCISCO**

OFFICE OF THE ARCHBISHOP

August 7, 2024

City of Half Moon Bay Planning Commission  
501 Main Street  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Dear Commissioners,

Please be advised that Father Jose Corral, the pastor of Our Lady of the Pillar, has my full support for this parish project that will develop parish property for use by Our Lady of the Pillar Academy.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Salvatore J. Cordileone".

Most Reverend Salvatore J. Cordileone  
Archbishop of San Francisco

SUBMITTAL

Date: August 7, 2024

From: Reverend Father Jose Corral  
Pastor, Our Lady of the Pillar Church  
400 Church Street  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

To: HMB City Council  
501 Main Street  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Subject: Petition to HMB City Council to remove Our Lady of the Pillar land from the Housing Element before approving.

Enclosed:

- 72 sheets of paper
- Containing <sup>645</sup>~~648~~ signatures from Our Lady of the Pillar parishioners and community members.

Delivered by: Derek Kulda at (time) \_\_\_\_\_

Hand Delivered To: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Print Name) (Signature)

CITY OF HALF MOON BAY

AUG 7 2024

RECEIVED



*Our Lady of the Pillar Church*  
 400 Church Street, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
 (650) 726-4674 Fax (650) 726-0980

Petition to the City Council of Half Moon Bay  
 To Remove Our Lady of the Pillar land  
 from the Housing Element Proposal

August 7, 2024

I, Reverend Father Jose Corral, Pastor of Our Lady of the Pillar Parish residing at 400 Church Street, Half Moon Bay and my parishioners request that the City of Half Moon Bay remove the land of Our Lady of the Pillar as an opportunity site for affordable housing on its Housing Element Plan.

While we believe that the affordable housing crisis needs to be met with various initiatives, many families and people also suffer a crisis of educational opportunities for both underprivileged families (many of, or most of whom desire Catholic education) and those who can afford private schooling.

This land is dedicated to be the future home of Our Lady of the Pillar Academy, a Catholic school which is successfully founded to provide high quality education opportunities to parents and children (PreK-8) from a cross-section of Coastside demographics.

This land is private property, owned by the Catholic Church, and is protected from government domain by the United States Constitution and our history of respect for religious liberty including the Religious Liberties and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA).

Whether or not the intended school building is built within 48-72 months, the Academy is currently fully operational with around 24 students, and the land is already being used for recess and play.

While I and the parishioners including those signed below thank you for addressing our housing crisis, we do not support your proposing this land as a potential site for affordable housing. Please remove it from the Housing Element.

Respectfully submitted,

Rev. Jose M. Corral  
 Reverend Father Jose Corral,  
 Pastor, Our Lady of the Pillar Parish

August 3, 2024  
 Date

**Parishioner Endorsements:**

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Print Name Address  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature