

Public Comments

Agenda Item 15 – Rincon Consultants

Written Comments Received By 12pm on 01/09/2023



January 9, 2023

City Council Meeting

From: Nick Lusson [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 8, 2023 4:36 PM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment - City Council meeting 1/9/23, agenda item #15

[CAUTION: External Email]

Mayor Bigstyk, Council Members, and Staff,

To start, I'd like to congratulate you on your successful elections and welcome you to your newly seated terms. I'm optimistic for the future of our community and wish you nothing but the best of luck in the year ahead. Thank you as well to city staff, particularly with the recent challenges of the severe storms hitting our town. Your efforts have been significant and appreciated.

Monday's City Council agenda includes approving funds for an environmental consultant for the proposed "Hillside Meadows" development on San Pedro Mountain. As this is the first time that this development application is formally reaching your agenda, I'd like to take this opportunity to make several critical points about it concerning this stage of the process.

- The projects of "Hillside Meadows" and "Linda Mar Woods" are one and the same. This is a clear attempt at piecemealing by the developer/owner of the parcel. There is significant case law to support this position, some of which has been previously shared with the city's planning staff. Some key, but not exhaustive, points to this position...
 - These are adjoining parcels, both located on San Pedro Mountain.
 - They're reliant on the same roadway changes and street traffic via Peralta Rd, Adobe Dr, and Higgins Way for ingress/egress.
 - It is the same owner, same developer, and same architect. They are being proposed simultaneously.
- "Hillside Meadows" was deemed a complete application before the developer unveiled plans for "Linda Mar Woods".
- Due to what has been explained to community members as a clerical oversight, this project application was deemed complete by default in 2020. A second unintentional error from staff was made in multiple miscommunications to community members over a 2-year period about the status of the project that it was an "incomplete application" when actually it was a "complete application" (including being listed as such on the city's website). This is significant, as it means the current application falls under Pacifica's 40+ year old general plan and not the 6-month old new one. I believe many of you had the same understanding as the general public in 2022, that your zoning decisions to this parcel would apply to this proposed development. But unfortunately, that doesn't seem to be the case.
- This proposal requires rezoning of a now extremely outdated General Plan.
- This proposal is in conflict with our Hillside Preservation Ordinance.
- The proposal is extremely misaligned with the newly passed General Plan that designates this parcel as "Transitional Open Space Residential" that allows up to 0.1 units per acre (this is a 6.8 acre parcel). The developer is proposing 36 units, our new GP states that this parcel is appropriate for 1 unit. I fully support the new General Plan and the underlying logic that we should avoid solving our housing growth goals via urban sprawl into the undeveloped hillsides on our borders.
- The approval of "Hillside Meadows" would result in making "Linda Mar Woods" an easier project to get approved.

It seems to deny common sense that a project that doesn't comply with our old GP, and conflicts at an even greater degree with our new GP, is continuing to be processed in this manner. The handling of this application has already been flawed, and continuing down this path will only lead to more wasted time and resources from our staff as the application is based on a faulty framework. The owners of this parcel should receive their due and fair consideration, but "Hillside Meadows" should be classified as the single development it is with "Linda Mar Woods" (call it "Linda Mar Hillside Meadow Woods" if you like) and brought under a renewed incomplete application status that then falls under the purview of our newly passed General Plan.

If the council chooses not to go this suggested direction, then this specific agenda item of funding for the environmental consultant seems wholly appropriate.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Nick Lusson

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Pacifica. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Public Comments

Oral Communications

Written Comments Received By 12pm on 01/09/2023



January 9, 2023

City Council Meeting

From: Jeffrey Qiu [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 9, 2023 2:24 AM
To: Public Comment
Subject: Oral Communications

[CAUTION: External Email]

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Jeffrey Qiu and I am writing with regards to the proposed 310-330 Esplanade Infrastructure Preservation Project. If it has been decided, what is the start date for the seawall construction? If not, what currently stands between now and finalizing a start date for the construction?

What progress has been made on the progress since the EIR Scoping Meeting on November 3rd, 2022?

Time is of the essence considering that there has already been an alarming amount of bluff erosion in the ongoing storm.

Thank you,
Jeffrey Qiu

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Pacifica. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.