

MINUTES

**CITY OF PACIFICA
PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
2212 BEACH BOULEVARD**

June 19, 2023

7:00 p.m.

Chair Hauser called the meeting to order at 7:16 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Devine, Berman, Ferguson, Godwin,
Wright and Chair Hauser
Absent: Vice Chair Leal

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Ferguson

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Murdock
Sr. Planner Cervantes
Sr. Planner Harkousha
Contract Planner Aggarwal

Chair Hauser gave information on how to present public comments participating by Zoom or phone.

Chair Hauser asked if they have any public comments for administrative business and seeing no one, asked Commissioners if there was a motion to approve the order of agenda.

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA Commissioner Ferguson moved approval of the Order of Agenda as amended; Commissioner Berman seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Devine, Berman, Ferguson, Godwin,
Wright and Chair Hauser
Noes: None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
JUNE 5, 2023** Commissioner Devine moved approval of the minutes of June 5, 2023; Commissioner Godwin seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Devine, Berman, Ferguson, Godwin,
Wright and Chair Hauser
Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JUNE 26, 2023:

None

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Mayor Bigstyck, Pacifica, stated that it was highly unusual for a councilmember to show up at a Planning Commission meeting, and would not stay during deliberations on agenda items, but he wanted to attend because it was Juneteenth, and there was no Council meeting, so he wanted to wish everyone a happy Juneteenth and shared his thoughts on the importance of this holiday.

Pete Shoemaker, Pacifica, stated he wanted to talk about the quarry reclamation plan and shared his personal concerns about the present planned project and asked them to seriously think it through before going forward.

Mike Vernazza, Pacifica, stated he wanted to express his thoughts on pushing back on Sacramento in things they are forcing local cities to do throughout California, and asked that we join several cities to voice their concerns to Sacramento.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. UP-106-18** **File No. 2018-021** – Annual Review of Use Permit UP-106-18 authorizing outdoor seating at the Taco Bell Cantina restaurant located at 5200 Coast Highway (APN 022-191-190). Recommended CEQA Action: Exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15378.

Contract Planner Aggarwal presented the staff report.

Chair Hauser asked if the applicant was present and wanted to speak.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that the applicant was here and, if they had any questions, he is here to address any concerns.

Planning Director Murdock clarified that, there is no applicant, so all members of the public, including any representative of the property owner or operator will have three minutes to address the Commission and the Chair can ask questions of any particular individual.

Chair Hauser thanked him for that clarification.

Commissioner Wright asked, when they were at the site, if they noticed if they happen to have a defibrillator on site in the restaurant and is that a code requirement.

Contract Planner Aggarwal isn't certain if it is a code requirement but she will look into this point after the hearing.

Commissioner Wright thought it was an ideal location for one to serve the public interest.

Commissioner Devine agreed. She understood this was the last check but asked what happens down the line when they continue to see non-compliance.

Planning Director Murdock stated she is correct that the original approval of this use permit for the outdoor seating area provided for no more than two annual reviews at the time. The Commission has the opportunity, per approval of conditions of the outdoor seating area, to amend conditions of approval if necessary to ensure compliance of the original approval and there is that option. Whether or not the condition does that, staff will be taking these facts for follow up action with the operator to be sure they are brought into compliance with the approval of the outdoor seating area or a recommendation at an appropriate time if compliance cannot be achieved to invoke a use permit revocation proceeding and those are some the present options. They can provide more information on how to evaluate or impose any option.

Commissioner Devine asked if now would be an opportune time to deliberate with Commissioners.

Chair Hauser stated that they will take public comment before they deliberate.

Commissioner Berman referred to packet page 61, first paragraph of section C, additional staff analysis, and she thought there was a typo. She referred to the sentence that mentions the date

range of the analysis which says from May 2020 through June 6, 2020, and she is guessing that it should be June 6, 2023.

Contract Planner Aggarwal responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser opened the Public Hearing.

Dan Kremer, Pacifica, stated he was involved with the original use permit in 2018 and, the process to obtain the use permit involved numerous meetings with the Planning Department and several months of dialogue. At the time, they all worked together and it was a great experience. From the date of approval, the restaurant has endeavored to comply with all the conditions listed in the use permit and staff report stated the city conducted annual review in 2020 and the outdoor seating area was found to be in conformance. Over the past several weeks, the restaurant operator has been in active dialogue with the Planning Department to discuss potential changes to the layout of the outdoor sitting area and he thought it was important to note that Planning was invited to the restaurant to look around in connection with that dialogue and it wasn't a surprise visit. He referred to the four conditions called out in the staff report, i.e., regarding the seating, there is not a specific seat count number listed as a condition in the use permit and the 38 number in the original floor plan, there were five big tables that had a total of 38 seats at the time but there have been changes made to the tables and it wasn't a specific number in the report. Regarding the flood light condition 6, it has been there from day one with no changes made and they are surprised that it was deemed non-compliant now. On condition 12, there is an alarm gate to the beach and at the time there was some problems with the alarm and that has been fixed and is fully functional. On condition 20, there is now an accessible table which he believes has room for 4 spaces. In the original floor plan there was only space for two accessible seats. He can't fully address the building code, but it seems there is more accessible seating now than there was originally. He asked that it not be deemed non-compliant.

Chair Hauser closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Devine appreciated that the applicant was willing staff into the facility to see what is going on and create an opportunity for input. She would like to see this period extended as she believes when alcohol is added to the situation, sometimes it takes a while to work things out, adding that on a beautiful day, it gets hectic and you have a facility in the sand that serves alcohol and you have staff that may not always be able to manage things on their own, which is not their fault. She thought it was a new thing for it to be a cantina and she thought it would be nice to extend this period.

Commissioner Berman agreed with Commissioner Devine's comment. Her understanding of the staff report is that they are able to adjust the conditions of approval at this time and she asked if they can modify a condition of approval to require a third annual review.

Planning Director Murdock stated that was an option and staff's advice, to give due process to the applicant and any members of the public would be to continue the public hearing to allow them to provide notice of what the proposed modification is and that can be a direction to come out of the Commission's deliberations at this time.

Commissioner Berman would be in support of that but she was looking forward to hearing from other commissioners. She appreciate that the business owner has been very cooperative and very

proactive in already starting to address the areas of non-compliance and she feels confident that these issues can be remedied.

Chair Hauser wanted to thank the restaurant for operating in Pacifica and it is nice to see one so well patronized. She referred to the staff report saying that 38 persons were approved and the public commenter said that it was just shown on the plan. She thought the more limiting factor is that the fire department has determined the permissible occupant load to be no more than 49 persons. She asked if staff can speak to the 49 persons.

Planning Director Murdock stated that there is typically a limit on occupant load of 49 or fewer in spaces that only have one "exit" for fire emergency exiting purposes and this is one such site in the Fire Marshall's observation, i.e., to have an occupant capacity in excess of 49 would need a second approved exit and that is a code limitation on the number of persons that should be allowed to occupy the space.

Chair Hauser appreciated that there was a safety issue and she thinks it needs to be reviewed in that vein. She would support the idea of a third annual review but she also would support the idea of giving the restaurant 30 or 60 days to work with staff to decide what the best course of action would be, whether coming back with a plan or amending the use permit at staff level.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he would also support a 30-60 day review period and sounds like 2 of the 4 are already addressed as the emergency exit is fixed. He thought the emergency exit sign is installed properly and there was just a problem with the function.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated the function of the gate, and the alarm was fixed but there is a sign that is an easy fix and staff can coordinate with the operator to fix that and she got some pictures which showed the accessible tables also being brought onto the patio area and those two can be addressed and staff can discuss with them about the light fixture. She stated that it was predominantly the seating which was something they need to work through.

Commissioner Ferguson asked, if 49 persons is the maximum, as they are not taking the exit through the building as an exit from the space, and he asked if there was a rule of thumb of amount of seating you are allowed to have for 49 person maximum, and if there is 38 do you assume some of the people are standing and is there some specific limit to give them to work off of.

Planning Director Murdock stated that his working knowledge of the issue is that there is a different ratio of square footage per person assumed for non-fixed seating, such as standing area or someplace where foldable or moving chairs might be placed in a different formula that may be applied to places with fixed seating in assembly type occupancies. He can't quote the applicable ratios but it may be a combination depending on fixed and non-fixed seating area.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if we have documentation having provided this information to the owner.

Planning Director Murdock was not aware of such documentation but it is common knowledge for architects licensed in California.

Commissioner Ferguson thought it was possible that they were unaware of their non-compliance on this issue.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that they were aware of their non-compliance when they did the second annual review. They found them in noncompliance in the first annual review, and the second review was the opportunity to examine the site and see what was compliant and noncompliant and they were informed at the time the second review was conducted.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he had no doubt the architect who prepared the original drawings was aware of that code limitation and, since the last annual review, could an onsite restaurant manager who is not an architect unknowingly violated that limitation. There spaced to have more seats and they are busy so put more seats. He thought that was a reasonable conclusion to reach.

Commissioner Ferguson referred to the lighting, and he stated that it preexisted the permit and the request was that they would replace the existing fixture or shroud it somehow and that is what was needed to come into compliance.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that they could shroud somehow.

Commissioner Ferguson isn't understanding the use permit, such as there might be a night skies ordinance that they aren't in compliance with but the picture was title 24 compliant before the use permit and now no longer compliant based on a condition of the use permit. He was there but doesn't recall all their conditions.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that it needs to comply with the guidelines for lighting which has to be that there is no glare off site from the facility which is why the condition called for down facing lighting, and this is something which is like a flashlight. She stated that hasn't been any complaints about it, but it doesn't strictly comply with the conditions.

Commissioner Ferguson assumed that what is being asked of the applicant is to shroud or replace it.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that, in this report to bring to the Planning Commission, was to work with the noncompliant items and they haven't had that conversation.

Planning Director Murdock stated that there was more than one way to resolve the issue and it is within the Planning Commission's prerogative if they say staff didn't identify that in the first annual review, it was existing, we don't want to ding them, all they are bringing are the observations on the date of this inspection. He doesn't have a good explanation for why they didn't identify it as noncompliant in the prior annual review.

Commissioner Berman referred to lighting, and if they agree with staff's recommendation, she wondered if the lighting in the patio would still be sufficient from the foot candle perspective. If that light was there the whole time, it may be necessary in order to get the required lighting for use.

Planning Director Murdock stated he wasn't aware if there was a foot candle or lumens requirement for this particular illumination but he can say that the building code typically requires

entries and exits have sufficient lighting for safety for people and a modification to this fixture is something they would check with the building official to make sure the lighting was sufficient and wasn't causing some other inadvertent code violation that causes some secondary issue.

Commissioner Berman asked, if it is determined that additional lighting would be necessary, whether that wouldn't have to come back to Planning Commission.

Planning Director Murdock stated it would not. A minor change of a fixture or installation of a second fixture could be found that substantially compliant with the original approval and grant the necessary building permit at a staff level and avoid coming back to the Commission.

Commissioner Berman referred to occupancy, and stated that her read of the staff report was that building code requires the 38 person max for occupancy.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that the plans submitted when the Commission approved the use permit showed seating for 38 persons which were the plans that were reviewed by the building official as well as the Fire Department. They reviewed that number of seating and, based on that information, determined the outdoor seating area was approvable for fire and building. They haven't really seen anything added as no amendments have come through the formal process for review by each of the departments and then go on to the Commission for their review and determination. She stated that, when staff says there is noncompliance in condition 1, it specifically speaks to compliance with the plans that were approved except as modified by conditions that follow. That is how occupancy was determined and, when the second annual review took place, staff did confer with the building officer and Fire Department and the seating present there now is not something that would be approvable for the building code or the Fire code.

Commissioner Berman asked if there was a concrete number that is acceptable, given the square footage of the patio for a maximum occupancy, i.e., is it 49.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated the 49 number is based on the exit that is available from the outdoor seating area. If you were to subtract the space which people would need to evacuate, it comes to about 38, according to the Fire code.

Commissioner Berman assumed, based on the total square footage for having one exit, 49 maximum occupants are acceptable but subtracting out access space and evacuation space, is it the building or fire code that says 38 or is it staff's assessment that 38 is appropriate.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated she is speaking to the input she was provided by the building officer and Fire Department and she could not cite to her where it says in the fire or building code, but they can follow up on that. She stated those were the feedbacks provided by the building official and the Fire Department.

Commissioner Berman thought it sounded like they may need a bit more information, but her comfort level is, if building code allows a certain amount and the Fire Department believes it to be safe, that she will feel comfortable with that number.

Chair Hauser asked if she was comfortable with the idea of 60 days for the restaurant to figure out what their plan is.

Commissioner Berman agreed, and wanted to ask one question related to that. She asked, if they allowed 30 or 60 more days to allow the business to come into compliance, what the next step would be, such as coming back to Planning Commission.

Planning Director Murdock stated that approximately 60 days from today would take them to the August 21 Planning Commission meeting and one potential motion for the Commission to consider is to continue the public hearing on the annual review to August 21 and to provide all required noticing to initiate a modification to the conditions of approval to add a third annual review to the use permit.

Commissioner Berman assumed they would modify that condition of approval at their next meeting.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, adding that they would need to provide public notice to the applicant and others of the proposed modification of conditions of approval and would concurrently consider that modification and acceptance of the report for the annual review and the Commission would have an opportunity to hear of any progress has been made towards compliance at that time to be able to consider all those activities together.

Commissioner Berman stated that sounds good to her.

Commissioner Devine stated, adding to what Commissioner Berman said, that she wasn't very clear with her first comment. She stated that was where her concern was with the occupancy. When things are crowded and hectic and a great day and staff is not well versed to make that call. She was comfortable with the 60-day review and she thought it was important to give them a number if they can guide them in that direction. She stated that PD and Fire have often stopped by per the staff report and has felt the numbers on the patio is unacceptable. Her concerns were there, such as on those crowded days when staff is doing what they need to do to make the restaurant go.

Commissioner Godwin asked if there was currently a maximum occupancy sign on the patio.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated there isn't.

Commissioner Godwin thought that would be a good addition as there are a lot of restaurants and entertainment venues that post the maximum occupancy and management and customers are expected to abide by that.

Chair Hauser thought that was a great point. She asked if there were any questions, comments or a motion, asking staff to help them for the appropriate motion as she didn't think what was suggested in the staff report was not what they discussed.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the suggested motion would be to move that the Planning Commission continue the public hearing to August 21, 2023, direct staff to provide public notice to propose an amendment to the conditions of approval of the use permit to add a third annual review and to require a maximum occupancy sign to be installed in the outdoor seating area and, as part of the research related to the maximum occupancy sign, to determine with the building

Planning Commission Minutes

June 19, 2023

Page 9 of 84

official and Fire Marshall what the current configuration would allow in terms of a maximum number of occupants under building code and fire code.

Commissioner Berman so moved; Commissioner Ferguson seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Devine, Berman, Ferguson, Godwin,
Wright and Chair Hauser
Noes: None

CONSIDERATION:

2. N/A Discussion of Objective Development Standards for Housing Element Rezoning Program.
Recommended CEQA Action: Exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they will have Senior Planner Brianne Harkousha deliver the staff report.

Sr. Planner Harkousha presented the staff report.

Chair Hauser stated that, before she opens it up for questions, she wanted to understand correctly that there is no decision being made at this meeting as the goal is to review these six categories and she asked that they be put back on the screen, specifically mentioning all six of them.

Sr. Planner Harkousha responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser asked if this effort will be guiding the objective standards process that staff is going through and hoping to scope the CEQA document.

Planning Director Murdock stated she was correct, and in addition to the sites identified and the assumed number of units and densities that are in the current draft, any additional information and direction that the Commission gives about potential zoning standards, such as height, setbacks, etc., will have relevance for the city's environmental review process, in other words, preparation of the environmental impact report for this phase 1 rezoning program.

Chair Hauser asked, with the feedback that commissioners and the community give at this meeting, if she correct in understanding that staff will then come back with more formal development standards for them to review and take action on.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, as this was sort of a study session to have a dialogue, figure out what the Commission may or may not like based on staff's information and input and community input, and at some future point there would need to be a formal public hearing process for additional public input, provide all associated noticing and have the Commission make a recommendation to Council on the actual zoning standards.

Chair Hauser understood and then opened up to questions.

Commissioner Berman asked if, at this meeting, they are allowed to discuss individual sites in detail at this meeting, such as if they have thoughts on objective standards particular to a specific site.

Sr. Planner Harkousha responded affirmatively, adding that they have prepared an exercise for the Commission to review about ten of the housing element sites, particularly for the rezoning sites as part of the phase 1 process.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they are the sites that were diagrammed in appendix F of the draft housing element where there has already been an effort by staff to identify the portions

of the sites assumed for housing in the housing element and that would be a starting point they would recommend and are prepared to support for the Commission. If there is a desire to get into further discussion, which they assume there will be, they can bring back another item to bring back another set of sites. At this time, they are going to gauge how much the Commission can get through with ten that they are prepared to support the analysis for and beyond that, they may not be prepared to support that discussion.

Commissioner Berman asked if there were any sites that Commissioners may need to recuse themselves from in the later activity.

Planning Director Murdock thought there is, i.e., there is one site they have identified with a potential conflict of interest for one commissioner, and whether now or prior to bringing up that site, they would need to disclose that conflict.

Commissioner Wright asked staff to describe their process for community outreach to allow the community to have plenty of opportunity as this seems like this is significant to the changes that are going to potentially occur over time in the city.

Planning Director Murdock stated that there has been a robust public outreach process for the housing element update, including numerous public meetings, citywide mailer, online newsletter, etc. For this meeting, in addition to the regular Planning Commission agenda distribution process which goes out to hundreds of recipients, they sent out an email notification to the Housing Element interest list that people have signed up for over the previous months and were aware that the Commission would be discussing this subject matter at this meeting.

Commissioner Wright asked if he could describe the criteria they used to figure out the parking requirements, based on the number of bedrooms, occupancy, square footage.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, for this meeting's discussion, staff has not proposed any particular standards, and is for the Commission to discuss and consider. They can give reference information from what the current code has, not all of which is particularly transferable to sites like these, as our zoning code has not been designed to accommodate projects of these densities that they are talking about of 30, 40, 50 units or more per acre and is a blank canvas of sorts and Commission needs to give some initial direction and, over time, shape that into where they are going to end up in this process with some of these six core objective standards for developments of this type.

Commissioner Wright then referred to setbacks, and noticed a 15-foot setback as one possibility and it seems to him that, in the eventuality that they ever do change it and allow people to park cars in the front, they are asking them to park cars over the sidewalk which doesn't seem too smart and he thought they should make it shorter to keep that possibility away or make it deeper for a realistic possibility. He wondered how he came up with that.

Chair Hauser didn't believe staff has proposed any objective standards and the objective standards attached to the staff report are a sample from other cities but not what they are proposing.

Commissioner Wright understood but he sees problems with some of the possible ones.

Planning Director Murdock stated that was the kind of feedback they need to hear. He stated that it wasn't necessarily the case that, for every standard or every site, the Commission will know what it wants in terms of X number of feet height or setbacks, but to hear what their concerns are so they can brainstorm how to address them in a future recommendation, just as Commissioner Wright stated about parking related to setbacks.

Commissioner Wright asked if the relationship between the amount of front setback, percentage of lot coverage, then what size does a typical Pacifica lot allow you as a rear setback from the other buildings. He thought there was a lot of moving intertwined parts that he needs to try to grasp the relationship between them all.

Commissioner Ferguson recalled that, during the Local Coastal Land Use program and Sharp Park Specific Plan, they sent out community email surveys to gauge community support, and it was granular in specific parts of West Sharp Park, such as which density or level would they support, and asked if there was any thought about doing something like that now that we have some direction on rezoning to gauge community support for what these design standards might be rather than just have the Commission try to represent the community as best they can.

Planning Director Murdock thought that may be a possibility as it is best practice, and something staff is open to conceptually. He thought part of the challenge is the timing and the resources available to commit to this particular rezoning process for what they are claiming is the term phase 1. This is the mandatory rezone to accommodate the housing units process and they are trying to incorporate a minimal number of objective standards as quickly and efficiently as they can to accompany that as we have to complete by January 31, 2024. He imagines it is more likely they can do a more robust community engagement process as part of the phase 2 objective standards which are going to be much broader and probably allow an opportunity for more granular feedback as he stated, and now they are just trying to create an envelope to protect the city in the in between time between doing the rezoning for the sites and the time it will take, probably the better part of a year or more, to do a very in depth comprehensive zoning update but many more objective standards. They are trying to strike the right balance in terms of time and resource commitment now, versus later.

Commissioner Ferguson appreciated the dilemma staff is in and he understands they are trying to avoid the builders' dilemma. They will look forward to getting more granular later. He wants to understand the goal for this meeting, i.e., trying to create some kind of a matrix that is site by site and breaks down each of the six objective design standards. He asked if they are able to do specific site by specific site or are they putting them into classifications.

Chair Hauser thought her vision for organizing this after they go to public comment is to start with the more complicated sites that are in appendix S, she thought ten of them, where in the housing element draft submitted to each CD, there is a polygon that shows where housing is expected to occur. Because those are the most complex, she thought they can start with those ten and go site by site. If they get through them, continue down the other 10 or so sites that are on the list and, if not, try to find a date to come back.

Commissioner Ferguson is in support of that.

Planning Director Murdock showed her a preview of the first site in the slide that they prepared. On the left is the graphic from the draft housing element and on the right is a reference to the site

location and six standards that they were suggesting the Commission discuss at this meeting. They prepared one slide for each of the ten. They can also have an additional resource of a google earth image that will allow them to pan around and see what site constraints or considerations may be unique to each site to help make that a broader discussion.

Chair Hauser thought that will be very helpful.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he noticed on the slide they mentioned the word duets and it looks like that is the same as a duplex, and he asked if he was correct.

Sr. Planner Harkousha asked what slide he was referring to.

Commissioner Godwin stated that she would have to go back and show it to him as she was giving some illustration of some housing units, then found it, i.e., under 12 density units, single family duets. He asked what “duet” means in that context.

Sr. Planner Harkousha thought the intent of duets is a duplex style apartment.

Commissioner Godwin thought that was what she meant. He liked the idea that they could have two different height limits for the housing unit closest to the street and the one behind it. He thought that was a really effective design strategy.

Chair Hauser asked him to limit it to questions at this point because they should take public comment before they start giving feedback.

Commissioner Godwin asked how tall the back house be using that design concept.

Sr. Planner Harkousha stated that they haven't evaluated that as of yet but that is something the Commission can explore further when they go through the exercise and look at different sites.

Commissioner Godwin stated he has seen a lot more electric cargo bikes and people hauling kids to school, picking up groceries in town. He noticed that the Chinese are doing a lot better like BYD and exporting their little mini-cars that weigh less than 1,500 pounds and are much smaller than a 6,000 pound American style SUV in Europe and Southeast Asia. He asked, when they considered parking, if they thought about the change in the mix of vehicles that are likely to be on the road within the next ten years when these housing plans are likely to take place. He thought it will be substantial.

Sr. Planner Harkousha didn't think they have considered any standards for this meeting, but parking standards are mainly from the Municipal code.

Planning Director Murdock thought that is the type of feedback to consider those issues and whether they can project likely trends in the future that might influence their long term parking standards that would be built into these sites. If that is a type of guidance and direction they want to give to staff during Commission discussion portion of the item, they would value that sort of feedback related to the off street parking standards.

Commissioner Godwin understood. He then thought we have way too much retail space and he knows there were a couple of questions about adding retail space and his guess for the future is

that there will be a lot less retail space in town and more goods are going to be delivered through things like Amazon Prime. He asked if they have thought about shrinking the amount of retail in town and, if so, by how much, rather than growing it as some people suggested.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, as part of this process, they have not considered a reduction to commercial areas, as there is an important constituency that advocates for more commercial space. He can't say whether or not that is based on economics but based in part on the perception that Pacifica does not have very much commercially designated areas to begin with relative to other communities and there could be a difference of opinion and different conclusions on different data. He stated, as a policy matter, they have tried to ensure that there are opportunities for mixed use development so they can create more walkable communities with employment and shopping opportunities near to where they live. Whether that is right in every case where they have identified that, that is also important input from the Commission.

Commissioner Devine had a procedural question as she is new to the Commission, and is sure it has come up from community members as well. She stated, developing these standards in an effort to try to fast track rezoning, once the areas are rezoned, is that a green light for development for the owners of these properties, or what does that mean.

Planning Director Murdock stated what they are trying to do with the objective standards is several fold. In the first instance, they are trying to create this envelope, not only in building form, but in terms of provision of off street parking and usable outdoor areas, etc., that will be minimum standards in place in the event a project comes in before the city puts in place more complex, robust and far reaching objective standards. Another thing this process is trying to accomplish is putting together a baseline set of standards to build on in the phase 2 process so they get the types of projects they want in Pacifica, and that relates to the third issue which is that, under state law in recent years, the legislature has started to take away local discretion related to the development review process and what that means, as Sr. Planner Harkousha mentioned, cities historically have relied heavily on subjective development standards and General Plan policies that no one from the development community could reasonably forecast and project and they would spend a lot of time and money and effort going through local development processes. For whatever reason, i.e., on the whim of a Commission or Council in a given community, their project would be denied because at the 11th hour it is determined not to be consistent with some subjective development standard or policy. The legislature said that is an anathema to providing enough housing that California needs in light of the housing crisis, and as a consequence of those past actions, local agencies can only evaluate these type of housing projects and deny them or reduce the number of units they propose if they fail to comply with objective development standards. An objective development standard is particularly defined so that an individual can look at a standard and, with reasonable effort and judgement, understand what it means in terms of what can and cannot be built so that cities are not applying subjective standards to undercut projects that otherwise meet the adopted zoning and he said that is probably the top three objectives they are trying to accomplish. The consequence of that is what she mentioned, that developers will have an easier time, not exactly a green light in most instances, to just go build, but they have a clearer path to approval through the process so they can more reasonably and timely and cost efficiently obtain a building permit to actually build the housing that is in the housing element.

Chair Hauser opened the Public Hearing.

Carmen Lazo, member of local Carpenter Union 217, stated she is here speak about labor standards in the housing element. She mentioned details such as in Menlo Park, Foster City and Redwood City and suggested Pacifica use such standards.

Mike Vernazza, Pacifica, stated he was here to be involved, and thought it was a same there weren't more community members and hoped he can change that as this thing progresses. He then shared his thoughts on this issue.

Kali Drake, Pacifica, attended a feedback session on different sites, and signed up for information on upcoming meetings but never got notifications of any follow ups, and shared thoughts on accessibility and safety issues, etc.

Patrick Mora, Pacifica, travels to San Francisco and shared his thoughts on the standards of housing and on exploring with an open mind to diversity, etc.

Sr. Planner Cervantes introduced the call-in speakers.

Jaime Wexcel, Pacifica, is owner of Wexcel LLC and had questions regarding what site 32 changes look like and what they will do regarding feedback on that development.

Suzanne Moore, Pacifica, appreciated that the Commission has set time aside for further public input on sites and standards for housing construction to meet RHNA goals and shared her thoughts on this issue.

Kimberly Finale, Pacifica, appreciated the report, and shared her thoughts and suggested options on this issue.

Sue Digre, Pacifica, stated that we need revenue and shared her thoughts on this issue.

Samantha Bird, Pacifica, appreciated the chance to speak, and shared her thoughts on this issue including the importance of informing the public to have more public input.

Rich Campbell, Pacifica, stated he was a former Planning Commissioner, and he offered his thoughts and suggestions on what can be incorporated into these developments being discussed.

Judy Hansen, Pacifica, shared her thoughts and concerns regarding the housing element including concerns about government involvement.

Nancy Tierney, Pacifica, acknowledged the sites favoring infill development, and shared her thoughts on the issue.

Chair Hauser closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Hauser was going to do what Mayor Bigstycck does, i.e., going through some of the questions by the commenters. She stated one question they heard a lot was how people can find out and stay up to date on the process, and asked staff to speak to that.

Planning Director Murdock referred to the one commenter who said she had signed up but didn't receive any email and he will try to find a way to get in touch with her or she can contact him

after the meeting to figure out what happened in that specific case. Generally, Pacificans can visit planpacific.org and go to the housing element portion of that page and sign up for the mailing list as once they sign up, they are automatically added to the mailing list they use to send out notifications, such as the one sent out for this meeting and for future discussions of the Housing Element.

Chair Hauser asked if it was possible, as a government agency, to post to NextDoor in Pacifica to allow people to have input to future meetings pertaining to the housing element.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is possible and they do that from time to time as it depends on the timing, workload, and the type and nature of engagement that they are trying to accomplish for a particular item. They include mentions in Connect with Pacifica weekly newsletter and those who aren't receiving that from the city can contact the Planning Department or City Clerk's office to sign up for that weekly newsletter from the city where they include mention of upcoming community meetings, special topics of interest like the Housing Element.

Chair Hauser stated that a couple of the callers had questions about traffic and she understood that would be studied in the EIR and would be forthcoming for the housing element. She asked if that is a correct understanding.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it depends what people mean by traffic. From a land use planning standpoint, it matters what you mean and, historically traffic congestion with the number of vehicles emanating from a particular project were evaluated in the environmental review process. A few years ago, the state changed the law to prohibit cities from using what is called level of service or LOS which is a measure of congestion as part of the environmental review process. The environmental impact report that they are preparing for the phase 1 rezoning will not evaluate traffic congestion as an environmental impact, but it will be evaluated vehicle miles traveled or VMT which is the new permissible metric for determining vehicle related environmental impacts. In other words, the number of miles that a vehicle will travel or the vehicle is emanating from a project while traveling. How does that relate to green house gas emissions as it relates to climate changes in the environmental impact is what will be evaluated as part of the EIR elsewhere. As one or more commenters mentioned, the Housing Element is part of the General Plan and needs to be integrated and internally consistent with other elements. In the General Plan circulation element, we do have a level of service standard for our roadways and it is in that sense that, either as part of the General Plan process on a project specific basis or both that traffic related congestion-related impacts will be evaluated for consistency with the General Plan.

Commissioner Berman asked if they were allowed to make effectively a level of service determination and objective standard for a site and what leeway do we have on making objective standards related to traffic as the level of service isn't going to be reviewed in the EIR.

Planning Director Murdock thought it may be possible but he would argue that the General Plan already has a level of service objective standard. He believes it is level D but he would need time to confirm that. He wasn't sure that it would be necessary to do that. What they are trying to accomplish with tonight's discussion is physical development standards for the sites themselves and the buildings that might be constructed on them to get a basic envelope of what can be built and the maximum profile of what that development would look like. Other types of offsite impacts that would result from these projects, probably beyond the scope of what they were

prepared to assist with at this meeting. He stated that the General Plan already has a level of service standard.

Chair Hauser stated a commenter called in about property they owned and, instead of focusing on that particular site, she asked staff to speak a little bit more to what the implication of the housing element is for property owners and what level of involvement property owners need to have.

Planning Director Murdock stated that property owners are welcome to engage in the process as any other member of the public and they made a broad citywide appeal to mailing addresses by sending a citywide mailer and every property in the city has been contacted, including those whom are proposed for inclusion in the housing element and whether they have chosen to participate or not along the way as it is theirs to make. For someone who may want to reengage or realize that they are not engaging or receiving notifications that they would like. They can go to planpacifica.org and make sure they are signed up on the mailing list and share any public comments they would like about the process.

Chair Hauser stated, while the housing element will make land use changes, it is her understanding that the housing element in no way requires property owners to make improvements or build anything or change their land. She asked if that was correct.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively stating that essentially what the Housing Element is doing with respect to sites at a basic level is demonstrating to the state that the city has land use designations at sites sufficient to accommodate its mandated minimum amount of housing to be built over the next eight years and it does not mandate any property owner to agree to build housing and doesn't result in the government coming in and building housing on any private property owner's property and the decision of whether or not to develop for a given property owner remains entirely their own. By including a property in the housing element, however, it may make it easier for a property owner that wants to construct a housing project that is consistent with the housing element to actually get approval to construct the housing. There are tradeoffs, but the theme of the day and the decision is ultimately that of the property owner.

Chair Hauser stated that, as they have a lot of work to deal with and she thought they should move over to analysis. As she supports building housing which is what she does for a living, she agrees with a lot of those who said that this process is kind of like taking a sledgehammer to something that typically requires a scalpel and it is hard to digest the level of public transportation that Pacifica has and it is hard to digest the number they have been given. It was given to us by the state and, at this point, she appreciates that staff has brought this item before them as, with state law, the risk is that, if they don't establish this building or envelope with the six different items that staff has asked them to review, people or developers can come in and build whatever they want. She thinks it is important that they establish the envelope and shed appreciates that this is what staff has started with and she mentioned earlier that she would like to go site by site for the ten sites that are in appendix F as she believes they are the most complex and they are formal and are pressing their buttons. She thinks people should feel comfortable just speaking and, similar to what Commissioner Berman did when she shared the General Plan and they went element by element, she thinks that at the end of each site, when they feel that they have given staff the appropriate amount of directions they will confer and move on to the next site.

Planning Director Murdock thought they could give Commissioner Devine an opportunity to disclose her conflict of interest related to one of the sites so, if she chooses to, when the site comes up she can depart from the meeting without further alteration of the process.

Commissioner Devine stated that she has to recuse herself from the Sea Bowl site as she owns real property in Rockaway Beach and that is considered within 500 to 1,000 yards.

Chair Hauser asked Planning Director Murdock, of the ten sites they are doing, can they do the quarry site last so that Commissioner Devine can participate in all the other nine without having to come back.

Planning Director Murdock asked if she meant the Sea Bowl site.

Chair Hauser agreed that is what she meant.

Planning Director Murdock agreed that they can structure it so that site comes up last and Commissioner Devine can be here for the first nine and depart if she so chooses not come back. He added clarification that it was 500 to 1,000 feet.

Chair Hauser referred to Fairmont Shopping Center and, if no one else has any thoughts, she stated that, when they looked at this under the study session with Council, whole APNs were identified as to where housing was going to be placed. She appreciated that in the document sent to HCD as staff took the most nuance and complex sites and further refined the polygon to where housing is allowed. If she read it correctly, she believes the blue polygon is where the city will allow housing, and in Fairmont, it is not the whole shopping center but the acre that is in blue, up to 50 dwelling units per acre and she didn't think they were able to talk about densities as that has already been sent to HCD and would have to come up after HCD's review, but they are trying to limit heights, setbacks, lot coverage, floor area ratio, and if they are, that will be floor area ratio of commercial and if they are limiting or requiring commercial space at this site, they should talk about the amount of open space for dwelling units if people need patios or common open space, such as a bocci ball court, etc., and the amount of parking spaces per unit.

Planning Director Murdock stated that many of the sites that will come up for discussion at this meeting are located within shopping centers which is reflective of one of the key community desires in their housing element and General Plan update processes, i.e., redevelop existing shopping centers to preserve our hillsides infill walkable development, minimized traffic, etc. He stated that the draft housing element does not indicate one way or the other that with these sites, such as the Fairmont Shopping Center site, the housing element component would necessarily be mixed use or residential only. He contends that, as part of the FAR component of this discussion, it is fair game for the Commission to offer their insights on whether it should be a stand alone residential building for each site or a mixed use, and whether the mixed use would be in the same building or a separate building in the designated area.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he was willing to jump in, but for helping them visualize, such as 50 units per acre which he doesn't know what it would like if you eliminated requisite open space for setbacks and if they could come up with a type requirement of 36 feet and is it possible to stick 50 units on this space. He asked if anyone has done any such metrics.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they haven't specifically diagrammed the sites or laid them out, but for purposes of this site, one acre in area of 50 units per acre allowable density, they have to further offset that for HCD with a conservative assumption and they handicapped that 50 units per acre which would otherwise be 50 units, to 41 units and they are not overestimating the housing production and it helps take into account issues like setbacks, parking, etc., and that 81% adjustment is based on real projects Pacifica has approved in recent years which sort of the amalgamation of all those taxes on site area is that 81%.

Commissioner Ferguson understood, stating that he didn't want to get into a position where they were effectively limiting the number and getting in trouble with HCD regulations.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, if that was the result from some direction from the Commission after they further analyze it, they would identify that for them and say, while they heard them, they were concerned and can't accomplish the stated number of units because of some reason.

Chair Hauser asked if it would be helpful information to the Commissioners if they ask Planning Director Murdock to go through the lot coverage, setbacks and parking standards that are currently being used in our zoning.

Commissioner Ferguson thought so.

Planning Director Murdock stated that these development standards are not set up for higher density housing projects, but in most zoning districts, there is a 15-foot front setback, a 5-foot side setback, somewhere between 15 and 20-foot rear setback, and adding all that, the citywide height limit currently, except for agricultural districts, is 35 feet in the zoning. In the General Plan and Sharp Park Specific Plan, there was a discussion and expectation that heights would go between 45 and 55 feet in some instances, generally corresponding to those 30, 40 and 50 dwelling units per acre land use densities that were approved in those documents; however, the current height limit in the zoning is 35 feet. Thus, he stated that there was an inconsistency where they likely will need to increase the height to something over 35 to accommodate those higher densities. He stated that the exception mentioned everywhere but agriculture, and strangely the agricultural zoning district actually allows 36 feet of height but doesn't allow intensive type of development and maybe that was intended for barns or other types of agricultural structures, not primarily housing. He then referred to off street parking, stating it was a little more complicated as they aren't talking about single family residences. For multifamily, that standard is varied based on the bedroom count of the dwelling unit. He pulled up the table and stated that, for multifamily housing, a studio unit currently requires one parking space, a one bedroom unit is 1.5 parking spaces and 2 or more bedrooms two spaces. He stated that there is a guest parking requirement of one space for each four units.

Commissioner Wright asked how many units for each.

Planning Director Murdock stated it was four units. He hoped that gives them a frame of reference for what the current zoning standards are and they can imagine how they could present some challenges to achieving the densities they need while trying to make desirable, well-designed projects.

Commissioner Wright stated that they keep talking about the number of units, and he personally would be more interested in seeing a mixture of units as he doesn't want to see someone come in and build 8 million studio apartments or see someone come in and build 8 million 5-bedroom apartments. He asked how, through these standards, they can try to encourage a mixture.

Planning Director Murdock stated it was an interesting question as zoning standards typically don't get into prescribing bedroom counts, he thought it was within the city's police power to do so. He thought one way they could influence that is by ensuring they give enough height and don't overly burdensome setbacks so there is enough building to accommodate more than a studio. If they overly constrain high floor area ratio setbacks, they are requiring smaller unit sizes and, while not necessarily saying it is would be a studio versus a one bedroom, but it becomes progressively more difficult to have larger bedroom counts and square footage for units and thus a variety of unit types, the more constrained those other development standards are. He stated that they can explore whether and how to prescribe bedroom counts, if that is of interest to the Commission, but he would suggest they first think about giving enough flexibility and room to design varieties of unit types.

Commissioner Wright asked what the typical square footage of each of those three types of units, studio, one bedroom and two bedroom.

Planning Director Murdock didn't know if he could offhand, as he has seen them range from relatively small like 400-500 square feet up to 1,800 square feet, 2,000 square feet and, in some cases, more for multifamily units. It really depends on the project type, what level of market it is trying to target in terms of price point. They have typically seen higher price point developments in Pacifica in recent years which has skewed most of those units on the larger side.

Commissioner Wright asked how many parking spots fit on one acre.

Planning Director Murdock stated it was hard for him to say specifically because they do need drive aisle for maneuvering and backing out, but the maximum under our current parking standards that he thought they can expect is around 250 parking spaces on a flat surface parking lot of one acre in size, and taking out 30-50% of that area for maneuvering, you would probably at about 100 to 150 range maximum.

Commissioner Wright thought, in this instance, they would need to have all studio apartments and they could have some diversity of the sizes of the units available if they had parking underneath and residences above.

Planning Director Murdock thought there were a variety of ways to design the off street parking facilities, the least expensive for the developer being a surface parking area which might affect the intensity of the development that can occur, as well as the build form and the aesthetics of the project. Structured parking or below ground parking become progressively more expensive but they can give you greater flexibility in terms of how you utilize the site and what the above ground built area looks like.

Commissioner Wright asked if staff has an opinion as to whether it is good to have parking visible from the street or whether better to have it behind or obscured by the structures.

Planning Director Murdock thought that was a subjective design preference that he thought most people in the urban planning and design field would suggest against having parking visible from the street and would rather have sufficient landscaped and well-designed building area be the public view that is visible from the street and the sidewalk and minimize the access points for parking from the street by strategically placing driveways and maximizing their utilization off of the primary viewable area and having parking set back behind or below.

Chair Hauser has a suggestion on parking, i.e., for almost every site they are going to look at for residential parking, she thought they should continue to implement the amount of parking required in the Pacifica code which is what Planning Director Murdock read, such as once you get to two bedrooms, it is two dedicated spaces and 1-4 guest parking spaces, so for every four homes you have a guest parking space. She stated that the nuance there is that the state government code for density bonus allows those who build affordable housing to reduce the amount of parking and there is a subdivision piece that allows you to reduce parking beyond what we have in our municipal code, and if they build enough affordable housing, we can reduce the parking. She thought was probably the same for all multifamily.

Planning Director Murdock thought the potential exists that, developers of increasing number of projects in Pacifica are likely to invoke the density bonus law from the state as it gives them great flexibility to request waivers from zoning standards, including exceeding height limits, _____ ratio limits, exceeding setbacks, providing less parking and all of those help them construct more housing and make more money but, in many cases, provide affordable housing at a lower cost so it is a tradeoff that the state legislature has said local governments must make if certain affordability criteria within a project are met, adding that almost by default, some projects will meet those criteria, given our 15% below market rate inclusionary zoning requirement. conceptually, Chair Hauser has pointed out parking, but with any of these standards, don't expect that it's a line in the sand that no one can cross, but these are standards that they are setting up with the best intention to achieve the types of projects we want but we will not reasonably expect that everyone of these will be applied to every project, particularly in instances where the density bonus will be invoked by an applicant.

Commissioner Berman referred to parking, stating that they likely won't get into this at this meeting, but she thought they also need to consider that a lot of the sites they are looking at may end up being mixed use. She stated that, since mixed use is a new land use designation for the city, they haven't had the opportunity to go into depth on what parking requirements are for mixed use and, at some point, she thought they should talk about that.

Planning Director Murdock clarified that it is entirely true what Commissioner Berman said about mixed use at these densities, and the city for a long time has had mixed use up to 22 units per acre and, in his experience on reviewing those projects for a number of years, it is very challenging primarily because of our commercial parking requirements to achieve enough off street parking to meet the zoning requirements and design desirable projects that have enough commercial area to satisfy our community's desire for that and provide housing. He thought part of the function of that is that they have very small constrained difficult to design sites and, at a fundamental level, if you get small enough, it is hard to fit all the pieces together. He stated that the good news is that most of these sites are much larger but the concept and planning challenge remains that they may want a lot of parking for commercial and other parking for residential and not have monstrosities of buildings in our community, but it is difficult to square all those and to reconcile them together. They need to spend time as part of the Phase 2 process to drill down on

what that balance is for higher density mixed use projects as our zoning does not have that set up by default now.

Commissioner Berman agreed, adding that she preferred to not get into it yet because going through each of the sites without that granular detail makes sense but on the second round, she felt they should have some specific discussions on it.

Chair Hauser agreed, adding that she wonders if, as a baseline, they start with the parking ratios that they approved for the Sharp Park Specific Plan in Table 4.4 which went through each use and had that level of scrutiny for both the MUN and MUC since they are looking at similar densities.

Commissioner Godwin stated that, the last time they looked at Fairmont Shopping Center, they concluded that they had an excessive amount of parking for its current use and it seems like their parking standards call for too much parking and part of the reason housing hasn't been built is the parking standards are too luxurious. He stated his preference would be to use a higher density with less parking, considering there are more electric bikes and the possibility of many cars coming into the mix of vehicles. He thinks they have overbuilt parking in general and they need less per unit.

Chair Hauser agrees with what he is saying, adding that the Sharp Park Specific Plan parking ratio that they implemented there reduced it beyond what is currently at Fairmont Shopping Center and the rest of the city.

Commissioner Godwin stated he is quite happy as he thought that is the direction they should go.

Chair Hauser wondered if there is any benefit to potentially exploring that providing additional bicycle parking, especially E-bike and maybe charging that would even further reduce that ratio as an objective standard within reason.

Commissioner Godwin thought so, and he knows the city has a task force on E-chargers. He also thinks there are going to be a lot more electric bikes that will need some level of different chargers, adding he hasn't flushed out what he thinks is a good recommendation but he thought that is coming in the not too distant future in large amounts.

Commissioner Berman stated she wanted to tread lightly as she thought there are certain areas in Pacifica where parked cars are inundated and she thinks there needs to be more parking in certain areas or more creative parking. There are other areas of Pacifica where parking isn't an issue. She doesn't know the solution, but thought they need to talk about it.

Commissioner Devine stated that this is a highly residential site. She understands they aren't getting into parking now, but as they look at the sites and surrounding areas, height comes to mind and that these commercial buildings are not very tall and are surrounded by homes that are, at most, two stories. She stated that inundating this quiet neighborhood, if they cut parking too much, that is something to consider, but beyond parking and going into height, she understands the attempt to reach this density per acre, but can't envision what that would look like while not completely distorting the site if they are talking about bringing in development that looks appropriate and not monstrosities. She asked how they accomplish this level of density in an area like this. She states some of the other sites that will come up later on and do have

commercial buildings and surrounding townhomes that are taller than this specific site. She wonders how they accomplish both.

Chair Hauser thinks they probably have enough for parking to give them the baseline to use the code amount for residential, understanding that state density bonus law has subdivision P and suggests we use Table 4.4 of the recently approved Sharp Park Specific Plan to guide commercial as that will be the baseline and they will have to really reexamine that in specific detail when this comes back. She asked if that was enough direction on parking at this point.

Sr. Planner Harkousha stated that it was enough direction for parking.

Commissioner Ferguson assumed they were talking about that for all sites unless they specifically indicated otherwise.

Chair Hauser referred to Fairmont Shopping Center, asking if anyone has any comments.

Commissioner Ferguson stated, to clarify setbacks, they are calling the front of this the Hickey facing side of the property based on the address.

Planning Director Murdock asked if he can speak about which frontage he is referring to.

Commissioner Ferguson stated, if they go by staff's existing standards of a front setback, side setback and rear setback, they need to define which sides those are, adding that he didn't know if it applies to the whole property or just this corner polygon as he assumed it is part of the same parcel.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it currently is. He stated that part of the difficulty in answering his question is that, under the city's zoning definitions, Gateway Drive frontage would be the front property line, even though they may think of Hickey being more prominent and broader being the front.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that the address staff listed is on Hickey.

Planning Director Murdock agreed that it was one of the addresses for the shopping center which he thinks is actually the address for the Firestone portion of the property.

Commissioner Ferguson understood and concluded that they are calling the front Gateway Drive.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they can call it whatever they want as they can define that for this site in terms of the standards and in such a way that they get the outcome they want, whether or not one street or the other is the front.

Commissioner Ferguson thought, as a group, they can choose one.

Chair Hauser stated that they can choose both. She stated this is their time to be specific and they could apply the same or smaller setback to both frontages, and it doesn't have to match the city code.

Commissioner Ferguson gets that, adding that if they were going to discuss which one they want to choose that is fine.

Planning Director Murdock referred to Commissioner Devine's comment earlier about height and scale for this particular location, he thought there may be an opportunity to explore setbacks above the ground floor that might help balance that concern about a building being too tall or too massive for this location or it can mean that, overall, there is not an appetite for height above the given number of feet but that is one of the design options that could, in part, step back from Hickey or Gateway or both to help balance that and put greater heights interior to the center rather than close to the adjacent roadways.

Commissioner Ferguson stated, if they set an objective height standard for the polygon at Hickey and if the developer invokes the builder's density bonus, are they allowed to void the city's set height, such as the Sloat Garden Center project as an example.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he has seen the media coverage of that concept. He stated that the simple answer is that, under the right circumstances, a developer could completely null and void a height zoning limitation but they would still have the opportunity to perform environmental reviews so, if that height caused an adverse environmental impact, the city would have the ability to mitigate it but, as a matter of zoning, they wouldn't be able to impose the height limit if the project was a qualified affordable housing development.

Commissioner Wright asked if they would still be able to do step setbacks that they can't get around as they exceed our heights limits.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is a law written in favor of developers that provide affordable housing and it is hard to speculate in those hypotheticals. There are supposed to be a limit on the number of zoning incentives you get, based on proportion of affordable housing, but there is a point at which unlimited concessions can be invoked and what that means for a particular zoning standard or set of standards is hard for him to answer at this point in time, but it could mean a good deal of our zoning requirements are no longer applicable to a given project that provides a sufficient amount of affordable housing.

Commissioner Wright referred to the relationship between height and setbacks, and stated the higher you go as you go back, he would like it to look like a set of stairs so as you are driving down the street what you see doesn't seem to be this giant face of a building.

Commissioner Berman thought they did something similar in the Sharp Park Specific Plan.

Chair Hauser stated that her personal vision for that is that Hickey is the frontage and we have ground floor commercial that is at least 25 feet deep on the ground floor on Hickey and an appropriate treatment of the corner so it doesn't look truncated and there are step backs, but with a 50 dwelling unit per acre density, she didn't know how they do that in less than five stories which seems absurd.

Commissioner Wright asks what they do about making sure they have enough loading zones to service those commercial properties.

Commissioner Berman liked loading docks.

Commissioner Wright stated not docks, but yellow zones so they don't have trucks double parking in the street and making all the neighbors angry.

Chair Hauser thinks they should require a dedicated parking that is oversized and time limited for loading.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that has to be in the interior to the north and east, not on Hickey or Gateway.

Chair Hauser agreed, but added that, since the property owner owns all of it, she wonders if they could grant themselves an easement on another parking space elsewhere in the shopping center. She thought this one might be able to solve their own parking problems outside of the polygon.

Commissioner Wright asked if there was any reason on this project to have a 20-foot setback and when the back is now into the shopping center, does it make sense to give up some space there as it seems so to him, as he would rather see more front setback and less rear setback.

Chair Hauser is personally of the opinion that, when trying to activate the street, you want a strong street wall and have a pedestrian scale so you want to have a minimum setback on the street. She agreed that, on the interior, you would want a bigger setback. She stated that everything else is setback so she didn't think there was any way to cut this where it doesn't feel like it kind of sticks out.

Commissioner Devine agreed and thought that is the most painful part. She thought they were going to encounter this in a lot of these sites. She understands that the community feels the same way which is the biggest challenge in these sites.

Chair Hauser asked staff, since they are going to do a CEQA level document, assuming that they do thorough and thoughtful objective development standards, if it would be wise to potentially look at some additional sites in case some of these don't develop as they would hope.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, as it was important for staff if there are additional sites the Commission thinks might be added as back up to Plan B, depending on what HCD's comments might be or what City Council's final decision would be on the sites list. Given that they have pretty sizeable buffer, they may not necessarily need every site in the capacity that they have identified currently or need to replace sites depending on HCD's comments. He thought it would be great to hear if there are other sites that might be part of this discussion in a future meeting as they need to get to them as backups or additional add-ons if they want to increase the buffer. He thought there were a lot of options.

Commissioner Wright stated, if they are thinking about the use and commercial, he thought, if you have commercial on the ground floor, you would want it closer to the sidewalk so that people can window shop and that is a little in conflict with their desire to have it setback a little for a more appealing look.

Chair Hauser stated that you can set back the residential and keep the commercial, such as have the commercial with a strong street wall and have a smaller setback and require a set back of the

residential above which helps with that, which is something they focused on in the Sharp Park Specific Plan.

Commissioner Wright asked, in terms of the outside space required for the residential units, if they currently allow roof decks to count for that space.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Wright concluded that they can do the same thing over the commercial for example.

Commissioner Berman adding to setbacks, she asked Commissioner Godwin if he was talking about a rear setback such as looking at the polygon and the rear setbacks were adjacent to the commercial parking lot, and was he suggesting that they minimize the setback there .

Commissioner Godwin stated that he was.

Commissioner Berman agreed with that, as at that location there could be less of a setback, but when they are talking about setbacks, she thought they are talking about setbacks from the polygon, not necessarily the property line. She asked if that was correct.

Planning Director Murdock thought that was the type of feedback they can take, and they can imagine it is a property line or think of it as part of the broader center, but being clear on what the intent is, and that will allow staff to create the appropriate standard.

Commissioner Berman asked if it was related to setbacks.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if they could create a setback for pedestrian access on all sides, including curb cuts, etc.

Commissioner Berman would agree with that, and she thought they could have a much smaller setback on the interior of the shopping center for this site and she stated that several different jurisdictions have a key corner especially for commercial lots where it is at a prominent intersection where that corner, such as the corner of Gateway and Hickey would have its own designation itself, stating that Mountain View does this in certain locations. She stated if they could imagine, the building wouldn't come to a point at the corner, there would be some additional space almost like a setback for that corner and she thought they would call it a key corner. She thought this property would be one that they could consider a little more space at the corner for planting, outdoor seating if there is a restaurant, and she thought it is a better feel rounding the corner of an active space versus an actual pointy corner of the building. She thought that there are a couple of other properties where she thinks that might be applicable.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he supported the key corner.

Chair Hauser and Commissioner Devine agreed also.

Chair Hauser stated she took a quick measurement of ground floor retail which was 200 linear feet and a 25-foot depth was 5,000 square feet of commercial is the minimum requirement. She

stated that parking standards they discussed and the key corner, and she would propose a 5-10 foot setback range on Hickey and a 15-foot setback range on Fairmont because she thought that was where the residential is and they need to not feel so tall there. She would propose a 5-foot setback from each of the two internal parking lot areas and, as Commissioner Berman mentioned, she likes the idea of making the polygon the property line as she thinks they are all working on the same diagram.

Commissioner Berman thought just like the context of how they talk about it.

Chair Hauser asked if that sounded good, and thought there was consensus. She stated that they have parking, SAR, setbacks and she asked what the lot coverage was that they could typically require.

Planning Director Murdock recognized that their standards aren't set up for this type of development, and would give her the most comparable standard that they have currently in our zoning for the R3 multifamily residential district which currently only allows up to 21 units per acre for a frame of reference in terms of density and intensity and that allows up to 60% maximum lot coverage.

Commissioner Ferguson thought they would have to go higher than that.

Chair Hauser agreed that they would have to go higher than that. She would ask staff to come back with a recommendation that accommodates the other development standards which she thought they will try to give staff. She asked if that works.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it did.

Commissioner Devine stated that she looked at the city of Brisbane and they bring it up to 70 or so.

Chair Hauser stated that they can start at 70 as the baseline and staff can analyze of that is sufficient or insufficient.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if it includes the setbacks and the space for parking that they talked about.

Chair Hauser responded affirmatively. She then referred to the open space per dwelling unit, she thinks they did a good job in the Sharp Park Specific Plan where they said it was 100 square feet per dwelling unit required and on 50 units, that is 5,000 square feet of open space. And it could be common, private or a combination. She stated that it is pretty low compared to other cities, but she thinks this density is probably where they are going to be.

Commissioner Berman asked if, for the Sharp Park Specific Plan, it was designated that it could be flexible and being common so the developer could take all of that and make the 5,000 square feet just common.

Chair Hauser stated that it says 100 square feet per unit, up to 50% of which can be combined as common open space which can be at any level.

Commissioner understood it was up to 50%, as she thought there was a benefit to each unit having some open space.

Planning Director Murdock asked if that was up to 75% could be common, as that would be at least 25 square feet per unit in that instance.

Chair Hauser thought they need to have a minimum of 6 x 10 for private open space or to remain un-usable like going into a closet.

Commissioner Ferguson stated 25 feet was 8 x 3.

Chair Hauser thought the minimum open space is private, 6 x 10.

Planning Director Murdock stated that would run counter to the Sharp Park standard where up to 50% can be used.

Commissioner Wright thought they could ask staff to think about that and come back to them with a suggestion.

Commissioner Godwin agreed, as he was personally in favor of raising the height limit and providing more open space. He didn't think that was the majority of opinion.

Chair Hauser asked, what if they did 120 square feet instead of 100 and it would be the 60. She stated that they had tried to get more in the Sharp Park Specific Plan and Diane Bhatia had said that, in these particular small lots, they weren't going to be able to, but these are much bigger lots. She thought they could even call it 200 and say it is 100 and 100 which would be consistent with a lot of cities and much less than the current 400 that is required under our code.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if they can talk about parking and open space as that is also developed within the polygon and not within the greater lot and they aren't using other parking to offset.

Commissioner Berman asked if they can do it through CC&Rs. For this site, it is one common property owner.

Planning Director Murdock thought the presumption should be that, for these standards, they will be accommodated on site. He stated that there are unique opportunities where maybe circumstances permit to have some shared parking as our zoning currently allows that and, unless the Commission proposes to disallow that, that will remain an option. There typically are limits as to the distance from the use being served, how far it can be, but there is some flexibility.

Commissioner Ferguson wanted to make sure as they are eliminating 45 parking spaces and they are going to add 17 parking spaces to the rest that they haven't eliminated. He stated that it is in this polygon of preserving this much parking.

Commissioner Godwin thought the guest parking could be done through some sort of maintenance agreement with the shopping center and establish some residential ones there.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he wasn't clear in the Commission's direction about the square footage of open space and the perception that could be combined.

Chair Hauser stated she was going to come back to it. She asked if they want to say 100 and 100.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he was fine with the 120, 50, 50.

Commissioners Berman and Devine were fine with that.

Commissioner Godwin stated he liked the 200.

Commissioner Devine stated she would lean toward the 200.

Commissioner Wright wouldn't be opposed to 200.

Commissioner Ferguson wouldn't either but asked if they are adding space they don't have.

Commissioner Berman stated that it could apply going forward, as looking at it as an equation, they can't make all six of them hard variables and will have to leave staff with some flexibility on some variables or what they direct at this meeting will not be achievable.

Commissioner Ferguson stated they will have to give on something.

Commissioner Berman agreed and to make their evening more efficient, they cut their losses and determine what they give to staff to figure out.

Commissioner Ferguson can see it on height and lot coverage and hold ground on design.

Chair Hauser thinks they start the same way they did the parking. They have the 100 and 100 be the goal and if staff comes back and says it's just not going to fit, they know it won't but they haven't analyzed it and they all want more open space and 200 square feet is not bad. She thought they should start there.

Commissioner Wright thought it was important to ask staff to give them an idea about are they trying to put so many constraints on something and nobody is ever going to build it.

Commissioner Ferguson stated to achieve density.

Planning Director Murdock thought that was a consideration. Now, they are trying to understand the aspirational components, get a sense of relative priority of these standards for a given site and he suggests a sight backed up to a big, and maybe height is less important there because there are not adjacent neighbors that will be impacted, but as Commissioner Devine pointed out, there are circumstances where nearby residences may be a sensitive consideration for height in a particular location and so getting that sense of relative priority where maybe they are firmer on one but can give some ground on another and that will allow staff to go back and do their work, weighing these different issues to try to get the right outcomes for these sites.

Commissioner Ferguson thought all that was left was height.

Chair Hauser stated that they are at 200 as the goal and now they are on height and she thought this will be the hardest one on every single site.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if 35 feet was achievable.

Commissioner Wright asked if that was even with the setback.

Chair Hauser stated that 35 feet is our current Pacifica height limit except in the Sharp Park Specific Plan area but that hasn't been adopted by the Coastal Commission. She stated that 35 feet equates to three stories and she thinks the question is how many stories. She didn't think they aren't going to be able to achieve it at five, she would be more in favor of four.

Commissioner Wright asked if one of those is parking. He asked, if they are saying stories, are they saying total stories.

Chair Hauser stated that they have to leave that to the developer to define.

Commissioner Wright doesn't disagree with that, but he is trying to think of what they are talking about.

Commissioner Ferguson stated maximum height ability.

Commissioner Berman stated it is from ground level.

Commissioner Wright thought that answers it sufficiently.

Planning Director Murdock stated one of the key factors in his mind, in thinking about this challenge, is where height may be a particularly sensitive standard that the addition of a ground floor commercial area takes away height that could otherwise be reduced for a building and that is a policy tradeoff the Commission will need to make in each specific site, i.e., is it so important to have ground floor commercial at the expense of a taller building or a smaller building with much smaller units. You begin to push the envelope one way or another and the outcomes can become very different for some of these buildings.

Commissioner Godwin stated that his vote is with Amazon Prime, etc., as he is not sure the retail demand is going to be there. He understands the motivation of mixed use retail but he thinks the trend on retail in the United States is down, not up.

Chair Hauser thinks people need a place to eat.

Commissioner Wright added and to gather.

Commissioner Godwin agrees that there needs to be some gathering places but he doesn't think there are a lot of people who want to start a retail store.

Chair Hauser stated she likes to go shopping more than he does.

Commissioner Godwin agreed that everyone shops more than he does.

Planning Director Murdock proposed that it isn't necessarily all or nothing, as maybe it's at least one-third of the ground floor area is commercial or some proportion that achieves the balance to have some area to gather or dine and add vibrancy but may reflect that they want to make up some of the area or height with parking or with residential uses to respond to some other factor.

Chair Hauser didn't think 5,000 square feet out of an acre is a lot of ground floor retail.

Commissioner Wright didn't think so, wondering how many square feet is in an acre.

Commissioner Devine thought, if they are working off 35 feet, that is three stories, and four stories is a compromise, as she thinks four stories on this site is a no-go, as she thought it would be very challenging for this community to accept this one corner and this entire community becomes for them a skyscraper. She will be comfortable with four stories.

Commissioner Berman asked, if they limit the commercial as mentioned by Planning Director Murdock mentioned and focused it at the key corner.

Chair Hauser asked if she means did less commercial.

Commissioner Berman stated less commercial so there would be some residential on the ground floor, both at Hickey and Gateway.

Planning Director Murdock thought it would help to understand more, as Commissioner Devine was speaking about stories and how that translate into feet. If that was possible, it would help as well, as the story heights can be variable from 9-10 feet to 12 or 15 feet depending on the use and the desired architectural component.

Chair Hauser stated that, in the Sharp Park Specific Plan, they had established 45 feet for four stories and 55 feet for five stories. She stated that the 45 feet was really a 16-30 dwelling unit an acre height and 55 feet was a 30-50 acre height. She also knows we have some 60 acre sites coming. She agreed that five stories was the right height. She asked to start with four stories and potentially look at additional sites to add. She had a list of some when it's the appropriate time for staff to look at adding.

Commissioner Berman asked if it is 45 feet.

Chair Hauser reiterated that they start with 45 feet on this one and staff can let them know if they have created an issue. She asked if everyone felt good about that, and concluded they did and stated that concluded site 1.

Sr. Planner Harkousha stated Pacific Manor Shopping Center address was 440 Manor Place, and the total sight area shown there was 2.28 acres and housing is in the blue shading for 1.56 acres. She stated the density proposed was 60 dwelling units per acre.

Chair Hauser thought this was one of the hardest heights in the whole housing element.

Commissioner Devine hates bringing up height again. This is really a challenging site as its entire commercial area is one story.

Commissioner Ferguson stated, if you go up, you get an ocean view.

Commissioner Devine states you then block everyone else's ocean view.

Commissioner Wright asked what the size of the actual lot was.

Sr. Planner Harkousha stated 1.56 acres.

Commissioner Wright concluded this is a separate lot, not the whole shopping center.

Chair Hauser stated that it is a portion of a lot that is shaped like a C and a portion of a rectangular lot and one of the comments she had was that she thought they should bring the poly line south. She understood they are trying to get an extra row of parking but she thought it is less complicated if you take that whole central APN.

Commissioner Ferguson stated, having lived in the alley behind Safeway, he thought parking is deceptively tough in this neighborhood unless you walk two blocks down Palmetto to get away.

Commissioner Devine was curious how this is going to affect all the other retail spaces and this is 60% of the lot so how is that going to affect these commercials.

Chair Hauser reiterated that this is one of the hardest sites in the housing element.

Commissioner Ferguson was thinking about the loading and utilities with the freeway right there.

Chair Hauser stated that people are jetting off the freeway onto Palmetto so she didn't think you could have access off Palmetto but would have to have access from Bill Drake or through the parking lot.

Commissioner Devine asked where vehicles are going to stay during construction, where are materials going to stay.

Commissioner Berman stated that is for them to figure out.

Commissioner Devine stated it will affect all these people.

Commissioner Berman mentioned traffic at that intersection that is already a problem.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that it is impossible to pull out of there. He stated, in his truck he cannot make the turn onto Palmetto without taking half of the ongoing traffic lanes and you have to really time it or go the other direction.

Chair Hauser asked Planning Director Murdock if she can throw out several other sites.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, adding he was happy to take notes.

Commissioner Wright asked if they can come back to this one.

Chair Hauser stated she was going to suggest that as well.

Commissioner Berman stated that they all take tests differently.

Chair Hauser stated she will throw out several additional sites that may be good studies, 801 Oceana Blvd., where Pavilion of Flowers is.

Commissioner Wright asked her to repeat it.

Chair Hauser stated 801 Oceana Blvd. which is 1.1 acres, Skyline Blvd. at King which is California owned, the water tank site, 725 Oddstad Blvd., which is 2.1 acres and she knows there had been an assisted living facility that had been entitled there but she doesn't think they ever built it and the entitlement expired, 730 Sharp Park Road which is a church with humongous asphalt parking lot, Ramallah Plaza at 681 Manor Driver and 2480 Skyline together which makes about an acre, and 340 Waterford Street, a vacant lot and a car wash together which makes about a half-acre.

Commissioner Wright asked if there was a development plan on Waterford about a year ago.

Chair Hauser stated that it's not on a housing element and not on their list of existing inventory and she thought that car wash is underutilized. She stated that, with the idea of five stories versus three or four stories, they can spread it out a little bit.

Commissioner Devine stated that, when she looks at this site, if it has to be a considered site, she thought it cannot take out 60% of that parking lot which she thought is unreasonable and not feasible for any community members coming in and out of this area. She asked Commissioner Ferguson if he wanted to say something.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that this, instead of the self-storage units on Palmetto down the street, and he thought one was more utilized and more community important than the other.

Chair Hauser understood, and stated that there are three story buildings and two story building across Bill Drake and the idea of a five-story building blocking Safeway or a four-story building, as these are all the restaurants that everyone uses, such as Green Enchilada, Red Eye, etc.

Commissioner Devine stated Rosalind itself takes up 50% of that parking lot.

Commissioner Berman thought there was a benefit to be able to see these store fronts from Oceana and the roadway instead of being hidden behind the housing development.

Commissioner Wright asked if they can use signage to defer some of that adverse impact.

Commissioner Ferguson thought it would be up to the owners.

Commissioner Berman didn't know if that could be a requirement but the developer would determine whether or not they add it.

Commissioner Wright asked if there was commercial property, commercial rents that they are supporting and it would be in their interest to design with that in mind.

Chair Hauser agreed.

Planning Director Murdock suggested that, while it was important to look at the sites that have been identified in the diagram and do their best to hopefully come up with objective standards for those, he thought the reality is that a number of these sites might redevelop with a broader proportion of these shopping center locations. They can't guarantee that, but he thought the reality is that it has a potential to occur and some of these site challenges might be minimized and addressed by a broader redevelopment that the opportunity to build housing like this might present when the economics are drastically different than they are currently. The other idea he wanted to offer to the Commission is to think about the Safeway site in Millbrae that has a similar type of configuration where it is largely built about the parking lot but there is parking underneath the Safeway. He stated, when you think about it blocking Safeway, it potentially exists that Safeway might want to reinvest and construct a new grocery store that actually doesn't take up quite as much of the ground floor as it might appear from the site diagram alone, and there are many different ways that a site like this could take shape. He stated the Commission's task is to do its best to come up with reasonable standards that provide outer bound of what that might be and allow some flexibility for a creative architect to design the right project.

Commissioner Ferguson stated, for clarity, this polygon isn't the only place they can put housing on this site. He thought they were limited to this as the only place that is possible.

Commissioner Berman asked if they then get rid of the polygon.

Chair Hauser thought they need to be careful here as the polygon is where developers will be able to put housing by right. She thought, by limiting it to this area, if the rest of the property wants to redevelop, then you get to go through a bigger process which she think would be of benefit to the city.

Commissioner Berman agreed, stating they are implying that and assuming that and she was wondering if the polygon needs to be rethought.

Commissioner Godwin thought so.

Commissioner Wright thinks the polygon needs to be rethought.

Commissioner Berman stated that they look at it and require that the entire ground floor is commercial, and then it is kind of, not restricting, but saying that housing must go here whereas perhaps master planning this entire block could yield a better design.

Commissioner Ferguson states that it makes no more sense to him than having a giant building in the parking lot of Safeway.

Commissioner Godwin agreed, stating that you either take out the entire shopping center and move the retail somewhere else or you leave it alone.

Chair Hauser stated that her concern, if they put the entire polygon in by state law, a developer can come in and use the concession and unlimited waivers to say they aren't going to put any commercial there.

Commissioner Ferguson and put 2,000 units up.

Commissioner Berman asked if they then move the polygon.

Chair Hauser stated her personal preference is to keep the polygon and call it three stories or four, if it is ground floor commercial.

Planning Director Murdock stated another factor to consider is that one of the areas that staff considered when trying to identify the housing sites is the underlying ownership. When you look at the in line shopping center as it exists today in Pacific Manor, there are several separate property owners the way the parcels have been subdivided, and the prospect of putting a site with half a dozen or more separate owners as a housing element site significantly complicates the ability to get them to agree to do a coordinated redevelopment plan which probably renders the site inclusive of that building ineligible or inappropriate for the housing element. This portion of the parking lot is a single parcel which staff believes is managed by the association and it would be a different process to think about coordinating the redevelopment action associated with that and moreover, it doesn't require any individual owner to give up his or her business in the course of allowing housing to be built there. He stated that it is a different dynamic and he agreed that master planning the entire shopping center would have great value, but there are some practical challenges, given the way it has been subdivided, to expect that to be viable site for purposes of the housing element.

Commissioner Wright asked, if they have a commercial requirement for the ground floor, would they be able to get redone space as part of that.

Chair Hauser stated that, if they don't want any commercial, and the shopping center owners decide that they want to do what the bowling alley is doing and cash out, the city would lose all of this commercial which she didn't think was a good option. She thinks we have to preserve our commercial.

Commissioner Wright agreed, adding that from taking this and putting that on there and then you turn it sideways like that, he likes that shape much better.

Chair Hauser stated, for those who cannot see Commissioner Wright's computer, he is talking about rotating the polygon to include Paisano's, the wash place and the taqueria.

Commissioner Berman asked, related to what Planning Director Murdock was talking about with the different property owners, whether HCD flagged that, i.e., if you choose a site and designate housing that may be three different property owners own property, does HCD allow that.

Planning Director Murdock stated that there was nothing with multiple property ownership that he was aware would disallow a site, but staff needs to do a reasonable analysis of constraints that are likely to affect the potential of a redevelopment to occur, and multiple property ownership, in his mind, is a pretty significant barrier to likely redevelopment of the site and they have tried to avoid including sites that have multiple property owners that would complicate potential redevelopment and construction of housing.

Commissioner Wright asked if we would rather have lower and wider or smaller and taller.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that is 100 units on the site, then taller and smaller.

Chair Hauser thought, with HCD currently reviewing this draft, she didn't think they should change a polygon that has been submitted to them. She would like to just go down, starting with Commissioner Wright, and say what their vision is for height for this polygon. If there are feedback from HCD that organically opens up an opportunity to change it, she thinks they can reexamine.

Commissioner Wright stated, here 35 feet.

Commissioner Godwin is at a loss on how they would make this polygon work. He assumes they need to put in a parking structure and something, and he is thinking something higher, maybe 50 feet. It will look amazingly bad, but he didn't know what else they could do.

Commissioner Ferguson thought you could move parking to one side as you couldn't eliminate all the parking from the commercial. He would list it at 45 feet. He didn't know how to get there, and he doesn't know where the 76 number comes from as it doesn't meet the 60 per acre.

Planning Director Murdock stated all of the total unit figures you see are adjusted by the 81% factor and, if you were to do the math from left to right, for the area in shading is 1.56 acres times 60 dwelling units per acre, times .81.

Commissioner Berman stated 35 would be preferable, but she thinks it will have to end up going to 45, so 35 or 45.

Commissioner Devine stated 35.

Chair Hauser stated she was 45, so 35, 45, 45, 45, 50, 35. She asked if they call it 45. She then referred to setbacks, and thought they needed to keep it at 15 feet off of Palmetto on the front setback of Palmetto.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he would go zero, as he shoved it as hard as he could on Palmetto.

Commissioner Berman stated that they are talking with respect to the polygon line.

Commissioner Ferguson agreed, adding that there are no visitors or pedestrian traffic and it is almost an industrial feel and he tried to create the space on the inside.

Commissioner Devine asked what setback she mentioned.

Chair Hauser stated 15 but Commissioner Ferguson said zero.

Commissioner Ferguson stated zero to the sidewalk not to the street.

Commissioner Berman asked if it was to the back of the sidewalk.

Commissioner Wright asked if they were talking about Palmetto now.

Commissioner Ferguson responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Ferguson stated for five feet, as zero is ridiculous.

Chair Hauser suggested they ask a different question for FAR. She asked if they think that they are going with 45 feet at ground floor commercial, and where would they want to see it.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it's the only place you have enough commercial in the whole town.

Commissioner Godwin stated it sounds good to him.

Commissioner Berman asked what they are thinking.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it was do they want ground floor commercial or not.

Commissioner Berman liked the idea of maintaining ground floor commercial but there is a good amount of commercial at this site. She thought on most properties, she is going to lean towards wanting ground floor commercial.

Chair Hauser agreed.

Commissioner Devine thought it would be ideal but they are looking at an area that they have commercial on both of the side streets and along the entire back end of the building. If it was a concession, it would be one that she would be okay with at this site.

Chair Hauser thought, to complete the feeling of Bill Drake, which is the street to the north, there needs to be commercial and it is technically mostly across from the gas station but there are restaurants, a salon, bar, and she thought it could help complete that street if you had ground floor commercial on Bill Drake and rap the corner, not a key corner as she didn't think, with the traffic, it was a place that feels safe to be outside.

Commissioner Berman agrees.

Commissioner Wright stated he would be in favor of ground floor commercial, but he would like to have a 10-foot setback on Palmetto to make room for street parking.

Chair Hauser thought that was a good idea.

Commissioner Ferguson stated eliminate the sidewalk.

Commissioner Berman thought they need more than 10 feet then.

Commissioner Wright suggests they get 15.

Chair Hauser thought you would need parallel parking spots and you probably want separated sidewalks.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that the idea of stopping there, the cars are going 50 mph from the freeway.

Chair Hauser thought the cars are going really fast there.

Commissioner Wright stated that there are opportunities to slow them down there.

Commissioner Berman stated that her opinion is that, if there is not going to be ground floor commercial on Palmetto, then she would say no street parking there. If there is going to be ground floor commercial on Palmetto, she would say that they consider street parking there. She likes Chair Hauser's idea of designating Bill Drake Way as commercial on that side.

Chair Hauser added with street parking on that side.

Commissioner Berman agreed with street parking on that side.

Commissioner Ferguson stated only commercial on that side.

Commissioner Wright stated, if not ground floor commercial, what is it going to be.

Chair Hauser stated probably residential.

Commissioner Wright asked if someone really wants to live on ground floor on Palmetto.

Commissioner Devine asked if someone really wants to live on this parking lot.

Commissioner Ferguson stated people live on ground floor on Palmetto already.

Commissioner Godwin thought Commissioner Devine had a good point. People are zipping by at 50 mph, and do you want to have a two-year-old wandering out of the house. He thought it seems like a disaster waiting to happen.

Commissioner Devine understands they are talking about needs versus wants, if a family needed this housing and had access to the housing as it was low income housing, she didn't think they would be in a position to argue if it was on the ground floor, cars driving by. It's not an ideal situation for that family. She stated that there is truth in what she said, but they weren't talking about this being the most ideal situation for anyone per se.

Commissioner Godwin asked if it would make more sense to build a parking lot on the bottom floor for a partial parking structure and put the residences above the parking in this particular case. He thought that would be a better design.

Commissioner Berman stated they can't ground floor parking at grade.

Chair Hauser asked where you measure the height amount.

Commissioner Wright stated that then you get no street appeal for your commercial.

Commissioner Godwin stated there was a lot of downsizing.

Chair Hauser stated there is no street appeal for ground floor parking.

Commissioner Berman stated you could still put commercial on Bill Drake.

Chair Hauser added and have street parking on Bill Drake. She also liked the idea of having ground floor parking and, as she was contemplating it, that is where she ended up as well, but the question she had is how higher are they going with the building.

Commissioner Berman stated that, with the parking, there are no units in parking.

Commissioner Wright stated that you can't dig here as they dug on the highway.

Commissioner Devine asked if you can or you can't.

Commissioner Wright stated you can't as they dug where the highway is.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if ground floor supports parking and the highway also floods every big storm.

Commissioner Berman thought the highway would still be lower.

Commissioner Ferguson agreed, a little.

Chair Hauser thought what staff is hearing is that they would be open to a 45 foot height, however, there may be some flexibility because they like to encourage ground floor parking, maybe subterranean, maybe not.

Commissioner Wright asked if they could say parking or commercial, if they chose to go subterranean, could they still have the option to do commercial on ground floor.

Chair Hauser thought they can give them the option to do it, but she thinks that they want to require it along Bill Drake. She thought, from a setback standpoint, they would want to do along Bill Drake the seemed 5-10 feet that they did for Fairmont Shopping Center. She would be okay having the 5-foot setbacks on the interior like they did on Fairmont Shopping Center. She thinks the question she has is what they do on that Palmetto setback.

Commissioner Berman thought, if Palmetto were to have residential units on ground floor along Palmetto, she would want a larger setback of at least 15 feet.

Chair Hauser asked with a separated sidewalk and straight trace to a safe pedestrian experience.

Commissioner Berman added no street parking.

Chair Hauser stated that was her thought.

Commissioner Devine agreed with that as it is a safety thing.

Chair Hauser thought a wider sidewalk should be installed, and should be installed as well for the Fairmont Shopping Center since that is on Hickey as well and thinks they should create safe pedestrian experiences.

Commissioner Wright asked if she is saying 6 or 8 feet.

Chair Hauser thought a 5-foot walk is okay but she thought they need to have a parkway strip of at least three feet.

Commissioner Ferguson stated, if you do ground floor parking once you set back on Palmetto.

Commissioner Berman thought, if it were ground floor parking, she would comfortable pretty close to the back of walk, i.e., 5 feet off the back walk.

Commissioner Wright asked what the width of a wheelchair is, as that is a long run.

Chair Hauser stated that the standard in the interior walks on projects is to be 4 feet and public walks need to be 5 feet to make ADA.

Commissioner Wright concluded so they can pass each other.

Chair Hauser referred to FAR, and thinks what they do instead of providing staff with an FAR is do the same thing at the corner of Bill Drake with 25 feet but a corner element is 50 feet deep.

Commissioner asked about the corner.

Chair Hauser stated the corner of Palmetto as it is not going to be key.

Commissioner Berman couldn't remember if that is what they are called, but thought that was it, adding no key corner here.

Chair Hauser stated that they talked about open space and parking on the last one.

Sr. Planner Harkousha stated the site is Brentwood Shopping Center, Oceana and Manor and the proposed density after rezoning is 60 dwelling units per acre and the total site area is 7.3 acres and the area assumed for housing is shaded in blue, roughly one acre with total of 41 units.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if they split the two or treat them as one.

Chair Hauser thought it was a split and she likes that it maintained Anderson which she thinks is a stable in the community as they have been there for decades.

Commissioner Devine asked if they were talking about the south lot, coming right up to that building. She thought they would have to create some sort of walkway.

Chair Hauser reminded her that they can choose their setbacks and the polygon is imagined as a pattern.

Commissioner Devine would like a zero setback if that remained.

Chair Hauser thought they would choose the setback from the building.

Commissioner Berman stated that you could choose to do a zero setback there but they probably won't.

Chair Hauser stated, because of how well patronized Manor is and how often she sees people in the coffee shop and these restaurants, she feel they should propose no net loss of commercial on this one and require it on the north portion of it, along Oceana and Manor to have ground floor retail but not deep, such as the same kind of 25 foot deep.

Commissioner Ferguson asked what the no net loss in commercial space and parking as there is never any parking in there.

Commissioner Wright would concur with that as he is concerned about the neighbors behind here.

Chair Hauser thought about instead of saying no net loss in parking, then realized what there is no loss to commercial and no net loss.

Commissioner Ferguson didn't know how you achieve that.

Commissioner Wright thought they have to get out the shovel again.

Commissioner Devine liked the idea Commissioner Berman brought up about the key corner.

Commissioner Ferguson stated at Manor and Oceana.

Commissioner Devine stated that they have Mozzetti's across the street and a really high foot traffic area and having something aesthetically pleasing.

Commissioner Berman agreed.

Chair Hauser stated that with the key corner, they talked about parking for everything but this goal is to go above the baseline. She thought it was a good idea unless anyone disagrees with Commissioner Ferguson. She referred to building height.

Commissioner Ferguson stated 35.

Chair Hauser asked if for 50 dwelling units an acre.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they need a minute as the table does not reflect the site as it looks like there was a typo in the draft housing element. He thought the calculated areas, 1.25 and .76 are correct but they are confirming what the proposed density is for this site.

Chair Hauser asked if it is a good time for them to take a 5-minute recess.

Planning Director Murdock stated that was fine from staff's perspective.

Chair Hauser called a break and then reconvened. She then referred to staff mentioning a need for some clarifications on this one.

Sr. Planner Harkousha stated that they clarified that it was 60 dwelling units per acre but the total area acreage is actually roughly 3.1 acres.

Chair Hauser stated that it is 7.3 total site acre, 3.1 area assumed for housing in the blue shading and 60 dwelling units per acre.

Planning Director Murdock stated the 7.3 is misstated. The overall site area is about 3 acres and the combined area of the two blue polygons is approximately 2 acres.

Chair Hauser stated that, going left to right, 3.1 for total site area, 2 for area assumed for housing and 60 for densities.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser asked about total units.

Planning Director Murdock thought they calculated 100, 97 or 100.

Chair Hauser asked to go down the row regarding height, starting with Commissioner Wright.

Commissioner Wright stated 35 feet.

Commissioner Godwin doesn't have a strong opinion but 35 feet sounds okay to him.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he can live with 3 stories here.

Commissioner Berman thought 35 is okay.

Commissioner Devine agreed.

Commissioner Berman thought they were talking about both polygons.

Chair Hauser responded affirmatively.

Planning Director Murdock stated he wasn't able to hear Commissioner Ferguson's input on height.

Commissioner Ferguson stated 35.

Chair Hauser thought he was hearing from all the commissioners is that this is a site where they want to see 35 feet. She thought this would be a good site for 45 feet but requiring a 30-foot setback from the single family on the back. If they are going to stick with 35 feet, she would ask that there be a 20-foot setback from the single family commercial on the back. She asked if anyone has an objection to a 20-foot setback adjacent to single family homes.

Commissioner Wright asked, if they want to give the single family homes more light, whether they want to do a set back and then a third story setback too.

Chair Hauser didn't because she thought 35 feet is already the height for the city and 20 feet is already the rear setback, and she thought it was hard to up zone property and make it more obtrusive to build at the same time.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that these are relatively narrow from a constructability standpoint and he asked if it would make more sense to have a gradation height coming from the back, like a single story 5-foot setback coming up to 35 and you already have most of the lot line built up to the property line.

Chair Hauser asked if he was saying that, at a 5-foot setback, you could build one story, at a 10-foot setback you could build two stories and at a 20-foot setback you could build three stories.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that was what he was getting at.

Chair Hauser asked for input from Planning Director Murdock, as she sees what he is saying about the proximity and she asked if these were nonconforming lots.

Planning Director Murdock asked if she was referring to the development that is presently on the commercial site.

Chair Hauser stated that she was saying that the single family home does not seem to have the same rear setback as the municipal code is requiring.

Planning Director Murdock thought that could be the case as many of these homes were built prior to the current zoning ordinance and it is possible, but he doesn't have the specific figures for any of those sites.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they are talking about the existing commercial buildings, much less than 20 feet setback.

Commissioner Wright thought there would also be a big impact on any solar that they may want to do if they don't allow that like to come in from the west.

Chair Hauser is not sure about Commissioner Ferguson's proposed setbacks.

Commissioner Ferguson was looking from constructability where are you going to focus on the west side in the center commercial. To achieve that setback otherwise with the parking, you are going to have to snake it around.

Chair Hauser suggested making a proposal that, to achieve higher quality three-story, they allow this height go to 40 feet to get things like a gabled roof and not have flat roofs and something that matches Mozzetti's across the street but still limit it to three story.

Commissioner Berman thought that sounded good.

Chair Hauser stated that what she has heard so far is height of 40 feet, three story, FAR no net loss to commercial, looking at additional parking above what they established at the beginning of this meeting and they had on the rear a setback of 5-foot for one story, 10-foot for two story and 20 feet for three story, and along the public streets of Avalon, Oceana and Manor, she would propose a 5-10 foot setback of minimum and maximum.

Commissioner Wright asked if they are going to key the corner.

Chair Hauser agreed, a key corner. She asked if they feel good about that, and got agreement.

Commissioner Berman referred to Oceana setback and asked if that includes the sidewalk.

Chair Hauser stated that it is the setback from the property line. She asked if she is anticipating that they will ask for a sidewalk improvement of another separated sidewalk, as she would concur with that.

Commissioner Berman saw that the property line is at the back of walk. She is an advocate for wider sidewalks and landscape strips pretty much always if they are going to be utilized, and she felt it would be utilized here. She stated that, if they need the extra space, she was fine with leaving that out. She was looking for clarification and trying to keep track of the polygons and where the lines actually end.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they would improve that corner a lot with landscape strip and wider sidewalk.

Chair Hauser thought on Oceana, and maybe not on Manor and Avalon.

Commissioner Berman agreed.

Commissioner Wright asked them to refresh his memory on what their commercial requirement is on this lot.

Chair Hauser stated that they are saying no net loss of the commercial, which if you look in the rest of the site, it's the Starbucks, Vietnamese restaurant, taqueria, small office space on the corner and the little area that has the comic book store and some other businesses there.

Commissioner Wright added absolutely nothing.

Chair Hauser stated that was just a parking lot.

Commissioner Wright knows it is currently a parking lot.

Chair Hauser didn't think commercial in there will be appropriate.

Commissioner Wright would be in favor of adding a little bit more commercial than what is currently there.

Chair Hauser states she is not in favor of it there, but is open as the majority rules here.

Commissioner Wright stated he is okay losing.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he would say no commercial in the south lot.

Commissioner Godwin felt he could go either way.

Commissioner Devine agrees with Commissioner Ferguson on no commercial in the south lot if possible.

Commissioner Berman also agrees.

Chair Hauser asked if that is clear for staff.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it was.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if they wanted to address more parking than they talked about earlier for the south lot since they are eliminating a parking lot. He stated that he said no net loss in the north one, and he asked if they are going to save for both. He thought the only way to achieve that would be to have a multi-story parking lot before they start on the south lot.

Chair Hauser stated that, if she is looking at the polygon correctly, all of the parking that is reserved for Anderson's is still in there and most of the parking for 24-Hour Fitness that is used is still in there.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that lot is always full with somebody, but he doesn't know what they are doing.

Chair Hauser asked if they would be amendable to going to four stories on the south lot and adding a little bit more parking.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that it could be achievable with three stories, but he thought, if they say a 1.5 unit for one bedroom, one unit for studies, it's not going to be enough as you are only going to generate enough parking for the building and eliminating all the existing parking.

Commissioner Berman stated that everyone is going to park in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if they wanted to say an additional 15 guest parking spots.

Commissioner Berman asked if they go back to net loss parking.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that, if you say no net loss because the entire footprint is already parking, the only way to have no net loss plus 96 units worth of parking is to get a two-story parking garage before you start.

Chair Hauser thought they could reassess the square footage of that white building that is not in the polygon and apply the Sharp Park Specific Plan, Table 4-4 and see if what is currently out of the polygon is sufficient. If it is insufficient, which she thought it was, they would add additional parking requirements for the south.

Commissioner Wright likes the idea of adding additional parking requirements as he is concerned about these backdoor neighbors and the potential impact on them if it gets too busy there.

Chair Hauser stated that she will go back to what she said, i.e., they should true it up with the Sharp Park Specific Plan commercial parking that was studied.

Commissioner Wright thought they get a second bite at this apple anyway.

Chair Hauser agreed, adding that this is all theoretical and someone has to analyze it.

Commissioner Berman stated it sounds good to her.

Commissioner Wright stated he can live with it.

Chair Hauser asked staff if they have enough.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Sr. Planner Harkousha referred to Vallemar station at 2025 Coast Highway, with a total site area of 2.45 acres and the area assumed for housing that is shaded in blue is 1.5 acres, with density proposed after rezoning is 50 dwelling units per acre and total units are 64.

Chair Hauser asked staff if there was a grade break between the single family and the east boundary, as if remembering correctly, the single family is significantly higher than the adjacent parking lot.

Planning Director Murdock believes there is a grade break, but he doesn't recall if it is significantly higher, but he recalls it is higher than the level of the parking lot.

Chair Hauser stated this is one where she personally thinks they can go higher as it is a weird shape and she doesn't know how you get an efficient state plan but she appreciates that the polygon is drawn like this as it preserves the historic building. If someone owned the whole property and wanted to develop it, they would have to work with the city and they couldn't just develop over the building. She thought, with CEQA, that would also be the case so it is hard shape. She understands the shape and appreciates it and thinks this is one where she is comfortable with more height as she didn't think they are blocking much.

Commissioner Wright asked, when she says more, if she is saying 45 or is she saying 55.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he would go as high as 55 here.

Commissioner Devine stated that this area is always beleaguered by traffic and constantly discussed as Vallemar School is right there. She understands this is a study session and nothing is in stone, but as development puts a project and applicants come before them, traffic studies, etc. are going to have to go through the wash.

Planning Director Murdock stated that a traffic study is likely to be a part of a major project like this if already the other housing element sites, analyzing the level of service will likely be a part of that, congestion or delay at intersections, as it relates to compliance with the General Plan level

of service policy, additionally, most develop is subject to one of two Highway 1 transportation impact fees to contribute money to transportation related improvements. He stated that, as the Commission may be aware, widening of the highway will require a vote of the people in accordance with an action taken by City Council a few years ago. He stated that widening of the highway is not likely to be a project component unless the voters were to approve that, and other transportation related strategies, like improvements with the fees he mentioned or transportation demand management strategies that would likely be part of a larger project like this, such as providing bus passes to occupants of the development, in some instances operating shuttle service, expanding the amount of bicycle storage and parking to encourage bike riding, things to try to reduce the number of people driving vehicles for their transportation needs. He stated that those are the types of strategies that are likely to be able to be implemented for a project like this.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if anyone sees an egress point that makes any sense.

Chair Hauser thought that would have to be studied, but that was a really difficult left turn onto Vallemar when you are leaving there.

Commissioner Ferguson stated an impossible right turn onto Highway 1.

Commissioner Devine thought, as they were discussing height and density at this site, that is just the first red flag in her mind because the hillside goes up, it is not as dramatic in regard to some of the other sites they looked at when they talk about higher.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it will be an eyesore.

Chair Hauser stated that now they are setting the envelope, but eventually the development standards need to include aesthetics, windows, openings, architectural style, materials.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it is an unusual development on Highway 1 where there isn't one anywhere in Pacifica.

Commissioner Wright stated that, if he recalls correctly, they had a hard time even putting a sign there. He said that they could achieve some of that with setbacks.

Commissioner Ferguson asked why Vallemar station carved out with separate property ownership or historical business preservation.

Planning Director Murdock stated that their concern was not complicating a potential development of the site by the historical resource impacts that would likely result to locally designated historical landmark and they didn't want to propose that there be a pathway to redeveloping that as part of the housing element.

Commissioner Wright asked him if he has any idea how much elevation difference there is between Highway 1 and these residences in the back, such as more than 20 feet.

Planning Director Murdock stated he might be able to pull up a contour map that might provide insight for that but it will take him some time to do that.

Commissioner Wright stated that they can do that at the “second bite of the apple” if that is too difficult.

Planning Director Murdock stated it isn't difficult but will just take a moment or so to do that.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they have a four-story building in the back of the parking lot already.

Chair Hauser stated that it is technically three stories, but it is the height of a four-story. She stated that there is a ton of large trees that create a buffer as well on the south side and that is why she feels that, with a bigger setback and step back that this would be a place where she feels the 55 feet feels okay.

Commissioner Wright stated he would love to hear a setback and a step back as he can't quite bring himself to 55 feet but she has moved him off his 35 number.

Chair Hauser hears that, adding that they have 1,900 units of housing we have to provide and we have to put them somewhere but she doesn't know how to do it if they keep thinking of everything at 35 feet.

Commissioner Wright stated that he was already willing on this one to go to 45 feet because of the hillside.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they should put a 1,000 units in the quarry.

Commissioner Wright thinks, on the city site, just build a giant high rise and put them all in one place.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that is what the Sunset project did.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the rough contour information he has ready access to suggests that the grey difference might be approximately 20 feet and it feels to him from his memory that it might be a little more but that is what the data is saying that he has available now.

Chair Hauser thought, if it is 20 feet and putting a 55 unit structure there is the equivalent of a 35 unit structure.

Commissioner Wright stated, as long as they do a little bit of a setback for some solar considerations for those properties, that is fine.

Planning Director Murdock stated the answer he was providing was relative to Highway 1, across the frontage. The grey difference is less between other portions of the site and the development beyond to the east.

Commissioner Godwin asked if the entrance and exit going to be off Reina del Mar and is this is what is being envisioned.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it would have to.

Chair Hauser stated that this is unconventional but she asked if they add Commissioner Berman's idea of adding a level of service of objective standard on certain sites. She stated that this is a great place for housing if no one drives. She doesn't know.

Commissioner Berman thought this is probably the site that has the most traffic issues already in that area.

Commissioner Godwin stated that is his feeling about it and he doesn't understand how they are going to develop it safely without buying another lot.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that, even if you put in a bus stop, he didn't see anyway to make it work.

Chair Hauser asked if this is dedicated as low or very low income, i.e., what is the affordability level on this site.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is indicated as providing 64 lower income units.

Chair Hauser concluded lower income meaning 60-80% of AMI.

Planning Director Murdock stated 80% below.

Commissioner Wright asked what if they reduce parking.

Chair Hauser thought this is an affordable housing development and maybe they do development standards that contemplate deed restricted affordable housing.

Commissioner Ferguson stated, along that train of thought, if you eliminate the parking, someone has to park there and there is not parking, where would they park.

Planning Director Murdock thought probably somewhere in the Vallemar neighborhood, which already had difficult parking.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that the nearest street parking is not that close.

Commissioner Devine stated it is a highly impacted area and street parking does not begin until along side of the market at the tree line and even that, they are talking about a two lane road that goes into a very congested neighborhood with a school, a school district building and a gas station.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that there is no good way to turn around.

Commissioner Devine stated, in regard to emergency accessibility, she is trying to figure out how people are getting in and out of there.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they do at Gorilla Barbecue somehow and it can be done.

Commissioner Devine stated that they are talking 30 people in line.

Chair Hauser stated that there are housing types that fit into this scenario nicely, like deed restricted senior affordable housing or assisted living facilities where there are very few trips and very few cars. She didn't know if that was something they were able to consider in making these development standards.

Planning Director Murdock didn't think it was an objective development standard, but it is policy feedback they can take as part of the overall housing element process and see if there is an opportunity to do that for the site.

Chair Hauser asked if assisted living count to our RHNA numbers.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it may under some circumstances, but he didn't have enough information to give her a strong answer on that now.

Commissioner Berman asked if there was a need for more assisted living in the city.

Planning Director Murdock stated that there is a need for more housing of all types, including assisted living.

Commissioner Berman recalls, many months ago, they had a commentor on a different project or maybe when they first listed the housing element, they have a housing development south of here and they were wondering why it wasn't included as one of the sites to review. She asked if there was an opportunity to incorporate that site that is already halfway through planning for housing.

Planning Director Murdock doesn't recall a site that is halfway through planning. He stated that they did add a parcel in response to the public comment just south of this site that is currently designated mixed use neighborhood and they added it into the housing element site inventory.

Commissioner Berman asked if the project was Pacifica Highlands.

Planning Director Murdock stated that Pacifica Highlands is a project that is currently in the planning process. There was a separate commenter, not part of the Pacifica Highlands project, that was speaking about a property adjacent to that Pacifica Highlands project and the adjacent property is the one that they added into the housing element site inventory.

Commissioner Berman stated, for ingress/egress, she doesn't see how they put it anywhere other than on Highway 1 as far south as possible. She thought you could have an ingress/egress on Reina del Mar but you can't have a left turn out, and she thinks having cars only turning out right on Reina del Mar would be an unnecessary burden for the neighborhood and the driver and she thought the main ingress/egress would be as far south on Highway 1 and that would be a pain to find the gap time to actually get out.

Commissioner Wright asked if even at lights, as when the light is red, people let you in.

Commissioner Berman asked if he meant at a traffic signal.

Commissioner Wright stated he used to get coffee at the Caboose all the time and he would drive around the back.

Chair Hauser stated that is only if one car is trying to leave but what if there are ten cars trying to leave.

Commissioner Berman agreed, such as during peak hours.

Commissioner Wright stated he was doing that during commute hours.

Chair Hauser asked if they got an answer to whether they can do a level of service standards as part of these objective standards.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he will offer the same response that they already have one and he isn't sure what more he can offer at this time, as they weren't prepared to dive deeper into level of services and objective development standard.

Commissioner Wright asked, in light of all this, if they want to limit the number of units here in another way, like lowering.

Commissioner Ferguson thought 25 foot setbacks and 25 foot height restriction, if they were catching what he is getting to.

Chair Hauser gets it.

Chair Hauser stated that they can't undermine the housing element.

Commissioner Wright asked how much fudge factor do they have as do they have more sites identified than they need.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the direct housing element they prepares has a roughly 30% buffer overall in terms of number of units, and their required number of units is 1,892 across all income levels and they have 30% buffer on top of that, which is the high end of what the state Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) recommends and within that they have over a 50% buffer for lower income units to try to create as many opportunities for lower income housing as possible and to recognize that many of the sites designated for lower income may not develop as lower income housing sites and they can hopefully avoid no net loss problems with approving housing projects.

Commissioner Wright stated that he has heard them in their concerns, and he asked if they have a sense of whether staff has an opinion in light of what they have been discussing and what might work to address all of their concerns.

Planning Director Murdock stated, for the Vallemar Station site, they are overall tonight.

Commissioner Wright stated the Vallemar Station site.

Planning Director Murdock didn't have a good sense yet with a 35 or 40 foot height limit and a 60 dwelling unit per acre density and he doesn't have a good sense of how to make that work at this point.

Chair Hauser stated, if the answer comes back that they can't do that as it is unhelpful, she wonders if they provide a height limit that targets assisted living or deed restricted senior housing, maximum parking that discourages other uses and put it into the objective standard or somewhere in the housing element that the goal for this site is senior housing but does not require a lot of trips to be generated onto Highway 1 or into the Vallemar neighborhood.

Commissioner Ferguson would prefer senior restricted housing with fewer drivers.

Commissioner Wright asked what they are doing to the property owner.

Chair Hauser thought that was a good point and good question.

Commissioner Devine doesn't want to be negative, but she is thinking about emergency vehicles. They are talking senior assisted living and she is thinking about it from an emergency access point of view aside from the neighborhood.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they are required to have a turnaround for the development.

Commissioner Berman stated that if it is a 150 feet dead end. She thought, for emergency access, there already has to be emergency access here and, if the concern was traffic on Highway 1, emergency vehicles already have to deal with it. She thought the lesser of all evils is, if there is a housing development here that doesn't generate a lot of vehicle trips and doesn't have that many parked cars or moving cars within the property that an emergency vehicle needs to deal with. Regardless, if they have to get here and leave, they have to do that already.

Chair Hauser mentioned that they talked a little bit at the onset of this when the LOS question came up about what CEQA traffic required, but she didn't think they talked about what CEQA analysis could provide. She asked if it is possible that they do a little bit more of an in depth traffic study as part of the EIR for this project.

Planning Director Murdock wasn't sure he could commit to that under the timing constraints they have, as they have the minimal obligation to plan for the RHNA and do the required environmental review for that but he didn't know if they would have the ability and time to do a more in depth site specific analysis for emergency vehicle access, etc., at a design level for the project.

Commissioner Ferguson is not in favor of developing the quarry and he just threw out that when it jumps down his throat. The idea that this is a better place to put dense housing than open space across the street, there is no one who can say that.

Councilmembers Berman, Devine and Wright agreed.

Commissioner Ferguson didn't know where that leads them.

Chair Hauser stated she is stuck and she thinks they are all in the same position, reiterating her comment at the meeting's onset that they are in a rough position such as many other cities, and in addition, we don't have BART, Caltrain, etc. She thought it was inexplicable why our RHNA numbers are this high, but they are what they are.

Commissioner Wright stated that Caltrans has a lot of responsibility for creating this mess for us.

Chair Hauser thought, beyond that, the issue is that, if they don't in some way protect these sites by creating guidelines, then someone can come in and put anything there, and we don't want them to put anything there. She felt it was a hard position and she is tempted to keep moving on as it is 11:15.

Commissioner Wright stated that it is currently a 35 foot height requirement. If they didn't change that, what would that do to our numbers, leaving it at the 35 foot height requirement with the density allowed. He asked if that would give them the numbers they need to meet the numbers on the table.

Planning Director Murdock asked if he was talking overall for the housing element.

Commissioner Wright stated that it was just this one lot, as he had some goal in mind for this lot and he asked what a 35-foot height requirement do to them for this lot.

Planning Director Murdock thought it would probably require very small units and probably less off street parking than would be desirable. Beyond that, he didn't know if he can speculate, but the lower height constrains a number of the other favorable development standards the Commission expressed wanting, like usable open space, ample off street parking, variety of unit sizes so not all studios or one bedrooms, and those are compromised by a 35-foot height limit on this site.

Commissioner Wright thought it seems like a lose-lose site to him.

Commissioner Ferguson thought it was too bad they couldn't put a teacher housing here.

Commissioner Devine asked if they have any authority to strike this from the list or is that impractical.

Chair Hauser thought not now is the answer and she will make the decision they keep going and, if they have extra time and someone wants to come back, they can, but they will skip it for now as she didn't think there was a good answer no matter how they talked about it. She suggested they move to the next site.

Commissioner Wright asked if they go for 45 foot height requirement and when they get the second bite at the apple they may have some more input about whether they can do the assisted living or some of those other considerations, and if they can pare it down, they do.

Chair Hauser is okay with that.

Commissioner Godwin suggested, in the short term, they reduce the density.

Chair Hauser stated what you seen on the screen is what is submitted.

Commissioner Godwin concluded that the density can't be changed either.

Planning Director Murdock thought they should presume is that the density will remain as it is as they are waiting for the state's comments. If there is feedback related to density more directly, staff doesn't think they can come up with suitable development standards that will also enable the density which is what he is hearing. That is relevant feedback for them to consider as they are responding to the state's comments and bringing something back to a joint study session with the Planning Commission and City Council, but at this time, he didn't think that should be one of the variables that can change but, if they have concerns about other objective development standards that would influence the ability to achieve the density like height, now is a good time to provide that feedback.

Commissioner Ferguson thought they were probably not going to get to this one at this meeting but give it some minimum standards and come back to it later versus giving it nothing.

Planning Director Murdock thought part of the challenge they are struggling with, staff struggled with, City Council struggled with and community struggled with, is that we have this housing allocation that has to go somewhere and what he has heard thus far at this midpoint, the height that had been discussed, etc., for a number of the sites they are concerned about the units going in some of these locations are at least large enough buildings that he had imagined would be needed to reasonably accommodate these densities. He stated that they are going to have think carefully, if they can't reasonably accommodate them on these sites, where else can they go. He stated that staff hasn't found many more options of places to put them that don't violate some of the other community priorities that were expressed through the General Plan update and housing element outreach processes. At some point, something will have to give in terms of types of projects in scale, height and density or the types of sites we are accepting as a community and he didn't think they can reconcile both reasonably.

Commissioner Ferguson thought this site was a good location for height and density, but just a safety factor on this specific area as there is no good way in and out.

Chair Hauser stated that she is stuck on safety here.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if they can move on.

Chair Hauser stated that they can move on as staff has heard their concerns and maybe that can be the guidance.

Commissioner Berman stated that she needs to leave.

Chair Hauser thanked her for staying so late. She stated that they can address the Linda Mar Shopping Center. She asked Commissioner Berman if she was going to stay for one more.

Commissioner Berman stated she would stay for one more.

Chair Hauser felt that the Linda Mar Shopping Center was a good place for a larger project because its removed from mostly everything and there are signalized intersections and it is replacing commercial. She thought this needed to be a 30-foot setback to the single family dwelling with a maximum of three story adjacent to those but it could go up to five stories elsewhere and if there is no need for commercial because she didn't think we need the big box.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if this polygon doesn't cover Safeway.

Chair Hauser stated it does not cover Safeway and she believes it is Ross Dress for Less, a bank and fitness area.

Commissioner Wright asked how far the setback is from those rear houses.

Chair Hauser stated she had a 30-foot setback from the rear houses, and once you hit that 30-foot setback, you would only have three stories allowed, adjacent to the single family home property line and then you could go to five stories after that.

Commissioner Wright concluded that you have 30 feet back then you go up to 55 feet.

Chair Hauser stated that you have 30 feet back, then you go up to three stories, step back and then you go to five stories.

Commissioner Wright asked how far is the set back between 35 feet and 55 feet.

Chair Hauser envisions that it will probably be about 20 feet.

Commissioner Wright concluded it is 10 and 10 feet. If you're at 35.

Chair Hauser stated sorry, but no. you have a single family home, a property line, you have 30 feet with nothing in it, no structures, then you can go up three stories to 35 feet, over 20 and up to five stories.

Commissioner Wright asked if we break that over 20 to 10 one story, 10, another story, 35, 55.

Commissioner Berman thought the 20 feet gives an opportunity for some deck space.

Commissioner Wright thought the 10 feet also does for each of those floors.

Commissioner Berman stated it wasn't as useable.

Chair Hauser agreed with Commissioner Berman. You are getting 50 feet away from the single family homes before the five stores start which she thought was important.

Commissioner Wright was fine with that but he was looking to give both floors a little bit of outside space.

Commissioner Ferguson concurs with the 30, 20.

Commissioner Wright agreed to go with that.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if, on the creek side, just five feet. And can you shift the density somewhere.

Chair Hauser likes the idea of five feet as long as they're respecting the creek setback that would be sensitive.

Commissioner Ferguson thought that was legislated elsewhere.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the General Plan has a creek setback of 100 feet.

Chair Hauser stated that it was from the center line of the creek or from the edge of riparian area.

Planning Director Murdock didn't recall that it specifies what part of the creek, so he doesn't know how to answer that now.

Chair Hauser stated that the setback should be five feet from the edge of the riparian area at the minimum but any stricter requirements in our code or state or federal code.

Commissioner Ferguson stated five feet from existing hardscape boundary.

Chair Hauser stated existing hardscape like a remodel and they will have to figure out.

Commissioner Berman stated, speaking of hammerheads, there probably is going to need to be some fire access back there but that would be a code thing that they would have to comply with.

Chair Hauser agreed with that and was thinking that, because the polygon has the two corner lots, she thinks they probably can exit onto the street.

Commissioner Berman thought emergency vehicles access.

Chair Hauser states she is guessing if they own that.

Commissioner Berman didn't know what overrides what but she imagines fire code and emergency access would override any concession that a developer could try for. Then a five foot setback from the existing pavement sounds good.

Commissioner Ferguson stated the existing pavement because he imagines, if they tore up that pavement, the riparian zone would retake that whole parking lot in a couple of years.

Commissioner Berman agreed.

Chair Hauser thought the interior property line, she was okay with the five feet on the Safeway side and zero feet on the parking lot side.

Commissioner Berman would say more than five feet on the Safeway side to allow pedestrian access that she can't touch both of the buildings.

Chair Hauser asked if she was thinking about ten feet.

Commissioner Berman responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Devine liked the ten feet.

Chair Hauser asked if she was okay with the zero feet on the parking lot side.

Commissioner Berman responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if Safeway requires a pull through for their loading and unloading on the back.

Chair Hauser stated it is the white truck on the screen. They back into it, so the truck can pull out. She stated this is definitely bigger than a 70-foot camera has and definitely bigger than what is required with the fire code Appendix D.

Commissioner Berman stated, for delivery, she is guessing they do a 3 or 4-point turn before getting behind Safeway.

Commissioner Berman thought they drive straight, maybe.

Commissioner Godwin thought that is what he has seen.

Commissioner Berman stated they drive all the way around.

Commissioner Godwin believes so, at least some trucks do.

Commissioner Wright asked if that was something they can put on Planning Director Murdock's plate to examine.

Chair Hauser stated that this is one property owner and they have a tenant that they have to provide access for so she didn't think they would propose anything. She thought this will be self-resolving.

Commissioner Berman stated, regarding self-resolving, she asked Planning Director Murdock with these things, especially fire access and code requirements, do they need to be spinning their wheels and spending time on how to accommodate them or they are going to have to be accommodated no matter what.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they will need to be accommodated no matter what but they don't need to worry about them too much now. Once they formulate a more complete picture of what the standards may be, with the next bite of the apple, they may want to think through a couple of hypotheticals to say let's stress test this package to see if it will be feasible and actually work. They probably won't get to actually designing these sites on their own at the Planning Commission stage as they don't have enough information about what the actual project will look like and qualified architects and engineers are employed for this purpose to make it all work for a particular project site.

Commissioner Godwin didn't want to bring up another complication but this lot gets utilized a lot in the summer for beach parking.

Commissioner Berman mentioned movies, asking if this is where they do the drive-in movies.

Commissioner Godwin didn't know how popular that is.

Commissioner Berman reminds her that a commenter mentioned, which is something she mentioned before during the LCLUP process, i.e., she felt they need more community gathering spaces and it is actually quite sunny in this side of Pacifica often.

Chair Hauser asked what she was thinking.

Commissioner Berman thought of increasing the common open space.

Chair Hauser stated encouraging the applicant open it to the public.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if he was hearing that we can't require that.

Chair Hauser asked if there is a park required here under the open space element currently or any sort of space.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if we can require public access to the open space.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, to his knowledge, there wasn't a park proposed at the Linda Mar Shopping Center in the General Plan. Residential projects are required to make parkland dedication and they can either do that by dedicating land or paying a fee or a combination.

Commissioner Wright asked if they could build a bridge to the beach.

Planning Director Murdock asked what he said.

Commissioner Wright asked if they could make them build a bridge to the beach.

Planning Director Murdock wasn't sure they could make them build a bridge to the beach as part of the parkland dedication requirement, but it may be possible as part of the parkland dedication is creating some sort of public plaza space or gathering space that could satisfy their parkland dedication alone or in concert with useable outdoor area requirement for each unit that is in addition to the parkland dedication requirement. He thought there are some interesting options to explore, given the size of the site and where it is in town.

Chair Hauser stated this is a lot of units, 182 units, and what if they make the open space requirement of 400 square feet, in the current municipal code, they skew it 100.

Commissioner Ferguson 620 to 280.

Chair Hauser agreed, and they skew it as a minimum of 60 square feet of private and the rest of it can be common or that can be reduced, instead of the park in lieu fee, the developer provide publicly accessible, useable open space to the city. That way, they have a big requirement to have a lot of open space and 182 homes. She asked Planning Director Murdock what the ratio was, like 3 people per dwelling unit in the parkland.

Planning Director Murdock was not recalling the ratio. The subdivision standard is the only ratio he remembers now, .02 acres per unit.

Chair Hauser then calculated .02.

Planning Director Murdock stated that was for subdivisions and there is no guarantee this will be subdivided, but it is a helpful frame of reference.

Chair Hauser thought that was a large parkland dedication that they could get out of that. She thought they could also benefit from not having to pay the fee.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, but he thought it was more likely that they wouldn't be subject to the parkland dedication potentially given the rental nature but they might be subject to a sizeable parkland dedication fee that they may want to satisfy with an onsite dedication of some sort.

Chair Hauser to be open to the public is the key thing.

Planning Director Murdock agreed that to satisfy that parkland requirement, it would need to be dedicated for public access. He referred to the earlier question about the 100 foot creek setback, and stated the General Plan provides that it is 100 feet from the top of the creek bank or the outer edge of riparian vegetation where it exists.

Chair Hauser stated she is clear where the top of bank is, but the edge of the riparian area is different.

Planning Director Murdock stated it provides for exceptions under certain circumstances where supported by biological information in combination with incorporated site and design or other mitigation measures and there is some flexibility there but the presumption is you are starting at 100 feet from the top of the bank.

Commissioner Ferguson thought that was like mean high water line as that lower part of San Pedro Creek is very different in the summer from the winter.

Chair Hauser agreed that it is top of bank which is where the grade stops changing. Stated, to recap, height is 55 feet except that the set back from the single family side would be 30 feet and you would have the next 20 feet has 35 foot height limit. The setbacks for the other side would be 10 feet on the Safeway side and 0 feet on the parking lot side and 5 feet from edge of pavement or as governed by other municipal code requirements for creeks. They already talked about the lot coverage, the FAR is 0 here as there is no requirement for commercial, open space is 400 broken up with the 60 versus 340 with the encouraging factor they just discussed about parkland dedication. The parking stays with what they established at the beginning of the meeting.

Commissioner Berman thought that all sounded good to her and she likes the idea of having some public useable space in this area.

Commissioner Devine thought it was a great suggestion and she thought it was pretty exciting for that area.

Commissioner Berman then left at 11:33 p.m.

Chair Hauser then addressed Terra Nova High School, asking if anyone wants to start.

Commissioner Wright hates the idea of building on this site and taking away a playing field that, in the future he can see us needing but he also understands the constraints and the handcuffs being put on us by the state. He thinks this is short-sighted and stupid.

Chair Hauser asked for other comments. Then stated that there is already a set back from the single family residential incorporated into the polygon and the large trees are already accepted from the polygon and she appreciated that. She thought this one would be four-story.

Commissioner Ferguson thought it was because of the grade change on the west side and you can go to four stories easily.

Chair Hauser thought this would be a good place for four story and a front setback of 10 or 15 feet with a separated sidewalk. She thought it was a small frontage and maybe they don't change the sidewalk as it will look weird.

Commissioner Ferguson what setback on the high school side.

Commissioner Devine is thinking about the high school side.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they have a grade change there at the polygon line.

Commissioner Devine things so but she doesn't know how significant it is right there.

Commissioner Wright stated that they are going to create a huge traffic problem there when the school is getting out which is the same thing as on Vallemar which is horrible.

Chair Hauser stated since it is a school site, it is possible the school uses it for faculty which would have a lot of in-commuting as they can walk to work.

Commissioner Ferguson stated they can go with that.

Commissioner Devine stated she definitely would not go beyond four stories.

Chair Hauser agreed.

Commissioner Ferguson thought the grade change down to the high school is pretty substantial. He stated rear setback 0.

Chair Hauser stated that she has a rear setback of 0 because the polygon already creates a setback.

Commissioner Devine wondered how much space it is.

Commissioner Ferguson stated the 147.92 foot site.

Commissioner Devine asked how much he said.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that he said 0 on the very back.

Commissioner Devine stated because of the tree line right there.

Chair Hauser thought they have to stay out of the tree line.

Commissioner Ferguson stated there is another code. He thought the General Plan tree guideline cover that.

Commissioner Devine asked Planning Director Murdock if this is an HPD site.

Planning Director Murdock stated he will check.

Commissioner Ferguson stated this site is completely flat.

Commissioner Devine asked if she is understanding correctly that the total site area is 43 acres and the area assumed for housing is 4.

Chair Hauser stated that the entire site is Terra Nova High School. She stated that, when they have Oceana High School, it will be 55 acres.

Commissioner Wright asked what height she was suggesting.

Chair Hauser was suggesting 45.

Commissioner Devine empathized with Commissioner Wright's concerns as she grew up on Shenandoah which is the court up and over Everglades and was stuck in that traffic every day and now her kids are at Terra Nova Christian Pre-School and she is still stuck in traffic every single day and that was the challenge.

Commissioner Wright stated all those same considerations that they talked about before, but they are stuck with that same thing and one of the only way that they can limit how many units go there and how bad we make it is with the height requirement, but at the same time, they are obligated by the state to provide units.

Chair Hauser thought, at some point, the city needs to do a really hard core traffic study. If we aren't going to do it as part of this, they need to figure out when they're going to do it as this is a really big issue and everyone cares about the issue.

Commissioner Devine stated that they are already adding Oddstad and that is moving forward and for people leaving town to go to work, they are going down either Oddstad and Linda Mar or going to go up Terra Nova, and thinking about this site as well.

Commissioner Wright stated that, if they put a light at Crespi then they could go up Alicante and go out Crespi or something, which is another thing they could do.

Chair Hauser stated, getting back to the six things they are looking at, she thinks this is another one, and part of the reason she likes going to 45 here is because this is another one where we should have the increased open space of the 400 square feet per unit. She likes all the setbacks

they discussed as she thinks they want to stay out of the trees but she doesn't know what setback that is and she thought staff can do some more analysis.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the site is not zoned a hillside preservation district.

Chair Hauser thought that was helpful. She asked if that works for everyone, and she asked if that is enough clarity for staff.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if there is 70% floor area ratio for this.

Chair Hauser stated that is a great point, but for this one, that would definitely be too high.

Commissioner Ferguson was thinking about 50.

Commissioner Devine was going to ask if they could go as low as 50.

Chair Hauser thinks they can because they have made the height enough. This is a dwelling units per acre that she thinks makes sense for this site and at 45 height limit, she thinks they are going to have a lot of opportunity to do.

Commissioner Wright asked if they will get big enough units to have families to send kids to these schools.

Chair Hauser stated that, with the height limit, they can go lower if they want to, but they are giving them the maximum. If someone can do three story garden style apartment which gets up to 30 dwelling units an acre or townhomes.

Commissioner Devine stated townhomes wouldn't be as much of an eyesore as this site.

Chair Hauser stated that they should goal to have no eyesores as they progress with the additional development.

Commissioner Ferguson thought the point is to limit eyesores. He stated he is for no commercial on this site.

Commissioner Devine agreed absolutely.

Chair Hauser stated that is okay and asked if they are ready to move on. She appreciated that staff kept the whole creek and whole riparian area out of the polygon and she thought that was great.

Commissioner Devine had talked about this before Commissioner Berman before she left, i.e., what is the height of the townhomes or senior living across the street. She thought it was three stories but it could be bordering on four.

Commissioner Wright stated it is not four.

Chair Hauser didn't think there is anything in the city that is four now.

Commissioner Godwin stated he was sure it was three, but he didn't know if it was 30 feet or 35 feet.

Commissioner Wright stated he would max out at 35 feet on this site, just to start the discussion about height.

Commissioner Godwin agrees as he thinks the whole street would look strange with something taller, even if it goes on for a mile or so.

Chair Hauser stated that there are three stories across and there is a gable. She stated, for higher quality architecture, she would propose that they do three stories but 40 feet so they can get pitched roofs with higher quality.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that there are pitched roofs all around.

Chair Hauser agreed, adding that when you are constrained to 35, you end up with little squat gable with no slope.

Commissioner Devine stated it is not a very modern look.

Chair Hauser stated, when they do development standards, she has a feeling that they won't want modern to go here, but they can discuss that.

Commissioner Godwin stated that you need a pitched roof in this climate.

Chair Hauser didn't know if we need one, but it would look aesthetically pleasing and she didn't think they should limit them to flat roofs.

Commissioner Wright stated that, if they do 40 feet, she is saying three stories.

Chair Hauser stated three story maximum with no four story.

Commissioner Wright stated that there is no attic that gets turned into useable space later.

Commissioner Ferguson stated you still use it with attic for multi-family.

Chair Hauser stated there is not any room to do any sort of mezzanine but she thinks they can make that a development standard that wherever they go to 40 feet, no half story or pseudo-story is allowed but true three stories.

Commissioner Wright asked what kind of setback their thinking about from the street.

Chair Hauser stated, if you look across the street, there is a pretty large setback and every part of Park Mall is on the housing element list, but she didn't see anything that ties to the street here and she would think that this is the appropriate place for a 20-foot primary setback.

Commissioner Devine agrees.

Commissioner Ferguson agrees. He tried to figure out how you preserve access to the library.

Commissioner Devine thought it looks strange.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it seems like you big spoon for the whole library.

Commissioner Wright asked if it would make sense to move the library somewhere else and just develop the whole site.

Chair Hauser thought a property owner could decide to propose that, but it would have to come before them.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it should be the city.

Chair Hauser stated it is discretionary.

Planning Director Murdock stated part of the concern with this site is making clear to the community that this will remain a library facility of some sort, other than in its current service model or potential future proposed modified service model, but to be clear, the housing element is not proposing to eliminate the library function. As Chair Hauser mentioned, the city, in reviewing a development proposal on this might say that they can yield a better library that is integrated into an overall site plan but they want to make it clear as a starting point that it will be preserved on the site.

Commissioner Wright had one last pitch. He asked if they could move the library to Park Mall. He stated there is plenty of space there.

Chair Hauser stated her concern is so much traction with the library advisory committee and all the different processes that the city had gone through and they probably don't want to intermingle that discussion with this one.

Commissioner Wright understood but it looks odd.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that the polygon doesn't have good PR on this one.

Commissioner Devine assumed there would have to be some way for patrons to continue utilizing the library and have some level of parking.

Commissioner Ferguson stated put no net loss to library parking with all eight spots.

Planning Director Murdock stated that his sense is that the potential future service model here may not need as much onsite parking potentially, so that might unnecessarily restrict the site.

Chair Hauser is okay with it as shown without the no net loss of parking.

Commissioner Ferguson concedes that.

Chair Hauser stated she didn't think they need a setback in the back because the polygon RA takes that into account. She thinks they can do a 5-foot setback on both sides.

Commissioner Ferguson is one touching the library.

Chair Hauser meant the property line setbacks north and south. She thought those would be five feet, 20 foot front, zero feet rear, solely because there is a humongous setback to the edge of the PL, five feet technical side setbacks and she didn't know what they have to the library building.

Commissioner Ferguson suggested ten feet around the whole building, or if there is a new plan for the whole site, they would not restrict it with setbacks in the middle of it.

Commissioner Wright asked if there is currently any natural light in the library.

Chair Hauser asked confirmation of natural light.

Commissioner Wright responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser stated that there is a whole central courtyard area.

Commissioner Devine was going to say the courtyard is really nice.

Chair Hauser stated it is where the tree is between the polyline and the building. You can see the community garden Sanchez on that on the side. She feels there is a lot of light in there.

Commissioner Devine agreed there is a lot of light in the courtyard.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if everyone was consistent with 70%, 200, 50-50.

Chair Hauser agreed. She asked if there were any comments or did staff have enough to move on.

Sr. Planner Harkousha stated they have enough.

Chair Hauser moved on to the Sanchez Art Center. She thanked them for keeping the fields out of the polygon.

Committee Wright thought it would be nice if they could move the line a little bit as that field isn't quite wide enough for a soccer field.

Chair Hauser is going from memory but she thinks the polyline follows the paved area and what's in there seems to be the parking they pull into.

Commissioner Ferguson agreed.

Chair Hauser didn't think they took any of the field and it is drive aisle and parking.

Commissioner Ferguson stated there was no net loss of the field in this polygon.

Commissioner Wright agreed, but it was currently not wide enough for a real soccer field. He stated that, if they want it to be a soccer field, now is the time to speak, but if you don't want it to be a soccer field, then it's okay.

Chair Hauser asked what the dirt area was in the back.

Commissioner Devine thought it was a dog park.

Commissioner Wright stated it was a dog park by the 547.34 .

Chair Hauser stated that it might be better for the development if they took the 116.96 line on the west boundary and you continue that line southwestward and took the extra dirt area.

Commissioner Godwin thought that would be an improvement.

Commissioner Wright would agree on that.

Chair Hauser asked if there was a reason that the polyline was jogged eastward where they get to the 101.22 feet.

Commissioner Wright thought it was probably where the edge of the driveway is.

Planning Director Murdock thought they were just trying to identify the existing building area for the most part.

Chair Hauser asked if staff concur with the idea of going to the 116.96 feet as a top and taking that line and dragging it straight all the way down and over to meet the 196.02.

Planning Department Murdock stated his understanding is to basically make the polygon more rectangular so that there can maybe be a reconfiguration of the existing field.

Chair Hauser thought there is a benefit to the field which is what Commissioner Wright is saying and there is also a benefit to a perspective developer who has a more rectal linear site.

Planning Director Murdock didn't have an objection to that as the city is in control of this site as part of the future development, similar to the prior Sanchez Library site. It might affect the file number of units or they may have to adjust the density slightly to achieve the target RHNA but those would likely be relatively minor changes.

Chair Hauser thought you end up with more in the polygon so they have more room and it will get a little bit better.

Planning Director Murdock stated that their proposal would take up part of that field at the bottom.

Chair Hauser responded affirmatively.

Planning Director Murdock understood.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if there was a way, like they do with the ground floor commercial, to require a certain amount of indoor recreational or, in this case, our community space

incorporated into the development as he feels that is something Pacifica has the least of now, especially with Sea Bowl gone.

Planning Director Murdock thought this was a unique site, given it is city owned, and he isn't sure how he would recommend trying to make that a zoning standard as opposed to noting it for the record. It is something that staff is already aware of in terms of marketing this site for potential development to ensure that they can hopefully recover sufficient remaining art space, given the importance of the existing facility.

Chair Hauser thought they could set a minimum FAR for specific active civic space and closed active civic space.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that was what he was asking.

Chair Hauser thought that was one of the things they are being asked. She feels very similar about the idea of the 30-foot setback from single families and then 20 feet of three story and then at one point go to four stories once you pass the three.

Commissioner Devine likes the approach.

Commissioner Wright asked if everything else in that neighborhood 35 feet.

Chair Hauser stated that everything in Pacifica is 35 feet, which is a citywide height limit that was removed for part of Sharp Park and hasn't been filled yet.

Planning Director Murdock asked Chair Hauser to repeat her setback and height proposal.

Chair Hauser stated that it is definitely not a recommendation yet, but she said they would have a 30 foot setback from the east property line and then a 20-foot zone that had to be three-story maximum, like the 35-foot height limit and they you would go up to 45 feet after that, which is her image of the site. She thought it gives enough space for a really generous ground floor and really nice arch spaces.

Commissioner Wight had one more discussion of height, i.e., there are no view or anything so it would be blocked off by a taller building here and would just be a little bit out of character.

Chair Hauser would be amendable to that if they also set a requirement that he started with, 35 feet off Linda Mar, and then they kind of telescope up.

Commissioner Wright had one other question, i.e., would this other large lot, if they save 45 feet there, where the nursery is, to the west, then it would only make sense that it also be 45 feet. He stated that it seems like they are kind of choosing a standard now and going to dictate that latter. He asked if that was something they were all okay with.

Chair Hauser stated she didn't follow it.

Commissioner Wright stated, where the nursery is.

Chair Hauser stated to the west.

Commissioner Wright agreed, stating it is going to be hard to argue that they are not entitled to 45 feet when they want to develop if we make this 45 feet. He asked if that is something they are all okay with.

Chair Hauser thought the zoning changes are only being applied to sites that are housing element opportunity sites and she thought they would have to go through a full rezone process.

Commissioner Ferguson asks if it is sending precedent for others.

Chair Hauser stated it would be a different zoning, which she thinks but doesn't know and is a great question.

Planning Director Murdock agreed and was trying to confirm the zoning of the adjacent site.

Commissioner Wright stated, for the record, he was still in favor of 35 feet for here.

Chair Hauser asked if it is 35 feet for the whole site.

Commissioner Wright stated this one, but he would do the 40 feet with the peaked roofs.

Chair Hauser asked if for the Sanchez Art Center.

Commissioner Wright responded affirmatively, stating if they are looking to get 130 units out of four acres.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he wants to preserve all the community uses of the property also.

Chair Hauser would like the ground floor to stay art center.

Commissioner Ferguson was thinking that as well.

Commissioner Wright stated, if they keep the ground floor art center, he would be okay with 45 feet.

Chair Hauser stated that they are then saying the same thing.

Commissioner Devine stated she was in support of that. If it was not a possibility to drive developers in that direction or even push in that direction, she would definitely be more amenable to 35 feet.

Chair Hauser thought there is double whammy that they can put it in here, as it is a city site and they wouldn't require it in a PSA.

Commissioner Wright thought they were good on this one.

Chair Hauser stated they are waiting for Planning Director Murdock to answer the question about the site to the west.

Commissioner Wright thought it wasn't that important at this point, and he thought they moved past it.

Chair Hauser asked if they established setbacks for this one on the field and Linda Mar side.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they said 35 feet on Linda Mar.

Chair Hauser stated she said that when it was 55 feet but she also thinks they should do that for 45 feet if everyone is still okay with that. She got consensus.

Commissioner Ferguson mentioned 20 feet on the field side for access, as it has to be at least 25 ad you have two-way traffic.

Chair Hauser stated that they are skimming-up what they are asking. She doesn't want to make it undevelopable but she agrees with him.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that you have to access the feel somehow for the new usable.

Chair Hauser agreed, adding that the fields are going to need to have parking. She stated that they will put it in there and staff can tell them if they made it undevelopable. She would restate it. This is a 45-foot site with 35 feet along the frontage, a 30-foot setback from the single family dwelling units of 20 feet of 35 feet there. The changed the configuration of the polylines to be more rectal linear and more developable, no setback on the bottom because it is already considered, a 20-foot set back on the field side and 15 foot setback on the front consistent with the municipal code because it's 35. She asked if that feels good.

Commissioner Devine stated that will see what they can do with it.

Chair Hauser agreed, and importantly, no net loss of art space on the ground floor, but it doesn't need to be on the ground floor but anywhere.

Commissioner Ferguson suggested art square footage.

Chair Hauser agreed with art square footage.

Commissioner Wright asked what they are doing about parking for the art center.

Chair Hauser stated it will be incorporated into the polyline. She didn't think that was a use that was contemplated in Table 4.4.

Planning Director Murdock stated h is only concern is the no net loss for the art space as it might be a high bar for a potential future project as a sizeable amount of that existing building is already art space.

Commissioner Wright stated that is why they gave them a whole extra ten feet.

Planning Director Murdock stated this site is designated as a lower income housing site and it is city owned so it is not clear that there is a strong market component of providing an extra floor

for providing community benefits. It could be an economic challenge for the project to have a no net loss of art space.

Chair Hauser asked how many square feet of art space is it.

Planning Director Murdock stated he didn't have a square footage readily available and they can figure that out.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it is the only indoor art space in Pacifica, other than clay creations.

Planning Director Murdock is not contesting the importance of the site but saying that it is a very strict standard in terms of potential future art space for a lower income housing project that also has built in financial challenges.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that he can't square prioritizing adding lower income housing at the expense of our only indoor art space in the whole city.

Chair Hauser stated there is no where for people to gather indoors so if you are going to have a year like this year with eight atmospheric rivers, everyone is going to have to go to Daly City and Colma and no one can stay where they live.

Commissioner Devine stated that they also have a lot of art classes for kids that she has frequented over the winter months.

Commissioner Wright stated, on the positive, a lot of the shaded areas is not currently building structure so we aren't talking about the whole thing.

Commissioner Devine asked if they could lower the percentage and would that be okay.

Commissioner Wright stated that they could say no net loss which, with his look at this, they are looking at about 50% of the ground floor.

Chair Hauser suggested that they say no net loss for now and, if at the next time they review this and have a square footage, that might help them reduce it, if there is an economic issue. She thinks they can keep it at the 200 because of the fields being there.

Commissioner Ferguson agreed and the potential of retention of community space.

Chair Hauser thought that was it for this one.

Commissioner Ferguson stated was this No. 8.

Chair Hauser asked staff how many they have left.

Sr. Planner Harkousha stated there are two more, this one and one more.

Chair Hauser stated this will be the last for Commissioner Devine. She thought this one was relatively straightforward because it is 30 dwelling units an acre which is achievable with our

current height limit, and its across the street and not adjacent to single family. Her feeling on this was a three-story frontage along Paloma with the opportunity for four-story behind.

Commissioner Wright stated this is the same issue for field as they are literally taking away.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that it isn't an organized playing field now.

Commissioner Wright stated that there is a softball field in the place and one of the local soccer clubs did apply to use this field over a year ago and got turned down because this item is on this piece of paper.

Chair Hauser asks what they make this one of the 400 square feet per unit sites.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if she means open space 400 square feet of open space per unit.

Chair Hauser responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Wright stated, if they can preserve the 300 feet by 300 feet by 300 feet on the west side, that would suffice for the needs for the kids. The advantage of that is there are multiple fields here and, as kids age up going through the sports things, the parents get to drop their different age kids off at the same place every time. That doesn't change.

Chair Hauser thinks they can't change the polygon and just require that this be a field but she thinks they can require additional open space and change the lot coverage.

Commissioner Wright stated, as long as they can accommodate that, he would be all for it.

Chair Hauser stated that the high school owns the site.

Commissioner Wright stated that they also own a bunch of flat land, more on the northeast side, where there is a big flat spot there. They could build on it an addition to the parking lot area to the northwest which is also very buildable. He stated there are plenty buildable spots there and, in fact, the site on the northwest has incredible views and they would attract much higher dollar figures with those views.

Chair Hauser asked what he thinks of doing a 50% lot coverage maximum or even a 40 % lot coverage.

Commissioner Wright would go with 40%.

Chair Hauser stated 40% lot coverage.

Commissioner Devine stated the community would really appreciate that as well.

Chair Hauser agreed. She stated that 40% lot coverage is another place where they want to keep the 15-foot standard front yard setback.

Commissioner Ferguson thought they might need more than that because of the slope as it slopes down from Paloma significantly towards the east of the property. He stated that it is relatively flat on the west portion but then a third is significant hill between Paloma and the flat field below.

Commissioner Wright agreed. There is a big hill between them and it doesn't help much. There is also a big berm there with about a 5-foot elevation change.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they can get that developer to deal with it.

Commissioner Godwin stated that they are proposing eliminating the two west most acres in the polygon.

Commissioner Wright responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser stated, out of 40% lot coverage this has to be townhomes or duplexes, but at this density, probably townhomes. She is hearing a 40% lot coverage and go to 20% front setback.

Commissioner Wright stated she means 20 feet.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he is fine with 15 feet. The developer and school will figure it out.

Chair Hauser stated 15 feet is okay.

Commissioner Ferguson agreed.

Commissioner Wright was okay with that.

Chair Hauser stated a 15 foot front yard setback, keep the same ones that are in the municipal code so the five foot on the sides and 20 foot rear.

Commissioner Wright agreed, and asked if they are going to get their number if they do that.

Chair Hauser stated that it is only 30 dwelling units an acre and they allowing them and saying three story on the frontage and they can signal four story behind the frontage. She didn't think it is unachievable and ADUs would count if they wanted to put ADUs in to help as ADUs can count to offset the density.

Commissioner Wright stated that is if you buy two.

Commissioner Ferguson three story.

Chair Hauser stated that a lot of townhomes now have ground floor ADUs or junior ADUs, built into them and its only like 200 or 300 square feet but it provides another rental opportunity in an otherwise for sale project and adds an inherent affordability to it which is great. It counts toward our RHNA numbers and doesn't feel like a 50 dwelling units an acre but like a 25 dwelling units an acre.

Commissioner Wright stated that, if they are larger units, you can be a caretaker unit as well.

Planning Director Murdock added that, while a developer can propose that, and they could get RHNA credit, they wouldn't be able to count those ADUs beyond the assumption that HCD allows for ADUs as housing element units. They have a very conservative approach about how many ADUs can be assumed for meeting the RHNA.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they could call them 200-square foot studios, not ADUs.

Chair Hauser didn't think they need to get into this much detail as the question is are the parameters they are giving for this really low lot coverage in these bigger setbacks, can they still get to 30 dwelling units, the answer is yes.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that they accept the analysis.

Planning Director Murdock wasn't clear if the Commission's direction is to exclude the western two acres.

Chair Hauser stated it is not. The height was the three story on the frontage, four story behind, setbacks were the municipal code setbacks that Pacifica has. The lot coverage is 40% lot coverage. There is zero commercial space and no FAR and the 400 open space dwelling unit per acre. She is tired. There is no acre, 400 square feet per dwelling unit.

Commissioner Wright stated that the goal is to preserve the playing area to the west.

Chair Hauser stated they were designating the 400 for dwelling unit as a general use, a 10x6 private and everything else is the common, like on the Linda Mar Shopping Center. She asked if staff needs anything else, and they indicated they did not so she moved on to the next one. She thanked Commissioner Devine.

Commissioner Devine recused herself at 12:13 a.m.

Chair Hauser stated that she did not see a world in which we don't have a bowling alley's worth of community, a neighborhood serving space.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that it doesn't have to be a bowling alley but some kind of indoor recreational space.

Chair Hauser agreed, with the key component being indoor.

Commissioner Wright stated that we already have bowling machines. He stated it would be a good idea to keep it.

Commissioner Ferguson stated, if they had something of this square footage for indoor recreational, what might it be.

Chair Hauser thought, at 60 dwelling units per acre, it is really tough.

Commissioner Wright stated, as much as he hates to say it, this is a site that is screaming for height.

Commissioner Ferguson stated they also included the Brewery and he thought the first time they saw it, it was a separate parcel.

Chair Hauser thinks it changed to make the square footage work. She has a question, i.e., can they move the polygon to be a portion of the parking lot and the sloped area behind it is subject to HPD, and can they make that. They get great views of the ocean.

Commissioner Wright asked if they own part of that.

Chair Hauser stated the whole area is part of the 8.8 acres so the blue shaded area is 4.5. She feels like the 4.5 is in the wrong spot.

Commissioner Ferguson asked, if included in that 8.8 is the triangle between Fassler and Highway 1.

Planning Director Murdock stated no.

Commissioner Ferguson thought it was the same ownership.

Planning Director Murdock asked if he means the site across Sea Bowl lane.

Commissioner Ferguson responded affirmatively.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, to his knowledge, it was a separate owner thus the site is called the rock in the past.

Chair Hauser stated she would be open to higher height limits for portions on the lower if they move the polygon or expand the polygon and do portions on the upper, as she would want to make sure those are not as tall as that slope is higher and this is where, in addition to maintaining the FAR of a bowling alley's worth of usable space, this is where she would also have the higher open space requirement with the hope that there would be some sort of outdoor open space open to the public.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if they are including the bowling alley in the open space as a publicly useable commercial.

Chair Hauser stated she was not.

Commissioner Wright asked how they accomplish parking for the Bowling Alley, parking for all the units and get outside space.

Commissioner Ferguson stated go up.

Commissioner Wright asked how far up.

Chair Hauser stated that she has 55 in her head.

Commissioner Godwin asked if there was a condo being built across the street from this site on the other side of Fassler.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it was up a little ways.

Commissioner Godwin asked how tall is that.

Planning Director Murdock stated that his recollection is that it is approaching the 35-foot height limit.

Commissioner Godwin understood it has the same height limit.

Commissioner Wright was okay with 55 feet and okay with keeping the indoor recreation space presently being used as a bowling alley.

Chair Hauser didn't think they can demand that it is this building unless they take it out of the polyline, but she would definitely be a proponent that the FAR for visitor serving commercial if that is what it is called.

Commissioner Ferguson responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser stated, considering how important it is to the community to have that indoor space, and how important it is to Pacifica economically, based on the Kosmat study, to have that space. She didn't see an alternative for the site. She thinks they are all on the same page.

Commissioner Godwin asked if that building has been sold or under some kind of development agreement with the present housing developer. He stated that they got that letter from the owner that said a partner would do something. So, he hasn't actually transferred the ownership and they have a development agreement.

Chair Hauser didn't think it was the Commission's responsibility to pave the way for a developer who bought a bowling alley or is in line to buy the bowling alley.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it was American's biggest housing developer.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he was not aware of whether the property ownership has changed yet, but he is aware, as he alluded to, that a letter was submitted by a residential developer who has expressed an interest in acquiring this site and attempting to gain city approval of a housing project on the site, but that is the extent of his knowledge other than the proposal would likely not include the Sea Bowl bowling alley remaining on the site.

Commissioner Godwin just wanted to make sure he understood the current arrangement.

Planning Director Murdock referred to Chair Hauser's earlier idea of expanding the polygon in some way into the steeper part of the site, and he stated it is designated in the Hillside Preservation District overlay, and there is nothing preventing the Commission from providing that direction, but he would note they tried very hard in their housing element inventory to avoid HPD designated areas as a response to the community's desire to protect our hillside areas, however, as mentioned, it is ultimately the Commission's discretion.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that can keep the same ceiling, but transfer across to the hillside area and it is the reason they are avoiding the hillside area.

Commissioner Wright stated it was a bridge to top floor parking.

Chair Hauser asked what he said.

Commissioner Wright stated that it is a bridge to top floor parking.

Commissioner Ferguson would be in favor of granting them some ability to use the hillside that is otherwise just invasive species.

Chair Hauser understood and she was going to look on Google.

Commissioner Wright asked, if they do this site at 55 feet and they get the allowances for low income housing, what is the maximum height that this could end up being, as are they still capped at the 55 feet.

Planning Director Murdock stated that potentially not if they were to invoke the density bonus law and be able to exceed that height limit.

Commissioner Wright asked up to what point.

Planning Director Murdock didn't have an immediate answer if there is a maximum height. He stated that part of the state density bonus law requires that the concession be related to decreasing the cost of providing housing and, at a certain point, increasing the height might actually increase the cost and it was a difficult question to answer simply other than three may not be an effective height limit from a zoning standpoint.

Commissioner Wright just wanted to make sure they weren't shooting themselves in the foot.

Planning Director Murdock stated that would be the case whether or not the Commission put a 55, 45, or 35 foot height limit. That is not the deciding factor.

Chair Hauser stated this is a low income housing site or a very low income housing site.

Planning Director Murdock stated lower income site.

Chair Hauser stated it is the 80% AMI.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser thought this is the right place for density and whatever development they do here should reflect a building prototype that is not three stories, has a minimum and couldn't be two stories or three stories. If they want this to be affordable housing, minimum height.

Commissioner Wright asked if she wanted to do a minimum of 45 feet, as they will have a bowling alley underneath and there is ten feet of it.

Planning Director Murdock stated his only initial reaction is establishing a minimum height may run counter to affordably constructing a particular type of housing, if they were to get creative with modular or some other very small footprint housing type that could be accommodated at lower cost and a lower height and it could run at cross purposes with the lower income housing objective for the site.

Chair Hauser didn't know what kind of low income housing can accomplish 16 dwelling units an acre and be less than four stories tall.

Planning Director Murdock struggles to think of the same thing, but being prescriptive for a minimum height is not something that they have undertaken elsewhere and it could run counter to a portion of the site where maybe a different unit type is appropriate, but it is a very firm standard.

Commissioner Wright asked if they should count on greed to make them want to build it bigger.

Chair Hauser didn't think they want to make it bigger. She thought the most profitable type of structure is 1, 2 and 3 stories and not a 5-story structure unless you are building affordable development and you are getting all sorts of grants and funds from the state.

Commissioner Wright stated he would be willing to defer to her expertise if he has a notion about how they can accomplish that.

Chair Hauser stated that the first order is figuring out the FAR and polygon and she thinks they need to start with that first. She thinks they are trying to accomplish is getting, based on the site, 60,000 or 70,000 square foot of indoor conditioned visitor serving commercial space, and it doesn't need to be a bowling alley because they can't force someone to open or rent a bowling alley, but it needs to be something that serves Pacifica.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he is with her 100%.

Chair Hauser asked if they know the square footage of the bowling alley.

Planning Director Murdock stated that rough numbers from an areal photo, it looks like its at least 30,000 square feet but that is a rough estimate.

Chair Hauser stated she will google earth polygon and will get back to them.

Commissioner Godwin stated this is just the furthest one.

Commissioner Ferguson stated they were almost there.

Chair Hauser agreed.

Commissioner Ferguson stated that he would up the parking number on this one so they don't lose all the parking for the visitor serving commercial.

Chair Hauser asked what the parking requirement was for visitor serving commercial currently.

Planning Director Murdock stated it depends on the use type. The most common commercial parking standard is one space per 300 square feet of floor area.

Commissioner Ferguson stated it could be 100 spaces form 30,000 square feet.

Planning Director Murdock doesn't recall if they have a specific bowling alley parking standard for reference for the existing site.

Commissioner Wright stated his guess is that bowling alleys as they current exist would be about 135 parking spots.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if there are that many in that lot now.

Commissioner Wright stated he didn't know.

Planning Director Murdock stated another frame of reference for a recreational type use, such as museums and skating rinks, one parking space for each five seats plus one parking space for each 200 square feet of recreational floor area, so more intensive than the retail requirement for the recreational area component.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he would call around 100 minimum parking spaces for visitor serving.

Chair Hauser thought they do visitor serving with no net loss and, depending on what the use is, they do the municipal code required parking. He asked what they think about the polygon.

Commissioner Ferguson isn't tied to it and didn't mind development going up the hill. He doesn't know if it makes it easier or harder. He stated that at least it gives the developer the option.

Chair Hauser asked if they want to take Pacifica Brewery out of the polygon.

Commissioner Godwin wants to.

Commissioner Ferguson would too, but they are two separate property owners.

Chair Hauser believes it is a single property owner.

Planning Director Murdock stated it is his understanding that it is the same underlying property owner, but there is a separate parcel shown, given the long term lease hold of a separate business.

Commissioner Ferguson understood two separate parcels and one owner.

Chair Hauser stated that being that this is a study session, she was inclined to reopen public comments, since he stuck through until 12:30 at night but she asked staff if that is allowed.

Planning Director Murdock stated it was her prerogative as Chair, and they need to offer that to anyone who might be dialed in as well.

Chair Hauser offered any members of the public an additional two minutes of public comment.

Mike Vernazza, Pacifica, stated that he has spent quite a bit of time here. He referred to the dirt road behind the polygon they are interested in potentially expanding, and shared his thoughts and conclusions on the calculations and possible aesthetics.

Chair Hauser closed public comments again.

Commissioner Wright stated he was good.

Chair Hauser stated she would be amenable to going up to the dirt road and removing the Brewery from the polygon and requiring an FAR with no net loss to the bowling alley and municipal code required parking spaces for the visitor serving commercial space.

Commissioner Wright asked what happens to the parking for the Brewery if they remove it from the polygon.

Planning Director Murdock understood that the way the property is delineated in the lease, it may include that strip of parking that essentially runs parallel with Highway 1 to Sea Bowl Lane and there would be an ingress and egress driveway and some off street parking related to the Pacifica Brewery that is dedicated to that use.

Commissioner Wright concluded that, from an area standpoint, they could do a gypsy swap of both the Brewery and the Brewery's parking to change the line up to the dirt road and it would be a wash.

Planning Director Murdock wasn't sure how the figures would work out, but that reconfiguration could occur to provide offsetting additional area.

Commissioner Wright asked if that was what Chair Hauser is suggesting.

Chair Hauser was amenable to that for sure.

Commissioner Ferguson is also, as he pulled up a partial map and ownership data and that area parallel to Highway 1 is part of the Sea Bowl owner's parcel whereas the Brewery is its own parcel and it could be the same company but different names. He didn't know if they can split off part of that parcel and say its out of the polygon now.

Chair Hauser thought they can as they have done it on every other site by taking a portion of the parcel such as Linda Mar Shopping Center so she thinks they can do it.

Commissioner Wright stated that, since he has more knowledge that he saw on his phone, when he says the Brewery, is he saying the Brewery plus that strip of parking.

Commissioner Ferguson stated the parcel of the Brewery is basically the footprint of the Brewery and does not include that parking which seems to be before the Brewery.

Commissioner Wright stated they don't want to shoot them in the foot either.

Commissioner Ferguson is with him.

Planning Director Murdock thought there is a way, whether engaging with the property owner or the business owner to try to modify the polygon, not only to exclude the building, but also whatever associated area is in their lease with respect to off street parking. He thinks he has the general mental picture of that but it should be confirmed so they draw the polygon appropriately.

Commissioner Wright asked if he can think of a way to accomplish that, and for now they leave the Brewery in their but they don't build on that but just enlarge the polygon and would that be easier for staff to manipulate later to get them to their goal.

Planning Director Murdock would prefer to try to exclude the Pacifica Brewery to make it explicit that it is not proposed to be allowed for housing, depending on when the housing element is adopted, such as eight years versus ten years of a lease as it is too close for comfort in his mind. They would presumably want the Brewery to stay there beyond the ten-year lease that is existing. He thought they can manage that, but the numbers might change slightly and he thought they may go down slightly for this site but they still have a significant buffer as it stands.

Chair Hauser reframed it stating that they are going to remove the polyline up to the dirt road or trail as she thinks they need to keep the trail out of the polygon so its still a useable trail, keep the Brewery and probably that strip of parking which staff will clarify, they height will be up to 55 feet and should shrink down depending on grade between the path for the area they added so it is all commensurate. As the grade increases, the height limit goes down. She is okay with the lot coverage they established at the beginning when they talked about keeping the square footage of space and she is okay with the 200 square feet for DU, if they do all of that even though she would like the 400, but that may be pushing it. She asked that staff explore the idea of a minimum height limit to ensure that they are getting affordable housing here.

Commissioner Ferguson stated he was with her on all of it.

Commissioner Wright agreed. He asked if they have one they needed to go back to.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if they talked about setbacks.

Chair Hauser stated they didn't but with the polygon here, she didn't think they need setbacks.

Commissioner Ferguson agreed.

Commissioner Wright asked what the hard one that they had to go back to.

Chair Hauser stated that they did all of them but the hard one was Vallemar Station and they kind of gave up.

Commissioner Wright thought they gave incomplete directions.

Chair Hauser stated that they had safety concerns that need to be thought through before they provide. She asked if staff needs any clarifications from the Commission.

Sr. Planner Harkousha didn't think they needed anything at this time.

Chair Hauser thanked her for bearing with them as it was a long meeting. She asked if they need any clarifications or receding of the sites they asked to be added for the EIR review.

Planning Director Murdock wanted to make sure he captured all of them. He heard 801 Oceana Blvd., the Pavilion of Flowers site, Skyline and King, the water tank site, 725 Oddstad Blvd. where the prior project had been approved, 730 Sharp Park Road, the church, Ramallah Plaza and 2480 Skyline, and 340 Waterford, the vacant lot and the car wash together.

Chair Hauser agreed, and clarified that Ramallah Plaza has two addresses, the second one is 681 Manor. She thought it would be really helpful, one, to establish that they would like as a Commission to set six development centers for the remaining sites at some point in the future, understanding that those are much simpler, and two, they would like to come back and review where things ended up and spend a good amount of time on the important remaining design standards so things like building materials, windows, all the little stuff that makes the architecture.

Commissioner Wright added like some residential design guidelines.

Planning Director Murdock stated he wasn't following the last part about what she wants to see with respect to that or when, as that's the phase 2 rezoning program in the housing element.

Chair Hauser stated that there are several things, one, they want to do this with the remaining sites, and two, they want to have another chance to weigh in on all of this when staff has had a chance to consume it and analyze it. The last one is, not now or in August, but at some point analyze what these sites look like. For an example, a very common objective design standard that they will see is buildings can be no more than 100 feet without starting a new building or a 10 ft x 20 ft recess. She stated that they don't want boxes but thoughtful, aesthetically pleasing architecture and at some point they need to get to that.

Planning Director Murdock understood and that point is planned to be the Phase 2 rezoning program in the housing element that will follow this Phase 1 rezoning program.

Chair Hauser asked when that will come into play.

Planning Director Murdock thought sometime after January 31, 2024 when the Phase 1 rezoning program is presumably put in place and they would then be able to shift to focusing on the Phase 2 comprehensive zoning and objective standards process that is going to take the better part of a year as mentioned earlier.

Chair Hauser stated that her concern is that at some point they have a gap where they set the envelope when people can propose whatever aesthetic they want. She didn't think it needs to be done on the same timeline as everything they are on but if it is done in December 2024 they are in trouble, and she thought they can give some thought to what the schedule looks like.

Planning Director Murdock agrees, and much thought has been given to that timeline. He isn't sure that he can realistically offer her a faster timeline than that.

Commissioner Wright asked if, in the meantime, to cover that gap, can they say that until the residential design guidelines are approved that everything needs to come before the Commission.

Chair Hauser stated that they can't as then it is not an objective design standards and it becomes subjective.

Commissioner Ferguson asked if they had so me objective design standards they want to throw out now.

Planning Director Murdock stated that there is a grey area. The key thing is that they can't use subjective standards to deny or reduce the density of a project as, general speaking, design review is still acceptable and permissible as part of the discretionary review process but you can't use that as a mechanism to circumvent the intent of the law which is to approve housing projects that meet objective standards, but can you condition that they modify a façade if people are attracted and approve the project and give them the number of units they apply for if they otherwise meet the objective standards. I think they can do that. Not all is lost, but if they refuse to do that or it affects the feasibility of the project, they may be in a more difficult position. Changing materials or adding a different mix of window types, etc., he feels is still an opportunity to do that before they have the full robust set of objective development standards adopted. He stated that is the best they can do for them now, given the workload and what is involved in getting this Phase 1 program across the finish line by January 31, 2024.

Commissioner Wright asked if they don't work until 12:45 every night.

Planning Director Murdock stated just most nights.

Chair Hauser thought it may be wise to adopt a snippet of some other cities' objective design standards so they don't get boxes, as a temporary band aid.

Commissioner Ferguson responded, please.

Commissioner Wright asked if the chair has a favorite.

Chair Hauser has seen very good standards in Morgan Hill that are citywide and not site by site, and even though they don't have completely lifting architecture as Pacifica, they have really detailed objective standards and not just six pages but 30 pages. She thought that would be an option.

Commissioner Wright asked Planning Director Murdock if that would be something worthwhile as a Commission to consider to read, look over and add in our second bite at the apple.

Chair Hauser also asked if they can potentially do that as this is very unconventional.

Planning Director Murdock didn't think he can, in good faith, commit to doing more than the Planning Department is doing already with respect to the housing element update, Local Coastal Land Use Plan update, quarry reclamation plan, and other activities that are significant and being undertaken at this moment.

Chair Hauser understood it is a hard situation and they appreciate staff doing that. She stated, if the opportunity presents itself, maybe there is something they can tackle.

Planning Director Murdock understood, adding that the main concern is the gap in time between January 31 and whenever that year long organic, Pacifica driven process might be completed. He stated that there may be an opportunity on February 1 to look at a near term, couple of month process to get something like the Morgan Hill standards adopted, and that is something he can think about, but he is not able to commit to do anything else between now and January 31.

Chair Hauser hears him. She stated, for her, the thing is housing and its probably going to be a lot of for sale housing which means it will be housing for a really long time. If they miss their window and they have 100 years of ugly looking boxes. So, if an opportunity presents itself, she asked that they let them know. She asked if there are any more comments on this item, and seeing none, she asked if they needed to make a motion.

Planning Director Murdock stated no, and thanked them for the feedback.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

None

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Murdock stated he has nothing further to add.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Ferguson moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:45 a.m.; Chair Hauser seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Ferguson, Godwin, Wright and Chair Hauser
Noes:	None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Murdock