

**MINUTES**

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

August 21, 2023

7:00 p.m.

Chair Hauser called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

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

**SALUTE TO FLAG:** Led by Commissioner Devine

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director Murdock  
Contract Planner Aggarwal  
Senior Planner Harkousha  
Assoc. Planner Lin

Chair Hauser explained the conditions for having Planning Commission meetings pursuant to Government Code Section 54953 (as amended by AB 361), to conduct necessary business as an essential governmental function. She also gave information on how to present public comments participating by Zoom or phone.

Chair Hauser asked if there were any public comments on administrative business and there were none.

**APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA** Commissioner Devine moved approval of the Order of Agenda; Vice Chair Leal seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Devine, Godwin, Leal and  
Chair Hauser  
Noes: None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None

**DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF August 28, 2023:**

Chair Hauser didn't think there was a need for designation for liaison to City Council.

Planning Director Murdock stated that was correct.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

Assoc. Planner Lin introduced the call-in speaker.

Samual Casillas, Pacifica, stated he was questioning the wisdom of potentially moving forward with the quarry reclamation plan, and explained his thoughts on the project.

**CONSENT ITEMS:**

None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 1. UP-106-18**                      **File No. 2018-021 – Second annual review and revisions to Conditions of approval applicable to 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 from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15301 (existing facilities) and 15061 (common sense exception) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Contract Planner Aggarwal presented the staff report.

Chair Hauser appreciated that the pictures were incorporated into the staff report and it was easy to follow. She opened public comments.

Assoc. Planner Lin stated that there were no raised hands.

Chair Hauser closed public comments.

Commissioner Devine proposed a motion to approve substantial completion.

Chair Hauser stated she would be happy to take a motion and asked staff if they need Commissioner Devine to read the motion in the agenda packet on page 11.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively. He stated that he is happy to read it and, if it comports with what motion she would like to make, she can say so moved. He then stated “move to adopt the attached resolution to find the annual review of Use Permit UP106-18 in substantial compliance with applicable conditions of approval of Planning Commission resolution No. 2018-004 and to modify conditions of approval 1 and 19 of Exhibit A of Planning Commission resolution No. 2018-004 and to impose a new condition of approval on Use Permit UP-106-18 and to find adoption of the resolution exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, pursuant to Sections 15301, exiting facilities and 15061 common sense exception of the California Environmental Quality Act CEQA Guidelines related to operation of outdoor seating at Taco Bell Cantina at 5200 Coast Highway, APN 022-191-190 and to incorporate all maps and testimony into the record by reference.”

Commissioner Devine stated so moved; Vice Chair Leal seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Devine, Godwin, Leal and Chair Hauser
Noes:	None

Chair Hauser appreciated Taco Bell’s quick resolution following their last hearing.

**CONSIDERATION:**

2. N/A Objective Development Standards Discussion Part 2  
Recommended CEQA Action: Exempt from the California Environment Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15378 of the CEQA Guidelines because the discussion is not a “project”, as defined, because it has no potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they will have Senior Planner Brienne Harkousha present the staff report.

Senior Planner Harkousha presented the staff report.

Commissioner Godwin asked if we have gotten any feedback from the state on the initial documents submitted that might guide this discussion.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they have received a comment letter from the California Department of Housing and Community Development, a comment letter on the city’s first draft submitted to the state. They received a 14-page letter and a lot of comments on various issues related to the draft housing element, however, none of them are specific to the objective standards. HCD gives some latitude. With the exception to that, he stated that it relates to off street parking requirements. HCD is interested in the city reducing its off street parking requirement, in particular for studio and one bedroom housing units, but beyond that, he doesn’t recall much specific feedback on particular objective standards at this time.

Chair Hauser thanked Commissioner Godwin and reminded everyone to speak into their microphones so people watching from home can hear them. She asked Senior Planner Harkousha that she got those correctly, height, parking, FAR, lot coverage, open space and setbacks.

Senior Planner Harkousha stated that she is correct.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they have a cheat sheet on each slide to help add to the discussion.

Chair Hauser stated their goal is to discuss this but also get feedback from the public, but she doesn’t see a lot of members of the public present and she wasn’t sure how many are called in. She asked how many sites were on the list.

Senior Planner Harkousha thought there were currently 18, then said it was 16 sites on the list.

Chair Hauser stated, if everyone is amenable, she would like to open public comment now and provide an extra minute of public comment if people call in and would like to after site 9 and then again after site 18. She didn't know how much public comment, specifically, now many people are on the phone or Zoom.

Assoc. Planner Lin stated that they have two members of the public in attendance this evening.

Chair Hauser didn't think that will take very long and that is what she would like to do. She asked if they all okay with that. She got affirmative response. She then opened public comments.

Assoc. Planner Lin introduced the call-in speakers.

Samuel Casillas, Pacifica, referred to the location where the Sea Bowl is and shared his concerns if they build housing at the expense of visitor friendly businesses shutting down as they are critical to Pacifica's financial survival.

Chair Hauser thanked him and informed him that there will be two more opportunities for public comment during this meeting.

Remi Tan, Pacifica, stated that he also thought there are issues with losing revenue generating businesses, and he shared his thoughts on hopefully positive housing aspects to consider as well as other issues.

Chair Hauser thanked him and reminded him as well about the opportunity to comment two other times.

Assoc. Planner Lin stated there were no more raised hands.

Chair Hauser closed this comment period. She reminded Pacificans that the first ten sites they started with in June were more complicated. She stated that a lot of feedback the Commission gave was to have no net loss of commercial on key sites, which include the Fairmont Shopping Center and other shopping centers and the Sea Bowl site. The Commission recommended looking at preserving the same square footage of the bowling alley building and restricting ground floor office and storage for the commercial uses as they have to be true visitor serving commercial. She thought they will hear back from staff in a couple of months on the result of the study. She wanted to get clarification, referring to Site 26 which is labeled quarry and she thought that was a bit confusing because she didn't think it was the quarry. She asked for input if there are concerns about biological issues or things they know already.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they used the quarry as a landmark to help people understand where it is in the town but not part of the privately owned quarry property that is subject to an ongoing processing of a quarry reclamation plan. The site is currently Caltrans right-of-way. He stated that, if it were included in the housing element, it would need to go through a decertification process with Caltrans, take it out of public right-of-way into a parcel status which could be conveyed to the city or another eligible purchaser. He stated that the

potential exists, as with very many sites in Pacifica, for the California red-legged frog, San Francisco garter snake and other plant and animal species of importance and significance. He stated that study of potential biological resources impacts will occur as part of the Environmental Impact report being prepared for the rezoning process in phase 1. He stated, it will not be down to a project level full site analysis but it will include a study of likely species occurrence on the site, as well as a limited visual site evaluation of potential species that are observed at the site. He stated that there are other potential environmental resources, including tribal cultural resources, referred public comment verbally and in writing with concerns about the presence of those resources and staff is aware of the potential presence of those resources as well and those are two leading factors among all the factors that they'll evaluate in the EIR.

Chair Hauser asked Senior Planner Harkousha if that is one of the sites they are discussing at this meeting.

Senior Planner Harkousha responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser thought she closed public comment.

Planning Director Murdock stated he wasn't sure but it seems to be open through the end of the item anyway as they will be offering opportunities again.

Chair Hauser understood.

Commissioner Godwin understands that the Sea Bowl bowling alley is closed but he asked if that didn't mean some other business could come and lease or buy that site, but at the moment it's not an operating bowling alley, and he asked if he is correct in that assumption.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it was correct to his knowledge.

Commissioner Godwin also wanted to make clear for anyone who might not understand is that the rezoning they are discussing at this meeting reduces the city barriers to building housing, but does not approve, fund or design a project, and does not do anything to get any actual project on any of those sites started and a builder can come in and propose something quite different than what they would approve with lower density or higher density, as this is just a discussion about the rules the city is imposing or not imposing on these sites, not any forward progress toward actually turning any of these sites into housing. He asked if that is the correct view in staff's opinion.

Planning Director Murdock stated he is correct, i.e., the housing element overall and the sites identifications in particular are essentially determining places where housing could be built and where barriers are identified, taking steps in the housing element through programs and other actions to try to reduce or eliminate those barriers so, if someone does want to build housing there and the property owner is interested in doing so, they have a clearer path to doing that. He stated that, for the housing element sites in particular, it is important because they have an obligation to plan in this housing element cycle for 1,892 housing units plus a sizeable buffer or margin above that and they need to make sure they are identifying many potential sites and eliminating the barriers to achieve that relatively high number of housing units for which the city has to plan. He stated that this is one of many steps ahead for a potential housing project on any of these sites and it takes a willing property owner coming up with a project that would align with the housing

element and other aspects of the General Plan and zoning and the public process environmental review, etc., as subsequent steps to ultimately get a project approval.

Chair Hauser asked if there were any further questions, and seeing none, turned it over to Senior Planner Harkousha.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Chair Hauser stated that she can't remember who was at the last meeting but they are going to be very casual about this. They will try to make sure they go through all of the six key objective standards on the bottom right of each screen. She asked if anyone had any comment on height.

Commissioner Devine stated she was trying to visualize the width of the strip so she can understand setbacks and she asked if anyone had a good idea of the size of this width.

Planning Director Murdock stated he could approximate that for her in a moment. He stated that the width is around 200+ feet.

Commissioner Devine appreciated that.

Chair Hauser stated that the length makes it misleading.

Commissioner Devine agreed, and she thought, in terms of height, it is generally unobtrusive area, especially with skyline seeing that frontage road and the landscaping along the back as well. She referred to the corner on Hickey, and asked if that was Sunset Ridge School there.

Planning Director Murdock stated that Sunset Ridge was further south and west of the image down Hickey. He clarified that the 200-200+ feet is farthest to the north and it does narrow to about 160 feet towards the tail end of the area in question. He stated that they wished they could diagram it a bit more specifically as this wasn't a site that had its own very detailed site specific diagram. It was a large parcel and they were talking about the five most northern acres and what was unique about this parcel is the developed property just to the west, The Villages at Pacifica Apartment Complex which is the site of an apartment complex where the city entered into an affordable housing regulatory agreement in 2020 in partnership with the property owner who converted it from a market rate apartment complex to an income restricted low income apartment complex. They are very interested if the city can put the conditions in place to acquire this property and develop an expansion of their existing property. To whatever extent that might relate to setbacks or height or site considerations for the Commission, it is a unique opportunity and would not necessarily end up with that property owner acquiring it but the potential exists to relate it to that apartment complex.

Vice Chair Leal thought, in terms of height, he thought this location, while not the highest point of the ridge line but at the top of that ridge for the most part. He would like to keep it in their standard city height limitations. He stated, in terms of setbacks, looking at the properties just east which appear to be single family homes and not much setbacks at least the property line of 35 and he thought similar setbacks along with those single family homes would be appropriate.

Chair Hauser asked how many acres this was.

Senior Planner Harkousha thought five total.

Chair Hauser disagreed on the height and thinks this is an appropriate place for more height. She also thinks that, going to Skyline and Sharp Park where they see the houses up against the road, you have a similar scenario for housing against Skyline and she wonders if that is a somewhat appropriate setback from the local highway to emulate. She thinks it would be unobtrusive and, if they are going to keep restricting height, they are never going to hit the 1,900 units.

Vice Chair Leal generally agrees with that and wants to increase height but he is concerned about this location on the ridge. He stated that, depending on how the project would come or if ever came and what it would look like, and the minds that they would want to see, and similar to other projects they have seen in the past, they can deliberate at that time. He understood her point.

Chair Hauser stated that she sees what he is saying and north of the site with the water towers owned by the state and NCCW deed, and she feels like that hill that is there is the true ridge line and the grade sinks down in that area. She thought this is one where four stories or five stories would be appropriate. She stated the thing she feels more strongly about it is making sure they have the appropriate setbacks.

Commissioner Godwin agrees that a taller building there would be more appropriate, but given by a road that is fairly heavily utilized in Skyline Blvd., he thought the setbacks were almost a safety issue and need to be maintained, but a five-story building wouldn't bother him there.

Chair Haiser asked how staff feels about the setbacks that are at the southwest corner of Sharp Park and Skyline.

Planning Director Murdock thought she was referring the white building that is the apartment complex in the City of San Bruno.

Chair Hauser responded affirmatively.

Planning Director Murdock stated he hasn't specifically studied that with that thought process in mind and to him, the topography feels a little bit different there, as it is a little more leveled off and they have the big grade break to the east that opens up to the views of the bay, and here, he wasn't sure if that same circumstance exists as he hasn't noticed it coming up Hickey to Skyline, but if that is an example where they think the feel of that seems appropriate, they can take note of that and see what those setbacks might be.

Chair Hauser stated that, as she is looking at it, it also looks like there's a road parallel to Skyline and she wasn't sure if that was what they would want to do. She asked if they have talked to Caltrans about whether they are going to reserve a butter's rights or going to be able to create an access point directly to or whether they will have to access from the neighborhood to the west.

Planning Director Murdock stated, if for this site, they haven't had a conversation about access with Caltrans.

Vice Chair Leal stated that, on access, he generally prefers for it to be off of Hickey or to the south. Especially in this location, with the fog and highway, he definitely has concerns even if there is a turn lane access off of 35.



Chair Hauser stated she didn't want to presume as she hasn't heard Councilmember Devine's opinion on height but she thought she was okay with 4 or 5 story heights.

Commissioner Devine was comfortable with 4 or 5 stories, definitely in this location.

Vice Chair Leal stated that, in terms of lot coverage, as this is currently a public property, he wondered if there was an opportunity for public open space or a park round the area. He knows Fairmont is not too far from this location but that is another opportunity because, based on the property, there is a lot of green space and wondered if that was an opportunity here.

Chair Hauser felt like Imperial Park is there also, and she almost thought it would be worth it to have a green buffer to maintain trees between Skyline and the buildings, rather than creating a usable amenity space. She stated that she will take a stab at a 30-40 foot setback off of Skyline with the goal of preserving as many of the mature trees as possible. She thought it sounds like they are all okay on 4-5 stories and she asked if that setback sounded good.

Commissioner Devine agreed, and if they could preserve as many of those trees, she thought that would be positive for effect.

Chair Hauser thought they could have a reduced setback on the west side but with the setback requirements that allow for a daylight plane that they are not intruding on the light for the single family homeowners. She asked if that made sense.

Commissioner Devine agreed. She referred to lot coverage, and asked how they were feeling as this narrows further south, and maybe that is the opportunity for some usable open space. She knows they are trying to address less off street parking.

Chair Hauser thought this is a good point, as that is a great dovetailing into talking about what staff mentioned in the presentation about less parking for smaller units. She asked if there was a recommendation staff would like them to discuss.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he would need a minute to pull it up as he doesn't want to misquote that comment.

Commissioner Devine thought the potential residents of this development would appreciate that tree line as well for some noise reduction along that frontage road, and also like a little kid running out close to Skyline and she thought a big setback is a good safety matter.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the paragraph in the comment letter related to multi-family parking, and says the draft element notes that one bedroom, multifamily units are required to provide 1.5 spaces per unit, including one garage or carport space, requiring smaller bedroom types, for example one bedroom units to provide 1.5 parking spaces is considered a constraint. Additionally, the elements must analyze covered parking requirements for impacts on costs, supply, housing choices, affordability and achieving maximum densities. The element must include a program committing to reducing parking requirements for smaller bedroom types, one space per one bedroom unit. He stated that a couple of things there, i.e., the ratio, reducing that from 1.5 to 1 for one bedrooms and, presumably studios, and then considering the ongoing relevance and impacts of covered parking requirements, garages and carports for example. The

comment, as he interpreted it, didn't say that they cannot have that but in sort of HCD speak, their saying they really like if they don't but they need to analyze it if they are going to keep that requirement. In his perspective and opinion, it does add cost because it is an additional improvements, additional structure, whether it is a garage or carport that needs to be constructed, and it does present certain constraints to site planning and building design if you have to provide covered parking versus uncovered parking lot for example. He stated that those are the two components that they need to think more about as they prepare objective standards.

Chair Hauser stated that, as he explained that, she pulled up the state government code for the density bonus law, i.e., the state's idea of the amount of parking spaces per bedroom, and it says that, for 0 to 1 bedroom which she thought they were talking about, the requirement is one on state parking space, inclusive of guest and no additional guest parking. She stated that it doesn't say anything about covered or uncovered and she thought it could be either. She asked what they think about using the state's definition for 0 to 1 bedrooms and for 2 or more bedrooms, being consistent with Pacifica's municipal code. She asked if that was fair.

Vice Chair Leal thought it was.

Commissioner Godwin didn't think it was not quite enough.

Chair Hauser thought the idea is that, if we want to build affordable housing, this was county, and then she asked Planning Director Murdock if what he read was from the county.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the comment he read was from California Department of Housing and Community Development's comment letter on their first draft housing element.

Vice Chair Leal thought there were a lot of transit options at this site, given its location, adding that there is no off street parking, and everything will have to be on site for any parking provided. He thought the other challenge is due to the narrow width of the parcel and creating open uncovered parking may also be a challenge. He was okay with following those standards.

Chair Hauser asked Commissioner Godwin if he was concerned that someone renting a studio or one bedroom would have more than one car.

Commissioner Godwin responded affirmatively. He doesn't understand why they couldn't relax the height requirements and build apartments on top of a parking structure. He stated that it seems that, on a narrow lot like this, it would make a lot of sense to him, but that was his first thought.

Chair Hauser thought they were saying they could do that and it could be flexible. She feels that anyone who is developing more than eight units in Pacifica could already use the state law that allows them. She didn't think being consistent with it is really going to burden them because she didn't think anyone is going to build less than eight units on any of the housing element sites the way the design them.

Planning Director Murdock thought the state density bonus law ticks in at a lower unit number, maybe as low as six units. He stated that there are criteria in terms of the proportion of units that need to be made affordable, but he thought it was true that very many of the housing element sites are already set up to enable someone to qualify for state density bonus law and, in return for

providing the required proportion of affordable units, state law provides that any number of local development standards, like height, parking, etc., need to be relaxed or waived if necessary to increase the affordability or reduce the cost of constructing the project. He then referred to Commissioner Godwin's point, stating that, in concept, having parking structures incorporated with a lot of these projects would address off street parking considerations. He stated that the main type of feedback that they get from developers is that it is very expensive to construct those kinds of structured parking facilities and it does adversely affect their ability to build projects at all in a lot of spaces because it is so expensive in this area to build and particularly for affordable housing, it is an extreme challenge in many cases to build structured parking of that sort. He thought it was great if it remains an option and he thought it is an option with the density bonus project as they can seek a waiver of height, for example, but they may seek other waivers or concessions like eliminating parking requirements entirely or pushing them down below what the code would require as that is more likely to reduce the cost of building the project which directly translates to the affordability they can provide with the units. He stated that parking is a big challenge and high cost, even though it is not often conceptualized that way for projects. He stated that, however you slice it, in terms of construction costs or utilization of expensive land area, it cost up a lot of dollars with the project.

Commissioner Devine stated that she would like some clarification, i.e., if they create a development standard recommendation that they go four stories and they use the state's 1-1 for the studio and one bedrooms, there could be a developer that seeks flexibility in some of those areas which would potentially passable, if she is understanding him correctly.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, i.e., the state has set up the law to say that, if you provide this minimum proportion of affordable housing units, they are going to clear local zoning and other obstacles out of their way by allowing them to pick and choose which ones they don't want to apply any longer or to minimize the requirements of those standards so they can more readily construct their project at a lower cost because they aren't paying for what often are amenities that cost money like providing parking. He stated that is the rule and law in California. He stated that he mentioned at the last objective standards discussion, with that in mind and recognizing that a lot of these sites are likely to qualify, don't overthink this process now, as this isn't going to prevent that from happening. He suggested they think of what they would optimally want or think is appropriate within reason, have a rational basis for it and have that as the outer bounds for projects that are not subject to density bonus to prevent a bad project from coming through. He stated that it is crude to say that this phase 1 process is to prevent a bad project from happening, not make a good project happen. He stated that phase 2 is how do they get really good projects that they want with a lot more detailed, refined, objective development standards when they have more time to go through that thoughtful process. He said to put a cap on it so it isn't 100 feet tall, require some minimum amount of parking, and come up with some minimum open space per unit type requirements so they aren't left without any open space per unit where they can impose their standards. He thought it may be hard instinctively to say they are going to do less than the best job, but that is unfortunately the reality of the situation and the timeline and circumstances that they are in. They are trying to get an outer envelope on what could come through the door between now and when they complete the phase 2 zoning process with more robust objective standards.

Commissioner Godwin asked if it would make sense to say a person who wants to develop this parcel needs to propose 8 or more units or something so that these rules apply as a simple way of saying that they not deal with this and say they only want projects with a minimum of 8 units.

Planning Director Murdock stated that was potentially an approach, and stated that the issue is that the developer has to invoke state density bonus law, which means they have particular obligations to provide affordable housing. In most cases, they will end up qualifying because our BMR ordinances are below market rate zoning which, at 8 or more units, requires 15% affordable and, depending on how they structure those units, it could almost de facto qualify them for state density bonus law, but they need to invoke it and some developers, for various reasons, don't, and the public perception for some developers is that they are skirting their obligations and not taking public input for example. He stated that no one has invoked density bonus on a project they have brought before the Commission for years and years, and there is a reason, as some aren't large enough but, otherwise, there are different reasons and it isn't as simple as just saying you can't build fewer than 8 units and, therefore, all zoning is off the table. He doesn't know if the Commission would want to do that entirely as it sets up any type of project to come through and they do want to provide a message to developers that this is the type of project they would have if they could control everything and that becomes the starting point for negotiations and discussion and working with developers. He doesn't know of any developer he has dealt with in Pacifica that wants to build a bad project in their mind or a project that they know the community is going to reject automatically. He stated that the all come in wanting to hope that they can get that sort of community support for their project, and they can show them the way, at least with some basic development standards, which he thinks is a good thing even if they won't all apply to all projects at the end of the day.

Chair Hauser noted that none of the sites that require rezoning would allow for 8 or less because of the size of the site and the density requirement.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, and stated that they are talking about projects with greater numbers of units but that is not to say that all the developers are going to invoke state density bonus law. He thought they should think about what our zoning should be in the perfect world where we can apply our zoning standards and allow developers to decide whether they are going to invoke state density bonus law and we will deal with that as the circumstances materialize.

Chair Hauser stated that she is proposing is that, for 0 to 1 bedroom, that is one onsite parking space with no guest parking which is from the state law, and from our municipal code, Section 9-42818, these are all multi-family so any 2 bedroom, 3 bedroom, 4 bedroom, etc., would have to have two spaces and one guest parking space for every 4 units. She feels that will work nicely.

Commissioner Devine agrees, adding that she thinks it is challenging in general because of its shape, but it is in a better location that some of the other sites that they have reviewed in the previous meetings and, for her, she would be flexible enough to go to five stories, and thinking of a potentially ideal and perfect world, that they could afford an underground parking lot and create some open space for some of the children who are going to be living in this complex. She stated that, unless they are going to go over, there is Gellert Park Club House, and also a lot of cemetery space as well and it would be great if they don't have to cross the frontage road or highway to go outside and play. She is more concerned about creating a somewhat decent ratio so they can possibly put something like that.

Chair Hauser thought they are all in agreement of a height of 4-5, all in agreement on the 30-40 foot front setback and they should get back to the other setbacks. She asked if they are okay moving forward.

Planning Director Murdock agreed.

Chair Hauser stated that they don't need consensus but she would love that. She thought they were all good with what was described and floor area ratio for commercial would be zero. She asked if she was understanding correctly that floor area ratio is just for commercial.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it could be applied for both, as traditionally in Pacifica, they haven't applied floor area ratio to residential projects.

Chair Hauser thought she was assuming, because they are creating an envelope and they have the lot coverage as the next standards to discuss and she felt that would define it enough.

Planning Director Murdock thought so for now, and they would be venturing into new territory which might be complicated and staff would want to bring them more examples if they were going in the direction of applying FAR to residential uses, but he thought there are other tools that are more readily understandable in most cases.

Chair Hauser thought Commissioner Devine will be the leader on lot coverage.

Commissioner Devine stated that she is trying to get to the south end of this parcel and she was thinking the southern 25% or 15%. She is guessing that, as the lot narrows, that is what they are going to really be looking at the bottom of site.

Chair Hauser stated she was going to say 60% lot average.

Commissioner Devine stated that she was flipping her numbers. She was thinking of 20% open space.

Vice Chair Leal asked where is the southern end of the lot, i.e., Timberhill Street.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is the water district tank site down just south of Timberhill.

Vice Chair Leal asked if the lot ends at Timberhill or just south of that or continues south.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the right-of-way continues south of that to the tank site, somewhat north of Glen Court.

Commissioner Devine stated it was quite long, and she was thinking about people walking and the likelihood of little ones playing at that park,. She was more than happy with Chair Hauser's number as she thought it was much more generous than she was thinking would be possible.

Chair Hauser asked if that sounds good to Commissioner Godwin and Vice Chair Leal.

Commissioner Godwin thought getting kids to walk past the water tank to go play is the non-starter and as much space as they can give them they are going to use and 20% works for him.

Chair Hauser stated she was thinking 60% lot coverage and they would determine the amount of open space that would comport to kind of a 20% that Commissioner Devine is looking for.

Vice Chair Leal stated he was thinking higher than 60.

Commissioner Godwin stated he didn't catch that.

Vice Chair Leal stated higher than 60% lot coverage. He asked Commissioner Devine if she was saying 80%.

Chair Hauser stated that Commissioner Devine was saying 20% open space so 80% could be non-open space but she believes lot coverage pertains only to buildings and things like roads are not incorporated into that.

Planning Director Murdock stated that is how it is defined for most sites in our current zoning code.

Chair Hauser stated 60% for buildings alone and then you have parking spaces and roads.

Commissioner Godwin thought a pocket park near where little kids could play in.

Vice Chair Leal stated 60% lot coverage.

Chair Hauser stated that she was hearing 60% lot coverage and hearing that they really want to get them to open space which is actually the next thing and a pocket park. She asked that they back up, stating that, if they have 30-40 foot front setbacks, they limit their width of the site to 200 feet long and that is not that narrow, but at the bottom where it is 160, that is 120 and that gets a little narrow. She thought the biggest question is what is the rear setback going to be from those homes and Pacifica Parks Apartments. She stated, because there is a road behind Pacifica Park Apartments, she would say 15 feet and she didn't think it needs to be that big on the back.

Commissioner Devine agreed.

Chair Hauser would extrapolate that the south and north setbacks as well, thus 15, 15, 15 and 40. He asked Planning Director Murdock if they were leaving him with too little land.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he would need to measure it out but he thought it sounds overall reasonable at this point in time.

Commissioner Devine was fine with that and they can leave it there.

Chair Hauser concluded a 15 foot side and rear and 40 front and it could go down to 30 if they really need it.

Commissioner Godwin asked if that includes the sidewalk.

Vice Chair Leal asked if on 35.

Commissioner Godwin responded affirmatively.

Vice Chair Leal thought the only additional sidewalk would be on Hickey, completing that all the way up to the intersection. He stated that currently there isn't one that goes all the way to the intersection but they would need to put one in.

Chair Hauser thought it would be nice to put it out there as someone who has tried to run this area before. It would be nice to have a place to run.

Vice Chair Leal stated, what he likes about this lot is, given that it goes so far south, it actually goes down to King and it can connect Hickey to King which is another shopping center. He stated that there could be a green multi-purpose trail along 35 which is off the highway that could be basically extending from these two corridors in this area. He kind of likes having the larger setback on the east side then that turns into potentially a multi-purpose trail.

Chair Hauser thought the 30-40 foot setback is a multi-purpose trail and preservation of as many trees as possible.

Vice Chair Leal agreed, adding that there is open space and a separate park just has a long trail.

Chair Hauser asked if they can make note of those things, adding that she notes they aren't part of the parcel but she thinks, since they are talking about it and it is natural.

Planning Director Murdock thought there are a lot of wonderful things that could be done on the site, and he is also recognizing it is likely be a 100% affordable housing project and is likely to be exempt or have significant reductions to their park in lieu fee contribution to construct some of these facilities. He stated aspirational is good and they will take note of it, but how they write those in to a particular site's zoning, especially in affordable housing site, he doesn't have the answer to that now.

Chair Hauser stated that leaves them with open space per dwelling unit.

Commissioner Devine thought they have got to go pretty full here, considering what they have already done now.

Chair Hauser felt that was totally fair, but if they want to have a pocket park or something like that, that could be common open space so they can have a very small amount of private per home open space required but a bigger common open space requirement to get the amenities that they are looking for.

Commissioner Devine stated that was much more amendable to her personally on this specific site.

Planning Director Murdock added one idea to use the Sharp Park Specific Plan objective standards as a touchstone. He stated that the Commission spent a lot of time thinking about what those objective standards would be so there might be a handy way to start for consideration of some of these, granted that the West Sharp Park neighborhood is very different than a site like this that is multiple acres and completely undeveloped now. That might serve as a floor for this particular site. He stated the Sharp Park Specific Plan for mixed use projects was calling for 100

square feet per unit and minimum useable private open space for high density residential projects of 300 square feet per unit.

Chair Hauser stated usable open space of 300 square feet per unit in Sharp Park seems like a lot. She thought using the Sharp Park Specific Plan's design guidelines for all of the pretty things that they aren't going to get to was a thoughtful and good idea and she would definitely agree with that. She thought, on a site like this, she would say somewhere in the realm of 150-200 square feet per home of common open space which gets to between half and two-thirds of an acre of open space.

Vice Chair Leal stated that he was thinking 100 but he thought they could go with 150.

Chair Hauser asked Commissioner Godwin if he could go with 150.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he isn't an expert and what they think is probably a good guideline.

Commissioner Devine stated she was going to go in the direction of Vice Chair Leal as well with 100 but she thought 150 would be great if they can pull it off.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it gets them to about a half-acre which is a pretty good chunk for an urbanized area associated with a housing project.

Vice Chair Leal stated that, in one of the attachments, there is language where up to 50% of that could be included in the common open space. He asked what they think about adding that.

Chair Hauser stated that she was thinking of making it all common and not having a private open space.

Vice Chair Leal assumed that up to 100% could be common open space.

Chair Hauser stated 100% should be common.

Vice Chair Leal stated at least if they say, up to, it could be flexible and if they want to provide private they could.

Chair Hauser stated she was amenable to that as her thing was the setbacks, but what she is hearing from Commissioners Godwin and Devine is that they want pocket parks and she didn't think they will get it if they position it as not being common. She states she is agnostic.

Commissioner Devine stated she could be flexible on that if they are getting toward a half-acre of open space and she could be flexible on the pocket parks, etc.

Chair Hauser stated that you're only getting the half-acre of open space if you are requiring that it be common.

Commissioner Devine agreed.



Planning Director Murdock stated that, in the tradeoff, it is easy to understand the value of the common open space if it's aggregated into a park for example on the development. The other component of private open space is like a balcony or a courtyard which also has a different utilizations and is also valuable and it may not be that they have to do all one or all the other, but they perform different functions for the residents of the development. He stated that, in the interest of getting a greater common area, maybe they are willing to cut down that 100 or 150 per unit to 50-square feet per unit or something for private so more site area and resources can go to the common open space area.

Vice Chair Leal asked if it is almost like flipping the equation or instead of saying up to 50% can be common, up to 50% can be private. He stated that there is guaranteed common open space and the project could include private if so desired.

Chair Hauser stated that, if they do that, her position is that they should go to 200 square feet.

Vice Chair Leal agreed.

Chair Hauser stated that 200 square feet of open space and up to 50% can be private. She asked if that works for Commissioner Devine.

Commissioner Devine responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser asked Commissioner Godwin if it works for him.

Commissioner Godwin stated he is relying on their expertise.

Chair Hauser stated one down, two to go.

Planning Director Murdock stated that could result in no private open space and, if that is acceptable by the Commission as drafted, that is one potential outcome.

Commissioner Godwin stated it is to him.

Chair Hauser asked, what if they said 50 square feet has to be private and 100.

Vice Chair Leal stated 25% is required private up to 50%.

Chair Hauser stated up to 50% could be with a minimum 6-foot dimension.

Commissioner Devine thinks that works.

Chair Hauser asked staff if they are clear.

Planning Director Murdock stated it was clear.

Chair Hauser asked staff if they have any questions on 25.

Senior Planner Harkousha stated there were no questions.

Chair Hauser asked to go to the next site.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Chair Hauser thought it was across the way from what they just discussed.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is at the southern tip so the angle on the right side at the top of the graphic to the right of the tank is at the bottom of the parcel.

Vice Chair Leal asked, between the polygon and 35, i.e., between the two blue lines on the eastern portion of the site, how many feet is that. He wondered if it was already in the existing setback and they can just specify what that is.

Chair Hauser stated that it also looks like it's mostly the flat part of the water tank site.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they don't have a specific dimension but measuring it out looks like it's somewhere between 50 and 60 feet.

Chair Hauser thought this was owned by the state and it was just added at the last meeting to a study site.

Planning Director Murdock thought that was correct, as his recollection is that it's owned by the state and he will check that and confirmed it is the state of California.

Commissioner Godwin asked what site number this is.

Senior Planner Harkousha stated it was Site G.

Chair Hauser stated, because it is literally 100 feet or less from the other one, she was almost tempted to say they do the exact same development standards on this one.

Commissioner Devine asked if the setbacks work.

Chair Hauser thought they take the setbacks from the turquoise line and not the dark blue line to be consistent to help form that dark blue polyline. She thinks they will end up with a little more space and maybe they say no building on the hill. She stated they can't tell if any of the hill is in the parcel or not.

Planning Director Murdock thought one approach the Commission took at the last meeting in some instances where the subarea within the broader parcel appeared adequate. He didn't believe an additional setback was specified or the Commission went back and sort of constructed the setback from the broader parcel. He stated that they can take whatever approach the Commission would like to take at this meeting, but they need not necessarily delve into setbacks if they are comfortable with the diagramming of the parcel from a setback perspective.

Chair Hauser personally thought this was a corridor and she thought there should be some consistency with the frontages in that corridor, like a unifying theme. She thought, just for this one, they are taking it from Site 25 rather than from the blue line.

Vice Chair Leal would agree as he thought, seeing these lots, there might be some opportunity for that lot to the north that they just talked about, even build south of Timberhill which would give support for that idea even more and he would agree with that.

Commissioner Devine was happy with that.

Chair Hauser reiterated that it is the same development standards as Site 25 with the nuance that they are taking the setbacks from the polygon line rather than the blue line and requesting that the north setback would be the base of the hill. She asked if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Godwin understands that the Water District appeal was held a few days ago and he asked if that has any impact on this.

Planning Director Murdock stated none that he can think of.

Commissioner Devine asked if this is a site owned by NCCWD.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he doesn't have any information that they own the property as it appears to be the state of California, according to the County Assessor's records. He stated that, regarding the tank sites themselves, one of them is owned by the city of Daly City and one by the North Coast County Water District, but this particular parcel does not appear to be owned by either of those agencies. He had a question relating to usable open space, adding that the other parcel was much larger and had more area to accommodate that type of project feature. This subarea is identified as more constrained and he didn't know if the Commission wants to think of a different useable open space and private open space.

Chair Hauser stated that common open space requirement could be included in the non-sub area.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is a unique site and perhaps a unique approach is warranted. They thought primarily about where housing could be constructed and would be appropriate on the site. The only other constraint that is immediately identifiable is the access road for the water tanks and, if they are talking about areas outside of that, perhaps useable open space could be provided beyond the diagram boundary.

Vice Chair Leal assumed, regarding that access road, there would be some sort of right-of-way agreement to continue to have that.

Planning Director Murdock assumed that there is an easement there that was granted by the state to the Water District and the City of Daly City to access their reservoir facilities, but he hasn't done the site specific research to confirm that.

Vice Chair Leal thought that, potentially that could be the same access road for the housing.

Planning Director Murdock stated, in theory, typically easement holders of those types of easements are protected and they wouldn't want some other use occupying their easement that could obstruct emergency access to the tank sites. He would not expect that the easement holders would consent to that but an attempt could be made to leave the most amount of area for other uses.

Chair Hauser asked if they are correct in saying that housing can only be built in the blue sub area.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser sees what he is saying.

Planning Director Murdock stated, whether the fundamental site assumptions are correct, the Commission can give staff feedback on that, but they sought to balance the constraints on the site, access to the Water District, topography, etc., while trying to maximize potential development area. He stated, if they think there is another way to squeeze more area out of this or change the configuration, let staff know.

Chair Hauser also thought the lot coverage could probably go up because there is so much of the parcel that is left out of the dark blue polyline. She stated that, based on what he is saying, she would be open to going to 70% lot coverage and lowering the open space to be 100 square feet of just private as long as the remainder parcel is left free of buildings.

Vice Chair Leal asked if she is referring to the 70% of the darker blue.

Chair Hauser stated dark blue only. She explained that she is saying, if they are constraining housing to only be on the dark blue, which is what she thought Planning Director Murdock was saying about the open space, i.e., if so much open space is already left, they probably don't need another common open space in this site.

Vice Chair Leal thought they could go higher than 70% if they are just talking about the dark blue one, pretty high, almost close to 100%.

Chair Hauser thought that is because it could be podium development of a single building.

Vice Chair Leal agreed.

Chair Hauser stated she would be open to that.

Commissioner Devine thinks it works on this site because of all of the open space outside the blue line.

Planning Director Murdock added that, one thing related to the open space, the circumstances under which this site could be rendered suitable for housing after discussions with the state, that is sort of one aspect, and they would do all that they can to get the dark blue diagramed area. He would not assume immediately that they would have rights to allow occupants of that development to go throughout the site for open space purposes without securing legal rights to do that. He stated that it may be that only the private space gets constructed into the development with a high lot coverage and without assurance that they get rights to the remainder of the site.

Commissioner Devine thought that was a good point because she can already assume that this easement road is going to be a particular issue on this site simply because of access to utilities and the rights that they hold already.

Chair Haiser thought, if it's a state site and they are building this much housing because of the state, they might want to facilitate it and maybe not giving access over the whole road but maybe allowing a T-off of a portion of the access that is already after Skyline.

Planning Director Murdock stated, without doing the site specific research, sometimes these access easements are exclusive easements so only the named parties have rights to them and sometimes they are not exclusive easements and multiple parties have rights to access. He added that it is possible the state has granted non-exclusive easements and could grant another non-exclusive easement for use of this development. He stated that they don't know and he didn't know if they need to drill down specifically into access designs.

Chair Hauser thought this will get solved because Caltrans is owned by the state, the housing requirement is from the state and the site is owned by the state, so she feels like, if they are going make this work, they'll figure it out.

Planning Director Murdock stated one would hope, but for now, they have the six key objective standards to think about as it relates to access, arguably parking, maybe is the closest related factor.

Chair Hauser thinks they are saying that they would take the other development standards that they did on the last one except that they would be willing to go up to 90% lot coverage and would allow for a podium.

Vice Chair Leal didn't know it made sense, as they don't have the numbers in terms of the light blue outline and what that acreage is, but he thought it is 1.71 acres for that entire lot in terms of lot coverage, not just the parcel, and that does give flexibility in terms of the idea of where it could be built and where the lot could be covered, and flexibility for the development up to 1.71 acres.

Chair Hauser stated that, because this site was one of the ones that she added in the last go around, it is a 6.69 acre total site and of the 6.69, it looks like 1.71 is what they are proposing. She stated that she is looking at the polyline and she thinks the state's lot goes further north.

Vice Chair Leal stated one of the feedback is that he is thinking, if they keep the same area that is in the smaller polygon, they apply that to the whole site in terms of lot coverage as a percentage or as a specific acreage.

Chair Hauser asked if he is saying 100% of the blue line lot coverage.

Vice Chair Leal responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Godwin thought that was simple for planning purposes and he likes that.

Chair Hauser asked if staff was amenable to that.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he wants to be clear with the Commission's directions. He stated, in alignment with what they have done for other sites that have diagrams in sub areas, the housing element site as it was, would just be the diagramed area. He asked if Vice Chair Leal was talking about allowing 100% lot coverage within the diagramed area, as he understands what

he is saying about allow up to 1.7 acres across the site, but unless they take a different approach with this, maybe remove the diagramed area and just set 1.7 over total area as a percentage of lot coverage. He thinks he should be more specific and think about the sub area effectively as the parcel even though, for setback purposes, they are looking beyond that in this instance to create consistency with the previous site.

Vice Chair Leal understood and, with that option, if it is 100%, they clearly need to probably have housing over garages and driveways around the entire building to access housing.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the site does have interesting topography where one could imagine maybe 30 or 40% of the site being covered but having a much taller building. With the tanks there, those are a prominent topography and he didn't think they will worry about blocking any views or being out of scale, in his opinion. He stated that was just a thought and could open up options for parking, maybe resulting in a lower lot coverage.

Chair Hauser stated she was losing the thread. She thought they were saying that the dark blue sub area, 1.71 acres, could have 100% lot coverage. If here was a raft style building or podium style building, it would cover 100% of the lot.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it could, and he wouldn't suppose that is the only design that would work there, given the ability to have a taller building that is not out of scale, given the topography and the presence of the tanks on the high ground.

Commissioner Godwin asked how tall the tanks are.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he doesn't have that data.

Commissioner Godwin stated he didn't have it either, but his recollection in driving past there, is that they are 50-60 feet tall.

Planning Director Murdock added that they were elevated well above the roadway.

Commissioner Godwin thought they could build housing up to the height of the tanks without impacting the views on the site.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, adding that he was suggesting that the lot of discussion on maximized coverage, tuck under parking, was one type of product and there could be another one where a taller building with surface parking elsewhere on the site where it is not tucked under could work as well if the Commission wanted to give some flexibility on maximum height. He thought, currently, they are talking about 4-5 stories, consistent with the previous site.

Chair Hauser asked if he was saying more than five stores here.

Planning Director Murdock stated he was just saying that this is the site where maybe more height could be accommodated, given that it already has significant topography and large tanks above.

Commissioner Godwin stated he was just saying that the tanks are 60 feet tall and what was wrong with building 60-foot buildings of about the same height, given the site lines are already impacted.

Chair Hauser stated that a five-story building, which is what they are allowing for, is going to be around 60-feet tall.

Commissioner Godwin stated that they are all saying the same thing in different words.

Chair Hauser agreed that they were saying the same thing in different ways. She stated that they are happy with 4-5 stories but would not go more than five stories. She thinks the lot coverage and all the numbers they are talking about just for lot coverage is up to and everything else is a minimum of open space, minimum parking, and they are all minimum densities that they are prescribing, and she thinks, as looking at this, they need to have some level of density range to give a little bit of flexibility to people. She thinks it needs to be really clear what the bottom and top are, adding that it is a general comment for all the sites. She doesn't think anyone will come in and build exactly 30 or 60, maybe 50-60 or 30-40 etc.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, adding that is in part the reason to have a healthy buffer, particularly for the lower income level units, should someone come in and build fewer units than was projected in the General Plan, in the Housing Element, and we wouldn't have to do a net-loss rezoning on a project by project basis trying to avoid that.

Chair Hauser understood and what she is hearing is that they are going to have the same setbacks as Site 25B with it being very clear that no building will be on the hill up to the water tanks, and they are allowing up to 100% lot coverage of solely the side area, not leaking into any of the cyan area, they will get rid of the 200-square foot of open space per unit and go down to 100-square feet of private open space per unit and that the parking is the same. She asked if she got that right.

Commissioner Devine agreed.

Vice Chair Leal thought it sounded good to him.

Chair Hauser stated that they keep going.

Planning Director Murdock stated, out of an abundance of caution, he didn't know if they wanted to take a brief recess, given that Commissioner Godwin has stepped away, in relation to a quorum of the Commission.

Chair Hauser was okay waiting a minute to see if he comes back, as she didn't think going through only two of the sites, she didn't think they want to take a recess. She would like to get to the half-way point, take public comment and then have a recess, if everyone was amenable.

Commissioner Devine stated that works.

Chair Hauser stated that they will wait for Commissioner Godwin to return to have their quorum.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Chair Hauser stated, based on the proximity to Fairmont Shopping Center and the commercial is successful from this part of Pacifica in the small size of the site, she would be okay with this going to 100% residential. She stated that they did a no net loss on a lot of the other sites, but this is one where she can personally see it being 100% residential, especially consistent with all of the multifamily and rental housing that seems to be surrounding it. She feels like it would be a very thoughtful urban plan. She didn't know how they feel about that.

Vice Chair Leal struggles with that a little bit, given its location on a major corridor and he thinks some of the services this plaza offers, especially with the surrounding housing already, and there are cleaners, child care, a corner store, and he thought maybe they reduce the commercial. He didn't know what the current percentages are, but he was okay with reducing it with the option that there are still some ability to provide services for the surrounding community. He gets it can drive them very close, but he thought lugging his laundry down there probably isn't the easiest way, at least from a pedestrian standpoint. He is okay reducing it but he sees value in the services offered there for the surrounding communities.

Chair Hauser thought it is so close to all the Westborough commercial and pretty close to Manor and Fairmont. She stated that, if they are going to keep commercial, she would make it pretty small.

Commissioner Devine asked like a key corner.

Chair Hauser agreed like a key corner, maybe no more than requiring 1,000 square feet of commercial. She stated that the site is 43,000 square feet. She thinks it is hard to get to 30 dwelling units per acre.

Commissioner Devine stated that, even at 23 units, what size building are they looking at. She is having a harder time visualizing the small amount than she is the bigger amount for some of the other sites they looked at.

Chair Hauser asked what she envisions here.

Commissioner Devine stated that she sees what she is saying about this small commercial corridor, specifically laundry, a corner store, pre-school, and she is thinking a key corner would probably be the most amenable in this situation, but if they are going to do a key corner and it's 1,000 square feet, what can really go there. She stated that, practically speaking, maybe a corner store.

Chair Hauser mentioned like a small coffee shop. She thought they should allow commercial, such as if they want to keep a pre-school on the ground floor which could be very cool with residential or something like that. She thought they can make it flexible but she didn't think there was a minimum FAR here.

Commissioner Devine liked the idea as she thought it would be very unique in this area.

Vice Chair Leal stated he was totally envisioning mixed use at this site.

Commissioner Devine asked the complete ground floor.



Vice Chair Leal stated that it doesn't have to be complete commercial but definitely if they want to release the ground floor for some parking and commercial, that could be an option, that's like mixed use.

Commissioner Devine asked, if they do that, how many stories up will they have to go in this size of a lot to reach the proposed units.

Chair Hauser stated that, to get to 30 dwelling units per acre on a lot with this kind of configuration is small and you don't have a lot of efficiency. You have setbacks, you have all sorts of things and you are probably already at four stories adding a commercial ground floor.

Commissioner Devine stated it looks like there is one building behind all of these that is three stories or four.

Chair Hauser thought it was two stories. There is a really tall one and she was looking at the one on Manor. She thought she was looking at the one north of Manor to Skyline apartments.

Commissioner Devine stated it was right behind that little commercial corridor. She can't help at 3 or 4.

Chair Hauser thought it was only 2, just that it is raised topography.

Vice Chair Leal thinks it is a higher elevation.

Commissioner Godwin stated that it was a couple stories here.

Vice Chair Leal thought it was higher on elevation.

Commissioner Godwin thought the lot changes altitude.

Vice Chair Leal states especially compared to 35.

Commissioner Devine thought they were looking at four stories, whether they are doing 1,000 square feet or multi uses of four-story buildings.

Vice Chair Leal thought that works here as it goes down as you are going west to east. The property is west of this one and would be on a similar plane. In the east there isn't much right. It is 35 and then undeveloped land and he thinks going higher than our city standard of 35 is definitely appropriate here.

Commissioner Devine stated she is hearing four stories.

Chair Hauser stated she can get behind that. She stated that the height limit is four stories. Regarding setback, they aren't losing a bunch of really big trees and because it's at a signal, it's not the same as thing as Site 25. She might come up with a number that is consistent with the buildings to the south where she is seeing out buildings that are pretty close to us.

Vice Chair Leal agreed, looking at those houses directly south would be a good barometer.

Chair Hauser thought maybe a 20-foot setback based on that little gray out building two lots south.

Commissioner Devine stated, considering how small this area is, she thought 20 feet is acceptable.

Planning Director Murdock asked which setback is the Commission addressing.

Chair Hauser stated that it is the 20-foot Skyline setback. She stated that, being next to multi-family, it really benefits from that and probably doesn't need a very large setback to the apartments north or west. She stated that they could probably go down to 15 on all of those other frontages except Manor which they should discuss.

Commissioner Devine agreed, as she is happy with that and that Manor definitely needs to be a little more flushed out.

Planning Director Murdock stated, as he is trying to conceptualize the site and figuring out what kind of building form and presence they want to achieve on the site, hearing a lot of public comment at this meeting but throughout a number of our planning processes about capturing revenue and bringing visitors in, there is a role for that to whatever extent commercial use remains here along Skyline to try to ensure people know there are businesses and some place to stop and spend their money as well as make it convenient and walkable, hopefully for the surrounding residents. He sees Vice Chair Leal's point about the service and convenience factor for the surrounding residents to have proximity to some number of services there but, maybe putting that emphasis on the 2480 parcel closest to Skyline, taking what the appropriate commercial setback is there, given it is not really a walkable corridor, given the topography. They may be freeing up some interior space for an outdoor seating area, for a small restaurant or coffee shop, maybe one other kind of commercial use if you are really looking to minimize it for whatever reason and maybe a 681 could really maximize a residential only kind of component there, use the more balanced geometry of the site and really create a core multi-family building there. Maybe all of the units go that potentially and maybe parking in a small retail building or something like a 24780. He thinks there is a sort two-part project here, one is the Skyline commercial component and one is the Manor sort of residential component which is one approach.

Commissioner Godwin stated that this site is so close to Fairmont Shopping Center and it is hard for him to see a retail operation wanting to locate there versus Fairmont. He thought this would be a spot that could be converted all to housing.

Chair Hauser added that, straddling, that was her view also, and she would advocate kind of straddling those things where you aren't disallowing commercial and you are not rezoning to residential but rezoning to mixed use and they don't cap on a commercial that you can put here. She asked what Vice Chair Leal's thoughts were.

Vice Chair Leal stated that they don't cap or state the minimum or both.

Chair Hauser agreed that they don't state a minimum and if someone wants to do 100% residential, especially an affordable project, as an acre is the minimum affordable project size and

she thought this could be a good one, but they could have a restaurant on the ground floor or laundry.

Vice Chair Leal stated he isn't envisioning Target to go in there or any retail but service oriented businesses definitely. He stated that the cashing place can probably move to another shop but services such as laundromats and food and other type businesses. He thought they can leave that option open for dislocation.

Chair Hauser stated that she has a weird proposal in light of that, referring to the buildings west on Manor, i.e., what if they made the skyline setback of 20 feet that they discussed which is pretty low for Skyline, and a 15 or 10-foot setback on the west and north property line. Having a setback for residential that matches the apartments to the west, so 20 feet for residential or five feet for commercial so they could have a strong street wall and activate the pedestrian frontage if they are providing that mix of uses.

Planning Director Murdock asked what 5 feet and which frontage.

Chair Hauser stated that it is the Manor frontage.

Planning Director Murdock asked if she is imagining that is with the residential use on Manor with a five-foot setback.

Chair Hauser stated, if it is residential only, it would conform to the setbacks of apartment buildings to the west which is 20 feet from Manor Drive, assuming that the setback is taken from back of walk which is what it looks like, but if it's a ground floor commercial use, then they reduce that setback from 20 feet minimum to 5 feet minimum to have that strong street wall.

Commissioner Devine stated that it makes sense to remain congruent with those three buildings as that would look a little strange. Minimizing the commercial setbacks could get them some more square footage.

Chair Hauser stated that it kind of incentivize someone to have some services who want to be there. If they are doing it like a lower or very low and if they are doing a mix of affordable, you probably want some services there.

Planning Director Murdock stated the one observation about the mixed use component is that the Fairmont Shopping Center is over a mile away and, by car, it is not particularly far, but for anybody who wants to walk its distance and there are no suitable pedestrian facilities along Skyline to make that a safe walk and some degree of community services, whether it is a small convenience store a small convenient store or whatever else, a small place to grab food, he thought there was probably some value to keeping a mixed use there for the neighborhood, not to mention the corridor on Skyline.

Vice Chair Leal added to that, i.e., King Drive is also much closer than Fairmont which is the best next to the next stop light and there is a shopping center there. He was 90% sure that was in Daly City. If they move commercial here and people start going to that shopping center, those are also tax dollars leaving the city. He stated that adding that hat on, given some economic comments earlier from the public.

Chair Hauser still thinks she is on the side of where they discussed before, i.e., no men or max commercial FAR. She thought they still need parking and she would vote what they did in the last two. She thought that was a pretty good standard for almost every project.

Vice Chair Leal agreed on the residential, and commercial on this one.

Chair Hauser stated, for commercial, maybe they have staff recommend something at the next one.

Planning Director Murdock stated, unless you are looking to deviate from the existing commercial parking standards they have, they can continue to model those as he is not aware and HCD hasn't commenting in their letter about commercial parking standards. That could be phase 2 in that discussion, unless there is something really unique about a particular site they are talking about that does warrant different commercial parking approach.

Commissioner Godwin stated that the stuff he has read has said that most cities have an excessive amount of parking and the trend now is to provide less in commercial space.

Vice Chair Leal agreed with that as well as a general approach to commercial parking. He asks, based on Planning Director Murdock's comment, whether that warrants that conversation here as those have off street parking and off-site parking, and there would be also be site parking and as they get into phase 2, he would definitely want to bring up that point.

Chair Hauser has a vague recollection that they covered this in the Sharp Park Specific Plan where commercial and residential have all sorts of benefits to doing a mixed use site but she can't remember what the numbers were.

Planning Director stated he would see if he can pull those up. He stated that, under mixed use, it says "the sum of the requirements for individual uses, residential parking shall be made functionally separate from commercial parking. Shared parking arrangements are allowed at the discretion of the Planning Commission, such as when required to improve site design". He stated that, unfortunately, that is not an objective standards as the objective standard is the sum of the separate uses in that instance.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, adding that in this case, the Sharp Park Specific Plan, particular commercial parking requirements which he would argue in most cases are better, modernized recently considered but there is nothing fatally flawed in most cases with our existing generic commercial parking standards.

Chair Hauser thought that staff, when they come back, can have a recommendation to either keep with the Muni-code or, if there are opportunities for reduction, let them know. She was concerned that if we go down the path of looking at each commercial use now, they are never going to get to site 4.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, to specifically recap from the Sharp Park Specific Plan, the Commission took a long time considering these details. For retail stores and service establishments, which is the vast majority of the types of commercial they are talking about in these mix use cases, the first 2,000 square feet of grossly simple space exempted at the discretion

of the Planning Director, such as when required to improve sight designs. So, for relatively small sites, the parking can be waived if needed.

Chair Hauser asked if the parking standards were allowed to have discretion anymore.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the requirements imposed can be waived, so he would argue its objective but someone might argue differently. He stated retail, eating and drinking establishments, three parking spaces for each 1,000 square feet of grossly simple area and he would say far below the current municipal code requirement. He thought that was a good thing overall. The current parking requirements in the Municipal code for eating establishments in particular are very burdensome and he thinks they run counter to a lot of site designs principals in his opinion. He stated personal services, two parking spaces for 1,000 square feet of grossly civil space and goes on for businesses services, three for 2,000 square feet.

Chair Hauser assumed they did do that in the Sharp Park Specific Plan.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser suggested they bring them forward. She asked if they want to recommend that for all of the sites, then stated she didn't want to discuss the ten sites they already did. She asked that they bring the commercial standards forward.

Planning Director Murdock stated that this isn't the last parking standard they will ever recommend to enact, but this is to put something in place between now and the conclusion of phase 2 when they can really drill down. If they think this that they reflected on and delved into last year that is better than something from the 1960s in the standard code, then maybe this could be the default until you have a chance to revisit it.

Chair Hauser thought they were down to open space per dwelling unit and lot coverage and, on this one, she would be okay with a 70 or 80% to be able to hit it.

Vice Chair Leal assumed for lot coverage.

Chair Hauser agreed.

Commissioner Devine stated that works.

Chair Hauser asked if there was any feeling one way or another.

Commissioner Devine stated no.

Vice Chair Leal suggested 80%.

Chair Hauser accepted that.

Chair Hauser referred to open space per dwelling unit.

Planning Director Murdock stated that this seems like a dense area and fill site that might be more aligned with what the Sharp Park Specific Plan would drive in terms of an outcome as a starting point.

Chair Hauser was checking to see what they did for the Fairmont Shopping Center, and thought they did 100 private and 100 common.

Vice Chair Leal worries about the common on this spot, i.e. will they be able to accomplish.

Chair Hauser asked why they don't do what they did for Site G and make it 100% private open space per unit of private.

Vice Chair Leal concluded 100 square feet.

Chair Hauser responded affirmatively, adding that, as we are a tree city, she thought there was another development standard if they're going to meet the requirements to low and not be common and they need to have a requirement for trees.

Commissioner Devine asked, when they do a requirement for trees, whether they mention license or just a ratio.

Chair Hauser stated she would ask a different question , i.e., do we have a development standard currently in the municipal code for percent landscape area required as she thought they did but she can't remember.

Planning Director Murdock stated that we do, typically for residential uses, it is 20% and typically for commercial it's de facto 10% based on the lot coverage standards.

Chair Hauser suggested that they do a lot coverage up to 80% but a 10% requirement for landscape space.

Commissioner Devine thought that sounded good.

Planning Director Murdock stated he didn't catch the last part about the landscape space.

Chair Hauser stated a lot coverage allowing 80% which is really high but a 10% minimum landscape space. She stated that she thinks they just covered that and she is going to read back everything she has. If she has it wrong or they want to change something, let her know, up to four stories, setbacks of 20 feet off of Skyline, 10 feet to the north and west, five feet commercial setback off of Manor but if all 100% residential, 20 feet setback off of Manor. She stated it would be a mixed use rezone with no minimum or maximum commercial FAR, parking space is going to be the same for the residential that they discussed for sites 25 and G. The commercial would be the same as the Sharp Park Specific Plan and 80% lot coverage and 10% minimum landscape area and 100% private open space per unit with a 6-foot minimum dimension. She asked if staff needed any clarifications. She then moved on to No. 4.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Chair Hauser stated that, just looking at it, she would feel they could use the exact same standards with different setbacks where they could have it to be a mixed use zoning designation but it could be 100% residential, four stories, 80% lot coverage, same parking, same open space as it is a very small parcel.

Commissioner Devine was definitely leaning more toward 100% residential on this and a lot of the same development standards only because of how small it is. She wished there was a walkovers from the highway so they could access those commercial space across the highway, but it is a small lot.

Chair Hauser tends to agree with her and the reason she is a proponent if the flexibility on this one is because she feels there was a developer that was interested and was proposing food use on the ground floor. She asked if she was remembering that correctly.

Planning Director Murdock stated that she was, and he stated what was unique in that particular instance is the applicant/owner/developer was in the boba or other ice cream drink kind of business and he was inclined to allow it as it allowed him to open another location. He thought it was hard to say if other developers would be similarly situated.

Chair Hauser stated that was why she liked the no minimum commercial required with the allowance for it and you have to hit the minimum density anyway. She stated that was her feeling and she didn't want to talk Pacifica out of a food use when they had it expressed.

Planning Director Murdock thought making it optional is one way to go comparatively as there are close walkable services in this vicinity. He questioned whether or not commercial was less critical to some of the surrounding neighbors. They aren't currently benefitting from convenient retail services.

Vice Chair Leal was okay with denseness similar to what they just talked about.

Commissioner Godwin stated he can live with it as well, as he stated it seemed like converting such a small site to housing makes a lot more sense.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they may recall that the prior project accommodating off street parking was challenging and they were using parking stackers and that had a whole additional range of considerations and potential complications and this is a constrained site in the sense of the geometry and the size of it so maybe all residential could help with the site design.

Chair Hauser asked if he remembered what the amount of units were on the past application.

Planning Director Murdock thought it was 7 or 8.

Chair Hauser stated it was 8 just for the orange portion.

Planning Director Murdock thought that was correct, as it was relatively small, certainly less than 10 whether it was 6, 7 or 8 he can't remember.

Chair Hauser stated that, if they want to disallow commercial that's fine, but if they had eight units on the orange with commercial and they put eight more units on the blue, which she didn't

think seems crazy, they would hit the 16 units that is the goal and they could get BOA, which she knows is critical.

Vice Chair Leal stated that his only concern with commercial here is its location, with the freeway onramp, especially BOA, but he thinks they leave the option open for commercial but if they don't want to put it in, they don't have to. He thought it also fits in better with this neighborhood, acknowledging that there are some commercial businesses on Waterford but the generally use of that is more residential.

Chair Hauser asked if Commissioner Devine was okay.

Commissioner Devine responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser asked if anyone had comments on setbacks.

Commissioner Devine stated this is a challenging one for her to envision. She stated that, where the orange line currently exists, it is already a little bit further setback than the rest of the homes on Monterey, then thought not as she saw it a little bit better. She asked if they want to try to mirror with those, and asked if that would be amenable.

Chair Hauser stated that she would just reflect on what is across the street for the Waterford setback and what's across the street to the east for the Monterey setback. She thought that is a good idea. She stated that they will let staff tell them what the safe setback is from the on ramp.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he thought it was an opportunity to minimize the setback to free up some usable area as there is additional Caltrans right-of-way for the highway that provides a buffer from the highway itself and they aren't going to be impacting any neighbors directly in that area, and between setbacks and height, it might be an opportunity to minimize that back half of the property.

Chair Hauser asked if it is a zero lot line to the west.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, as he would be open to that

Commissioner Devine thought she couldn't tell if there were trees, bushes or what.

Chair Hauser thought it was some scrubby Monterey Cypress she thinks, but on Google map, it is mostly like the stuff that grows by the coast with purple flowers and is really flushy, and stated she was down for the zero and matching what's across on Monterey and Waterford.

Commissioner Devine thought that worked for this site.

Vice Chair Leal asked about height.

Chair Hauser stated that they are going to match Ramallah Plaza except for the setbacks. She then stated Site 5.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.



Commissioner Devine stated, considering the location of this parcel and proposed amount of units, it is looking like a five-story situation. She asked if she is assuming correctly or is it looking like more.

Chair Hauser stated that 40 dwelling units per acre, then stated it isn't looking like more. She stated that she didn't think, for any of the densities proposed in the housing element, that they need more than five stories. She stated that it was helpful as they studies five stories with the Sharp Park Specific Plan and they will have some development standards off the bat.

Commissioner Devine asked if she was correct that there are residential homes on the Avalon Drive.

Chair Hauser stated that she thought it backs up to a fire station and a church and there is one single family home,

Commissioner Devine asked if 120 is not a residential home.

Vice Chair Leal stated it is.

Commissioner Devine thought that makes sense.

Planning Director Murdock thought that they might need to circle back to this site, as something is wrong in terms of the density and the number of units.

Chair Hauser agreed to come back to it.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they will take an opportunity to double check the figures.

Chair Hauser asked if that is still one of their active fire stations for the engines.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is but it is not included in the housing element site but he thought that area on the bottom right is Fire Station 71.

Chair Hauser stated that she was thinking more for the noise factor. She agreed to go to the next one.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the site seen there is shown as 801 and he suggested that they go to the next slide. He stated that it may help to think about the sites together even though they are separate sites and separate ownership as it relates to the high set back site planning considerations. He stated that they can go back to the other side but, whenever they need to toggle, let staff know.

Chair Hauser asked if this was a hillside preservation site.

Planning Director Murdock stated he didn't believe so.

Chair Hauser stated, if she remembers the site correctly, the east property line, next to the Conamara Homes, are really high compared to where Oceana is as that little parking lot off of Moon Ray is where the GGNRA parking lot is to get to Milagra Ridge Trail.

Planning Director Murdock confirmed it is not in the Hillside Preservation District, and she is correct as the elevation is quite high and the size of the building, while he doesn't have the exact height, is certainly more than three stories that can be accommodated there without breaking the finished grade of the site so views wouldn't be impacted with a 4 or 5-story building in that location.

Chair Hauser stated that, when she looks at Pavilion of Flowers, she thinks that is a great developable site on a parking lot underutilized as a lot of it is surface parking lot. She said, when she looks at the green area, that is hard for her. She didn't know if someone wants to kick it off but a bunch of trees on a hill. She asked if it would be possible to combine Site 2 with Site E, Site H. Commissioner Devine asked if it isn't practical to assume they could combine the two sites.

Planning Director Murdock thought the complicating factor is the ownership.

Commissioner Devine understood.

Chair Hauser asked if it was a different ownership.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is, adding that they have been approached by the owner of this site with interest for a particular development concept already and he thought opportunities to try to align that with acquisition of Pavilion of Flowers might be challenging.

Chair Hauser asked if there was a sense of what kind of product or density they were looking to provide.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively, adding that they thought very carefully about crafting this to accommodate the likely application. He stated it isn't exactly this parcel configuration so there is a little bit of flexibility in achieving it but it is pretty close.

Chair Hauser thought, if you are a homeowner off the Conamara property and you bought a home with an ocean view adjacent to a parcel that was not zoned for residential, she asked what the current zoning on that future property.

Planning Director Murdock stated the General Plans currently are high density residential and it just needs to go denser than that as part of the housing element rezoning.

Chair Hauser asked if that was 25-40.

Planning Director Murdock stated that high density residential currently goes up to 21 units per acre in all sites and up to 30 for a half-acre or greater.

Chair Hauser assumed this is going from 30 to 40 essentially.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Chair Hauser thought it will be a minimum of 40 dwelling units per acre as a housing element site.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they haven't done the full detailing of what minimum densities would be specifically, but they would be able to accommodate these densities. His desire is to establish a pretty aggressive minimum density in a lot of these sites so they don't have projects coming in way below what the desired density is. In a lot of cases, the highest and best use economically for the developer is single family residential use but that doesn't accommodate or achieve our housing related goals or some of our economic development related goals that relate to housing density and greenhouse gas emissions and other kinds of land use planning goals.

Chair Hauser referred to the site north of 801, which she thought was on the market for a long time, and asked what that land use is.

Planning Director Murdock stated that site is owned by the same owner as the site they are talking about here, and that site is currently designated office commercial.

Chair Hauser asked if anyone has an opinion.

Senior Planner Harkousha stated that the zoning appears to be C-2 for this property.

Planning Director Murdock stated that there is a discrepancy as, in accordance with state law, the General Plan would prevail in the event of this inconsistency and they didn't complete the typical comprehensive rezoning that would follow a general plan update and they had to sandwich this into the minor housing element process.

Chair Hauser thought it was already compliant. Because of the General Plan, it doesn't matter what the zoning is. Someone would say, your zoning doesn't match your general plan so give me best zoning.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Vice Chair Leal asked if they should go one by one height. He is thinking if it is possible to do certain portion of the parcel a higher height than another one, i.e. if they start at the south and say the southern half of the site goes up to 4-5 stories and then it is 35 feet on the northern half.

Chair Hauser stated she might even go so far as to say it's 4-5 stories on the west property line and when you get to the path that takes you up to Milagra Ridge, it is no more than two stories and a much bigger setback so you're telescoping down and not blocking the single family homeowners who are living off of Conamara.

Vice Chair Leal thought the tradeoff is that they get a taller height on the western side but you have to give up that 35-feet, 15-feet on the eastern side.

Planning Director Murdock thought this might be a site where you can take unconventional approach which might allow them to sort of drill down on establishing the maximum heights and just day no greater than finished grade of Conamara or finished grade minus 5-feet or something

relative to that and allow some flexibility in terms of overall height when the drill down to drafting the zoning standards. It is a different approach that might work unique to that planning sensitivity.

Commissioner Devine would agree with that, like 5-feet lower than this. She thought that was a lot more flexible.

Chair Hauser stated more like the height of the highest plane of the roof line and it would be at no higher than finished grade of Conamara development above. She would be a proponent of at least 20 feet from that trail. Whatever the building height is, the setback would be the same as the building height from the orange line.

Vice Chair Leal had a concern with the height, stating that the person who owns it can go 35 feet right now and potentially obstruct views. He isn't intimate with this site and doesn't know what could happen, but he was concerned with protecting views and we don't have a view ordinance, and limiting the development on this site. He stated that is his concern with the ridge line effect without seeing it into practice and what it would look like on the site with the project. He was a little hesitant in stating that here. He thought maybe you could go 35 feet and that is the height limit and they don't increase the height for this site due to the shared concern.

Commissioner Devine stated she could see where he is coming from with that. She thinks the struggle for her is that there is already so much confusion around the execution of these development standards in this plan and there is already so many feelings going around about this. She stated that, although we don't have a view ordinance, we should try to take things like this into consideration as often as possible.

Chair Hauser stated that, what is bolstering that to her is that it is not just a single family home neighborhood or residential neighborhood that's in existence but the fact that it is a public access to one of the resources that is a key.

Vice Chair Leal thought that trail was technically private as it is on private land. He added that he doesn't know all the rules around that trail but he believes it is the property of the Homeowners Association.

Chair Hauser asked if it was the little parking lot up there.

Vice Chair Leal stated not that, but the actual trail.

Chair Hauser asked if it was the trail that goes down to Oceana.

Vice Chair Leal agreed, adding that he thought the parking row is access to the public trails in the back.

Chair Hauser stated that the trail that runs to the retaining walls.

Vice Chair Leal knows it is used for public access but he believes it is assigned that it is owned by the HOA. He believes the purple line southeastern of the orange line is some sort of property line that continues north as well.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the space in between is HOA property for the Conamara development but, whether or not there are public access rights to that trail, he isn't certain.

Vice Chair Leal agrees that the northeastern setback should be 20 or whatever they agree upon as it is a trail and he thinks having a building up to that trail probably isn't the best direction.

Commissioner Devine asked Commissioner Godwin if he had any thoughts right here.

Commissioner Godwin doesn't think he knows enough about this one and it doesn't sound clear enough that they should decide this one at this time, but move on to the next parcel.

Chair Hauser asked if staff had recommendations on this site.

Planning Director Murdock stated it was a difficult site, with an interesting shape, in proximity to the trail and homes, i.e. all the issues they have keyed in, safe topography, potential project might do a low of grading and bring down the finished grade to have a taller building without running afoul of height limits which are some of the key factors they have identified. He stated that grading comes with tradeoffs as well. He thought it was a balance but a good site for housing and generally walkable neighborhood, reasonably good transit access, whatever that means in Pacifica, and he thought there was a lot to like about this site but it's not without its constraints and challenges. He stated that, if they aren't sure how to prescribe standards, the next best thing for them is to hear what are the key planning factors, and they have articulated some of those, i.e., blocking views for Conamara residents and trail users, not crowding the trail users by ensuring at least a minimum setback from the trail. If there are other key planning factors, he thought that might allow them to craft some recommendations for the future.

Chair Hauser thought she would personally feel comfortable with the minimal setback from the west property line but a pretty generous setback from the east property line, such as 30 feet. She doesn't like too little parking for the residential that they talked about at the onset as that would require a lower lot coverage and higher open space per dwelling unit here but she can't figure out how they deal with the height.

Commissioner Devine asked if they would be able to put in something along the lines of that the goal is not encroach on any views and a way in which they might do that would be some sort of grade. If the intention is to build this many feet, then they need to grade to this extent.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is not commonly done, probably because it takes a little more technical analysis and is very confusing to the public, but it is possible to set a maximum above the sea level type of height rather than a from finished grade height which is more typical. This is a place where maybe that makes sense because of the concern about Conamara views or views from the trail. Given that guidance, they can go back and say that is the best way to do it or can impose that but in a different way. He stated that, rather than measuring from bottom up, measuring top down provides some flexibility in this case. He stated that it may be a unique instance where they find a way to make that work as a zoning height standard, keeping in mind the objectivity that they need. He stated that saying subjective things like, don't block views, is different than saying don't exceed "X" height.

Commissioner Devine thought that was a challenge.

Planning Director Murdock stated that is why he is saying, if they aren't sure where to go in terms of direction on the height, tell staff what they are trying to accomplish. That is the next best thing and allows staff to be creative and try to bring something back if they can't think of an option at this time.

Chair Hauser likes how he explained it as an onset of having the height limit be the floor of the single family homes because they can have that telescoping of height whereas taller buildings are at the bottom where Vice Chair Leal had started.

Vice Chair Leal agreed and was fully on board. He just wanted to make sure that, not being intimate with the site, they aren't limiting certain parts of the site because of that standard. He would be in favor of it, but he wants to make sure the site isn't limited because of it.

Commissioner Devine thought that was exactly what they are saying, that it is going to limit it by saying that.

Vice Chair Leal thought it wouldn't if they can still go 35 feet, and he is saying that part of site having basically a 10-foot building on it and avoiding that or a 15-foot building.

Chair Hauser asked if he was open to the 35 setback on the east site.

Vice Chair Leal responded positively.

Chair Hauser thinks, regarding the height, what everyone is saying kind of coalesces once you set that setback. She was totally open to a five-foot setback on the other two frontages which sounds fair. She stated that she said parking would be the same and no one jumped on it so she assumes that is okay. She stated open space per unit and lot coverage. She didn't think anyone has commercial in mind. She stated that she thinks this one is almost more like the Oceana High School site where they have the 400 square foot of open space per unit. She thought they have concurrence. She stated that was only 40% lot coverage and she feels like they can do 50% lot coverage here.

Commissioner Devine asked, at 50% lot coverage, are they still in the 80-unit range.

Planning Director Murdock thinks height becomes a factor.

Vice Chair Leal thought the point mentioned earlier was that the next slide they will be talking about 801 and, if they go up in height on that one, depending on what height limitations they add, it could be sandwiched where they have a view out the back of the hillside behind them and the backyards of those homes up there, and then in front of them, they have the back of a building. He thought, in taking that into consideration, the height is going to be the sticking point of whether they can get 80 into this parcel or not.

Commissioner Devine is looking at this image and trying to envision the slope from the Pavilion up and going. She stated that they aren't talking about 801 now, but if they do 35 feet at 801, this becomes a little bit more of a challenge.

Chair Hauser stated she would be amendable to the higher height at 801 that they have on the adjacent front. She stated that, if you look at it, you can do a really tall building at the base of the

property line and they are setting it at the finish grade of the adjacent property and if you extrapolate that to the flat part of Pavilion of Flowers, she thought you are getting a much higher building.

Commissioner Devine thought it would look strange if they weren't coordinated. She stated that it is not that huge of an area.

Chair Hauser stated that she is tending toward a much lower lot coverage on the one with all the trees and hope they save a lot of the trees, and a much higher lot coverage on the asphalt parking lot.

Commissioner Devine thinks they get that no matter what just because of the way 801 is currently.

Chair Hauser asked if she was good with the 400 square feet of open space for 751.

Commissioner Godwin stated that his feeling is they probably planned too many units on this 751 Oceana and he would rather reduce the number of units and keep the open space and lot coverage.

Chair Hauser thought Pavilion of Flowers was an add so you could put some of the density on that one.

Vice Chair Leal thought that would make more sense to him.

Chair Hauser stated that she will say lot coverage 50%, open space 400 per unit and call it a day as she feels that covers everything.

Commissioner Devine agreed.

Chair Hauser stated the next one.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Chair Hauser thought they were at 4-5 stories on this one with a lot coverage of 70.

Commissioner Devine thought that was looking practical.

Chair Hauser thought, on this one, maybe the open space goes to the 200, similar to the Caltrans site where up to 50 can be private, same parking standards and thinking no required commercial. She stated that just leaves setbacks.

Vice Chair Leal stated the small setbacks south.

Chair Hauser stated that was just a wall, but she would be amendable to a small setback here.

Vice Chair Leal questioned a wall, stating there is a street or a drive.

Chair Hauser stated that they can match the setbacks north of Milagra because it is still Oceana Blvd. She stated that they add for the Manor and Oceana Blvd. setbacks, and they had 5-10 foot setbacks on all public streets and she thinks they do 10-feet here.

Vice Chair Leal agreed to 10 feet.

Chair Hauser stated that a 10-foot front setback and again the 5-feet for the other three.

Commissioner Devine agreed.

Chair Hauser asked for any comments. She stated the next one.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Chair Hauser thought this was another good place for heights of 4-5 stories and they can have that theme as it is still Oceana with a 10-foot front setback and because it is parking lot around it and they can do the same 5-foot, 5-foot, 5-foot. She thought they can make this all residential as it is a really small parcel.

Planning Director Murdock asked her what the setback was along Oceana.

Chair Hauser stated 10-feet for both Site H and 5 feet for the other.

Commissioner Devine stated the total units for this site is 14. She is looking across the street and it is probably mostly single story and a couple of two-story houses, and she thinking not beyond four stories as that would be really stark. She stated that is unfortunate because it is a good corner site for something like that, but considering that is the only residential area in the totality of this site, it seems that it would be a quite jarring site.

Vice Chair Leal stated that what he likes about this one is east of this is a big ridge with 2-3 story apartment building up on top and he would say that the site lines from those homes when they look north towards this direction, they are already seeing homes on hills and he was more open to that, given that's the case. If it was just single family homes and flat land north and east of this, he may have a different opinion but that is how he views this site. It is a hillside behind the building on the northeast corner and there are apartments up on there already.

Chair Hauser kind of agrees with what he says, and she is also measuring in Google earth and it looks like the closest building, which is that out building across the way that is long and gray is like 90-95 feet away and she thinks it feels like a 55 or 60 foot building. She thinks there is so much like the road and the highland parking and setbacks, and she thinks it is probably okay. She was amenable to go to either.

Planning Director Murdock wanted to note that this site is within the Sharp Park Specific Plan and the portion of the planning area that the plan is in effect so this was considered as part of the overall Eureka Square Shopping Center and that planning process, high density, mixed use configuration, and to make it residential only would be carving out of that mixed use intent, and would be a deviation and they would have to amend the Sharp Park Specific Plan eventually in order to do that. He is trying to find the specific heights that were contemplated during that process.



Chair Hauser thought it was 55-foot in Eureka Square.

Planning Director Murdock thought that was relatively high, and more than 35 feet.

Commissioner Godwin is more comfortable with what they did with the Sharp Park Plan where it was a mixed use, 55-foot building and that seemed to fit in to this Eureka Square environment. He wasn't excited about this being a residential site by itself, being so small and being in the middle of a mixed use commercial shopping center. He thought they did better initially than what they are doing now.

Chair Hauser stated that, looking at the title software, they look like they are owned by different people and it is not technically part of it. She knows it was in the Sharp Park Specific Plan but it isn't currently the same owner. She is amenable to all residential.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, in the Specific Plan for Eureka Square, the height was 45-foot base height, additional 5-feet for every .075 floor area ratio increase in commercial uses up to a maximum of 55 feet, interpolated to the nearest 100. He stated that there was a range of 45-55 in that planning context. Greater height was tied to greater commercial and they were trying to find incentives to provide more commercial area. With or without commercial use, greater heights were considered in that site.

Commissioner Godwin stated that is what he is comfortable with.

Chair Hauser stated the more she is thinking about it, the more she is coming to his point of view. She would follow that.

Vice Chair Leal stated basically leave it as is in the Specific Plan.

Planning Director Murdock stated just describe some setbacks that work and program in at that level.

Chair Hauser thought they could have zero setbacks on the parking lot side but the setback would be as Oceana, and she asked if that was defined in the Sharp Park Specific Plan.

Planning Director Murdock stated he would have to spend a little more time looking as he doesn't recall. He heard the commissioner earlier say five feet on the side so he asked if they are down to zero on the parking lot side and 10-feet on Oceana.

Vice Chair Leal stated he would be okay with that as it is all just parking around it.

Chair Hauser stated she is getting rid of the 4-5 stories and just writing comport to Specific Plan except the setbacks.

Commissioner Devine asked how many has that been.

Chair Hauser stated that it is seven, and two more then they will reopen for public comment and then take a recess.

Planning Director Murdock clarified that on Site 20, it looks like there was an error in the underlying draft housing element in terms of the calculations based on site area and density, and he thought they could have a constructive conversation and it will be in that range of units, maybe a little less, probably not a little bit more, so they can go back to that or they can group that with the sites they will have to pick up next time that are not being considered at this meeting as there were two sites they could not include due to potential conflicts of interest.

Chair Hauser understood and stated that they can do one more and they can come back to 20 and then take public comment.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Chair Hauser questioned that asphalt parking lot is in the HPD but the one on Oceana is not. She feels this is an under-utilized. She would add more surface parking lot, and she asked if they are able to do that.

Planning Director Murdock stated that potentially, as the more they increase, the more they would have to check on how it aligns with the environmental review that is being pulled together for the rezoning based on these assumptions.

Chair Hauser asked why they wouldn't want to include the whole site in case the property owner wanted to take advantage of the new state laws where a religious organization can sell their land.

Planning Director Murdock stated it was up to the Planning Commission's discretion of how much of the site to recommend. He added that they assumed this amount for purposes of beginning the environmental review but he would have to check with their consultant if they could still change at this point in time. If there is interest, it is contingent on not derailing the environmental review process, and they can consider if more units could be appropriate. He stated that the caveat to that is that they need to assume a reasonable amount of housing development and determine the sites feasible. He has no reason to believe this entire site is prime for redevelopment and the church is in an overall good condition, no indication that they are looking to get out of the religious business so to speak. While there may be some viability to the state law, some call it YIGBY (yes, in God's back yard) and to his knowledge, it is not in effect yet and they don't know what the impact would be in Pacifica so he said, at a minimum, it is a conservative estimation for what could be achieved on the site.

Chair Hauser asked if anyone wants to start this off.

Commissioner Devine asked if anyone else is seeing height as an issue, because it is all single-family homes. She didn't know if she was being sensitive to that, but she is also not seeing a slope in this particular area in the church lot in comparison to the single family homes, and she asked if she is right in her assumption.

Commissioner Godwin thought she was correct.

Commissioner Devine stated she would say no higher than 35 feet.

Vice Chair Leal agreed with that.

Chair Hauser thought she agreed with that but she is trying to find out to clarify. She thought the density that staff has is 30 dwelling units per acre and she thought that makes sense. She might configure the lot in a different way so it makes use of the row of tenant parking stalls that goes north south and maybe reduce some of the poly line adjacent to the single-family homes.

Commissioner Godwin asked if the access to this site would be through the church parking lot.

Chair Hauser stated that the church would be the one selling the land so they would have to grant an easement.

Commissioner Godwin understood that is the assumption.

Chair Hauser thought, if they are open to selling their land for housing, they would be willing to provide an ingress/egress easement.

Planning Director Murdock stated another idea is that the church building is rather prominent and they maybe come up with a two-tier height option where maybe the interior half of the site could be 45 feet and the exterior maybe down to 25 or 35 feet to provide some greater density and flexibility where it is not going to be directly impacting the single family residences. More than likely, they wouldn't see the bigger buildings. They would see an immediate row of houses closest to them with a two-tiered height option.

Chair Hauser asked if it was true that religious institutions typically have a higher likelihood of providing lower or deeper levels of affordability.

Planning Director Murdock didn't know if that was a general rule, but he will say that they do often see lower income or supportive housing type uses as part of the mission of a lot of religious organizations. There may be just as many that sell land and profit from the market rate transaction that aren't immediately obvious as associated with a prior church ownership, so he couldn't say for sure. He stated that Good Shepherd Catholic Church, there is a supportive lower income housing development there as an example.

Chair Hauser stated that she would be amenable to going to a 45-foot or 4-story not adjacent to single family homes and then adjacent to single family homes would be the 35-foot with a very big setback. She stated that she will look at what they did for Linda Mar Shopping Center for those single family homes. She stated that it was a 30-foot setback to the adjacent single family homes and 3-story adjacent to that and up to 4-story as you go closer. She asked if that makes sense for everyone.

Commissioner Devine stated that she was looking at the eastern blue lines, the 92-feet, and she thought she was talking about 30 feet there.

Chair Hauser stated that it was a couple of things. She was hoping that the 92 feet could move leftward to where the 198 label is and then, instead of backing into all of that, 2-story residential behind. It could go up and take the asphalt parking lot up so it would be a more directly linear and more efficient area and she says a 30-foot setback on the west side and south side and beyond that part is a setback at the first end. The adjacent buildings have to be 35 feet and could go up to 45 feet. Then, the 5-foot setback for the other property line.

Commissioner Devine assumed for the interior.

Chair Hauser agreed.

Commissioner Godwin asked if she was envisioning two rows of townhouses.

Chair Hauser stated she was not sure what she was envisioning.

Commissioner Godwin stated he was trying to follow what she said.

Chair Hauser is envisioning that the depth of each parking space, which is about 20 feet, and another 10-feet is empty and there is no building in there. Then a 3-story element, whether that means it is 3-story garden apartments or 3-story townhomes or whatever. She didn't want to prescribe a building type but she thought that will create something natural and be consistent with what they talked about for the last stuff in June.

Commissioner Godwin was just trying to follow her logic, and he could understand when she was describing in more detail.

Chair Hauser thought being in a single family home or a condo that's two stories adjacent to a 5-story building is probably a concern

Commissioner Godwin thought most desirable.

Chair Hauser agreed, adding that there was no street like there was on the last Oceana site and that is where that 30-foot setback is coming from. She asked if that feels good.

Vice Chair Leal responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Godwin stated that strip of land was almost 93 feet wide and with a 30-foot setback you are talking maybe one row of housing.

Chair Hauser stated that they are going to look at moving the blue line so it goes like more a rectangle.

Vice Chair Leal likes that because you will have less of the housing adjacent to residential because you're making use of that upper left corner and she offered higher quality housing because they open up those views in the upper left corner as well which he assumed that gets over that water tank and be able to offer ocean views from there as well. He stated that the 30-foot setback is just against the adjacent residential properties, and if they shift that line to the 1 and 198.87, roughly around there, and they will be adjacent to what he sees at most five residential properties. He stated that looks like it's two units so he will call it seven.

Chair Hauser stated that is using the same parking that they have been talking about and this is one where they redo the site 25, the Skyline Caltrans open space and maybe 70% lot coverage on this one. She asked if that felt good. She asked if there were any other questions on this one. She stated that they can go back to 20.

Planning Director Murdock stated that there is a little bit more context here as well. They have a parcel that is just over 3/4 of an acre. The city is in discussions with Pacifica School District for a potential property swap or some sort of public joint venture for utilization of this site as well as some other school district owned property. He encouraged the Commission to think about this in a mixed use context, most likely ground floor office type mixed use in some fashion for potentially school district offices and then figuring out how housing project might be able to take shape above or around that on this site.

Vice Chair Leal wanted to clarify that the three parcels are all City of Pacifica owned.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Vice Chair Leal asked if, in terms of the numbers, parcel site is accurate for the three parcels.

Planning Director Murdock believed that parcel size to be accurate. The calculation of the assigned density didn't yield the right number of units and he has to double check our assumed density, i.e., is it that or just a bad calculation off of the density.

Chair Hauser thought that, on this one, they would want to do the same setback off of Oceana, probably based off of Milagra setback. This one is probably four stories, and maybe three stories on 104.

Commissioner Devine thought, if we could do that, that would be very considerate.

Chair Hauser is going to assume, if no one is raising a hand, they are happy with the proposal.

Commissioner Godwin stated that was fine.

Planning Director Murdock thought he missed the last part, as he heard 10-feet off of Oceana and Milagra, four stories, and he missed the next.

Commissioner Devine stated three stories at 104.

Vice Chair Leal asked about setbacks on Avalon at 104, suggesting ten.

Chair Hauser thought 10-feet but single family homes are really close to their lot line.

Vice Chair Leal stated, if they are going to keep limiting it to three, then he was okay with the very small setback. If they have a higher height, they should probably expand the setback.

Chair Hauser probably wouldn't go less than 15 which she thinks they did in the Sharp Park Specific Plan. She asked how wide lot 104 is. She added that she didn't want to kill the space.

Vice Chair Leal thought 116 and 120 were pretty close. He also doesn't want to apply standards to just the parcels they are looking at today that aren't unreasonable for the neighborhood. If houses are on top of each other, then that is the character of the neighborhood and he is okay with a small one.

Planning Director Murdock stated that 104 is about 68 feet wide.

Chair Hauser stated she is okay with the 10-foot setback by 116 and maybe it goes to 5 when you get to the church and the fire station.

Vice Chair Leal thought ten. He was looking between the houses and it is about ten.

Chair Hauser stated that they said 4 stories except 3 next to a single family home. She stated this is like a fully paved site with no trees and she is okay with a higher lot coverage and less open space here.

Commissioner Devine agreed.

Chair Hauser asked if they do 25 open space again. She stated 25 open space and like a 70% lot coverage.

Vice Chair Leal agreed.

Chair Hauser asked Planning Director Murdock if that will allow the project that he is envisioning.

Planning Director Murdock is looking back at Site 25 open space and his notes show 200 square feet usable open space per unit with a minimum of 25% private and up to 50% can be private.

Chair Hauser added with a 6-foot minimum dimension for private.

Vice Chair Leal stated that it was general standard that they are trying to apply for private open space, using the 6-foot minimum dimension.

Chair Hauser agreed, adding that they used the Site 25 for Site A as well which they just looked at. She feels that they answered all the six criteria for this lot. She asked if there are any other comments on the courtyard before she moves on.

Commissioner Devine stated no.

Chair Hauser then reopened public comment, as she doesn't know if anyone is on the phone or on Zoom.

Assoc. Planner Lin stated that they have one raised hand.

Remi Tan, Pacifica, referred to the parking, and shared his thoughts on the various possibilities. He then referred to setbacks, and asked they keep in mind that there is a set standard in different cities and less confusing for developers.

Chair Hauser closed public comment. She called a break and then reconvened the meeting. She then asked Planning Director Murdock to remind them how many sites they have left as she thinks there are some conflicts on a couple.

Planning Director Murdock thought they have four sites remaining, stating that he over counted at the beginning of the meeting and the good news is there are a fewer than anticipated.

Chair Hauser stated that they were being very efficient. She asked that they move on and have a goal to finish by 11:00 PM.

Planning Director Murdock thought they can do that on the staff side.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Chair Hauser asked, similar to the Caltrans right-of-way that they started with, if staff can provide them with a dimension of the width of the site.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is something along the lines of 160 feet toward the southern end and 180-190 feet at the northern end.

Commissioner Godwin asked if this site stops north of the access road for the quarry project and this would be added, as it looks like it does.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it does. He stated, for clarity, it isn't shown on the slide, but Caltrans' right-of-way actually jogs back towards Highway 1 and when you get to the point of the quarry access road, it is private property at that point with a small shoulder from the built portion of Highway 1.

Senior Planner Harkousha stated she would like to add that this property is located in the Hillside Preservation District.

Chair Hauser thought, depending on where you are, there is a pretty significant berm so no matter how high they make it, it's going to feel taller. She asked why they chose a site that is in the HPD,

Planning Director Murdock stated that they have a lot of housing units to plan for and they need to maximize area where they could reasonably be constructed, and the other part to the answer is that the Hillside Preservation District, in and of itself, doesn't regulate density or use and doesn't seek to limit the types of development that can occur and tries to preserve the slope areas and it encourages less coverage but greater heights in that trade-off for protecting the sloped areas.

Chair Hauser asked if it was a Coastal Commission zone.

Planning Director Murdock stated that this site is in the coastal zone and arguably would still be within the Coastal Commission's permitting jurisdiction at this time. He didn't want to confirm that point on the record, but the quarry overall is the private property component of that at minimum.

Commissioner Devine thought hillside preservation was one per five acre.

Planning Director Murdock stated that the Hillside Preservation District, in and of itself, doesn't establish density or land use, but establishes a formula for slope that determines how much land area you can cover and disturb the development.

Commissioner Devine wanted to clarify that, in the last study session, they were looking at this site across the street and they were talking about access.

Planning Director Murdock agreed, explaining that it was the Vallemar Station site.

Commissioner Devine stated they were talking about really big issues with access and how that really could only occur at that main intersection which they were looking at that entry into the quarry north lot and the school district on the other side of the highway. She was trying to envision the access to this parcel.

Commissioner Godwin stated that, from the north side, there is a stop light at that point and it should be pretty safe this way if you access the parcel from the north perimeter.

Commissioner Devine stated that a lot of people go in that parking lot and make U-turns to be able to go to the school, as that parking lot is jammed in the morning.

Commissioner Godwin stated that could be prohibited and probably will have to be if they develop this site. You probably have to require no entry on that site from at least one direction and probably two, so they would probably need cooperation from multiple groups to make this work.

Vice Chair Leal stated that time and a few other things which helps their act.

Commissioner Godwin stated that there was talk of making a tunnel under there at 1.2, for pedestrian access there has been a couple of ideas on how to make that more useful. He didn't know if any of them ever worked out.

Chair Hauser kind of concurs with Commissioner Devine on this and also thinks because it is in the coastal zone and asked staff to bring that the information on that. Because it isn't a coastal zone, it doesn't fall into the same that they have to determine the envelope now because it was discretion because it is still in the coastal zone and she assumed the Coastal Commission would have some level of discretion and she almost wants to say that they see what the CEQA study looks like.

Vice Chair Leal stated that the site reminds him of the first site they looked at, with one access point at the north, Hickey.

Chair Hauser stated that it does but Skyline doesn't have the same traffic issues as Highway 1 and she thinks this particular intersection is one of the worst intersections in the city.

Commissioner Devine stated that it may not have been in an official capacity but they became so frustrated with the site across the street and how impractical it was and they completely tabled it and she was looking at this and thinking how is this better and how does this work in this specific area next to this specific intersection. She is open to being enlightened.

Chair Hauser thought it was helpful that they have all these replacement places they are studying in the EIR because of all the sites they talked about, a lot of them have been difficult but only Vallemar Station and this one seem to be like she doesn't want to impose the same bucket. He



thinks they continue to study it in the EIR and get a definitive answer on the Coastal Commission's purview.

Planning Director Murdock thought part of the challenge is that, for the CEQA study, they need to have some sense of what the project is and they can't back into it using the CEQA process. They may need to assume a maximalist project here to determine what the maximum potential environmental impacts would be and consider standing back from that point, but he didn't know if they can defer decisions on that now because they need to get underway with the Environmental Review based on the assumptions that would be in this phase 1 rezoning.

Chair Hauser asked if that assumption the 122 units for the 60 dwelling units per acre or maybe she is misunderstanding.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is, but in terms of high lot coverage etc, if there was some resource that would be impacted on a small portion of the southern end of the site that wouldn't be developed, maybe that's not an impact but, if the site was 90% lot coverage, potentially it would and it was a simplistic example but having some sense of what the development would be is necessary to do the CEQA review.

Vice Chair Leal was leaning toward using similar numbers to what they did on the first one.

Chair Hauser asked if he wants to put 4-5 stories here.

Commissioner Devine was highly against that.

Vice Chair Leal stated, per what Planning Director Murdock just said, if they want to look at the study, then they go to the maximum use and that is what that would be. If they don't want to do that, then that's fine. He stated that was what he was going after. He stated that using what they have been talking about for other projects, limiting site lines of private properties is not blocking views, and it is straight hills on the eastern side and they don't have those considerations here. Going up, this is actually a good site for it. Regardless of the views of what is west of the property, he thinks some of the standards would apply to other parcels, and he is trying to think how they align to this one as well.

Commissioner Godwin agrees with Vice Chair Leal that, if they are going to be consistent, they should build something tall here. He knows it would be somewhat jarring to the community to do that, but he thinks that is what is most logical.

Vice Chair Leal stated that they aren't building anything at this time, and he is just clarifying his point.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he was just saying that they could zone it such that this kind of project is a possibility.

Planning Director Murdock stated that a couple of other points of reference for the Commission are, as mentioned, the HPD, and he will leave it to them to conclude whether this is a prominent hillside but, for whatever reason, the HPD overlay applies to the site and, among its purposes is to minimize disturbance even at the expense of greater height. He stated that is a tradeoff that is already included in the HPD overlay. He stated that the other factor is that, to the extent that they

have heard public input and believe there may be travel cultural resources, for example, minimizing the horizontal impact to the site could provide the offsetting benefit of minimizing potential impacts to those resources, particularly if they could do some on the ground study at the project level were it to occur to figure out that they think the fewest resources or no resources are here and use this as a footprint and build up. He stated that there are a couple of factors that come into mind for him, and a third factor is a taller building located on the northern most portion of this site might lend itself to the most logical circulation pattern, concentrating around the existing signalized intersection and perhaps avoid some of the concerns that Commissioner Devine outlined about inbound and outbound circulation factors. He stated that those are three things he has in mind if he were to be thinking about how to plan for the site.

Chair Hauser asked if everyone would be willing to do what they did on Vallemar and come back to this one at the end, as she feels like there is pretty good divide on the Commission between their thoughts and she wants to be expeditious on the other three and come back to this one if they are amenable to it.

Commissioner Devine stated that she would definitely like the other commissioners to have comment on this site.

Chair Hauser suggested they come back to this one at the end and see how they want to proceed.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Commissioner Devine thought there was mixed use across the street at 35 feet. She stated that there is Orange Theory on the bottom and apartments on top. She didn't know if there are townhouses above.

Senior Planner Harkousha thought there are.

Commissioner Devine thought it would be great to marry and try to go with similar development standards. She added the tree line along the back of the site also.

Chair Hauser felt that 4-stories would be appropriate here, but not next to the single family homes. They would do the same kind of thing they have done.

Vice Chair Leal thought that was a motel.

Commissioner Devine asked if the 500 block is a motel.

Vice Chair Leal agreed.

Planning Director Murdock stated that 510 is a single family residence but 500 is a single story detached motel rooms.

Vice Chair Leal stated commercial use.

Chair Hauser was amenable to going 4 stories here. She likes the idea of having bigger setbacks.

Commissioner Devine asked if along San Pedro or along the tree line.

Chair Hauser stated both, i.e., comport to the setback at 560 which she believes is the Ace Hardware and they just line up to that whatever that setback is. She stated that it looks like 20. She stated having a typical backyard setback which she believes is 20 feet in Pacifica to stay out of the tree line. She can see 70% coverage.

Commissioner Devine asked if it would be another mixed use situation.

Chair Hauser likes the idea of not disallowing it, especially if they are going 4 stories for a 30-dwelling unit per acre products. She stated that there is no commercial max FAR but mixed use allowed.

Commissioner Devine thought there was a lot of interest in this area of town when it comes to restaurants, dining, etc.

Vice Chair Leal stated just commercial uses as he didn't think the commercial places last long as when one goes out another business is coming in. He stated it is a low vacancy.

Chair Hauser assumed this would be the same parking as Ramallah Plaza which was commercial from the SP and the same residential.

Vice Chair Leal agreed.

Chair Hauser asked what they want the side setbacks to be, such as 5 feet.

Vice Chair Leal agreed.

Chair Hauser thought they answered all of those open space per dwelling unit. She feels it's the same as No. 25 which was like 250%, 25%.

Vice Chair Leal agreed.

Chair Hauser asked if he wanted her to reread that.

Planning Director Murdock thought he captured it, but he wanted to circle back on Commissioner Devine's height input. He thought she was inclined for a lower height limit and he heard a couple of commissioners talk about the higher height limit and he wanted to confirm the Commission's consensus on that.

Commissioner Devine asked if they talked about 3 along 500 and then going up to 4, or are they talking about 4 all the way.

Chair Hauser thought that was what she had proposed when she thought they were homes, but when it was a motel.

Commissioner Devine stated that, if they do 4 all across, she would propose maybe a 10-foot setback on the 500 because what those really are is not hotel rooms but elevated bungalows and they are considered higher end luxury stays.

Chair Hauser asked if they want to do a 3-story adjacent to them.

Vice Chair Leal stated he would rather do a 10-foot setback.

Commissioner Devine thought that was more appropriate, give them a little more space and opportunity for some landscaping to create a buffer there. She thought it sounds silly, but if you drive by it, you'll see what I'm saying.

Vice Chair Leal stated that they are nice places.

Commissioner Devine agreed.

Chair Hauser thought that was very fair.

Vice Chair Leal concluded 4 stories and 10-foot setback to the west.

Chair Hauser agreed, adding 5-foot to the east and 20-foot to the front and back.

Commissioner Devine thought that looks good.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Chair Hauser stated she would literally be amenable to doing the same thing and reestablishing the setbacks for the east and west.

Commissioner Devine thought they were talking more mixed use.

Chair Hauser agreed, not required but permitted.

Commissioner Devine agreed. She asked if this was privately owned property.

Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Vice Chair Leal stated the eastern setback on Highway 1 would be ...

Chair Hauser stated that is the thing they need to talk about, i.e., what the west setback and she thought they do 5-feet there and you have 10 feet between the buildings on the site and she asked what they think on the east.

Commissioner Godwin stated in front of that is the parking area for the access trail and he thinks there is a pump house.

Vice Chair Leal stated that there is some parking where the cars are, north of the pump house.

Chair Hauser thought the setback is matching the building that is already there and she thinks it will be unless they call it more of the same.

Commissioner Godwin stated there was talk at one point of putting one of the OSV vehicles there and he didn't know whether that was ever resolved.

Chair Hauser thought that was north of where the cars are shown.

Commissioner Godwin didn't know if there would be any access issues for that.

Vice Chair Leal believes the discussion there was it would be a pull through site where they would enter through the drive \_\_\_\_ parking and pull through past the pump house. He thinks that's were they settled, but maybe they can ask later what the status is on that one because that one was in Coastal Commission's jurisdiction.

Commissioner Godwin didn't know how it finally came out. That was one answer they proposed but he didn't know if it was the final answer.

Planning Director Murdock didn't remember if that one had a pull-through design offhand, but at least there were two spaces that permit has been appealed to the Coastal Commission and is still pending action by the Coastal Commission.

Commissioner Godwin just wanted to mention it when they discuss this site to see if it was impactful or not. He thought it sounds like it's not.

Chair Hauser likes the idea of a 10-foot or 15-foot east setback if there is a trails there so it feels public.

Vice Chair Leal asked if they were doing 20 feet against 35. He added that on the other parcels on Highway 35 they were doing about 20 feet and he asked what they thought about that for this one.

Chair Hauser stated that, on Skyline, they were doing 30 to 40 feet to be consistent with what was further south at Sharp Park, but she feels like that is probably too big for this. She wouldn't mind going to 20 feet. She stated that you would have 20 feet at San Ped to 20 feet to the east and 20 feet along the rear.

Commissioner Devine stated, in a perfect world, they could do 30 but she didn't think it is going to work for this particular location. She asked if it would be crazy to do 20 and then tear it up, maybe go 3 and set it back to 4. She asked if that is unnecessary in that area, but she was just thinking about the trail and how often it's utilized as it's quite small. She stated that there are a lot of mountain bikers on that trail as well.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he has done some work in relation to planning for that future coastal trail alignment, and the way the right-of-way is configured there, it is very narrow and doesn't really provide much of an opportunity to create a safe and desirable trailhead. He thinks requiring a sufficient setback could protect that space for future discussions with the property owner or review during a development project to secure some additional land to crease a robust and quality trailhead opportunity.

Chair Hauser asked if she was hearing 30 from everyone.

Planning Director Murdock thought at least 20 for example.

Commissioner Devine suggested settling in the middle and say 25. She is trying to be reasonable.

Chair Hauser agreed. She stated all development standards are the same as Site 30 except 5-foot west setback and a 25-foot east setback. She thought the next one is the last one on the list and they can go back to No. 26.

Senior Planner Harkousha continued the staff report.

Chair Hauser feels like this is another scenario where the blue line kind of makes the setbacks, and she didn't think they needed to have any setbacks from here.

Commissioner Devine agreed. She stated that the teacher development project is already moving forward and is going to be adjacent to this.

Chair Hauser stated no, that it is by Frontierland to the north. She stated that it just south of the park mall. She asked if there was an opportunity for an assemblage with the Park Mall site and she felt like there is a lot more flat empty area here.

Planning Director Murdock stated his hope would be that this would become part of a re-envisioned Park Mall and a future development scenario. He stated that it was speculative but one can hope. He stated that all they can do now is to plan for this site but not do anything that would preclude it from being associated with Park Mall in the future. He stated that one of the key issues on this site is the proximity of creeks on two sides of the property and assuming that the 100-foot creek setback as set forth in the General Plan and they tried to under program this site to provide some flexibility for those ecological resources, as well as planning for access on and through the site. He thought it could potentially accommodate more units but they shouldn't lose sight of the potential for biological resource constraints or other factors to come up at the project level.

Chair Hauser asked if they missed Park Mall, as she was looking through her notes and she didn't think they did Park Mall.

Planning Director Murdock didn't believe they have because the site doesn't require rezoning at this point and they had to prioritize if for this site discussion at this time.

Chair Hauser understood that Park Mall is not being upzoned.

Planning Director Murdock stated that it is not proposed to be at this point in time. He stated he didn't have the answer to one question which is whether they will have the time to do a similar process for sites that are not proposed for rezoning. He would love to do that if they can, but it is already a heavy lift ticket through the rezoning sites and the time they have available.

Chair Hauser concluded that they were saying that this is on the sites with existing capacity for housing.

Planning Director Murdock if it was the sight they are talking about now.

Chair Hauser stated Park Mall is on that list.

Planning Director Murdock stated she was correct, i.e., existing capacity in the General Plan update, and it was designated mixed use neighborhood which had up to 30 units per acre for the site.

Chair Hauser stated that she would say zero setbacks but you just match the Park Mall standards.

Planning Director Murdock thought part of the challenge is that they don't yet have standard mixed use neighborhood zoning and it would be helpful to get some sense of height that might be appropriate here.

Vice Chair Leal asked about things around the Sharp Park Specific Plan leveraging back here.

Planning Director Murdock thought 45 feet would be consistent height that was considered for mixed use neighborhood in the Sharp Park Specific Plan where they got to a mixed use center which was up to 50 units per acre and they talked about up to 55 feet in height but he would say 45 generally aligns with a mixed use neighborhood designation.

Vice Chair Leal thought across the street is the senior housing apartments across the street and is above street level and 3 stories on top of that, and considering the street level parcel which he believes this one is, it probably gets to about 45 feet. In terms of mixed use blending in with that neighborhood or general area, it wouldn't be entirely out of character.

Planning Director Murdock thought, from a scale and massing standpoint, their main consideration is 725 Oddstad single family residence there, not to downplay one resident's experience but it is one housing unit as compared to many of the other sites where they had multiple proximate single family residences. It was a tradeoff for the Commission to consider in terms of height.

Chair Hauser thought this is one where she thought it would comport to CEQA but this is one where she might move that 103 line further north and then go to 3 stories, like a lower lot coverage so it is more consistent.

Planning Director Murdock asked if she means lower height but greater lot coverage.

Chair Hauser stated that she would make the dark blue line narrower to keep away from the southern creek and wider parallel to Park Mall Shopping Center and would lower the density on it.

Vice Chair Leal thought he would make it more narrow.

Chair Hauser thought it was already pretty narrow. She would keep the narrowness, the 109 and 103 feet but she would extend the length, i.e., instead of the 199, she might make it 300 feet but then have 3 stories instead 4 stories, next to a single family home.

Commissioner Devine thought she was talking about extending it further back into the hillside. She thought, if that was a possibility, that would be much more attractive and conforming for this neighborhood.

Chair Hauser stated that they could still do the amount of units covered in the EIR, thus the same amount of units but would just have more open space.

Vice Chair Leal asked if that tree line they are looking at is the western part of the property and he thought that is the creek and the further you push it back on the parcel, he thinks they get closer to the creek on that back left which is a challenge that staff was describing earlier as it is on two sides, on the rear and the west side.

Chair Hauser stated she was open and she didn't think 4 stories goes well here. She thought it does sit lower than the Park Mall but, if the Park Mall is 30 dwelling units an acre, she would rather do this at 30 dwelling units an acre on a little bit more land and get to the same 16 units and have them be a 60-lot coverage. She asked Vice Chair Leal wants to do 4 stories.

Vice Chair Leal stated that he is okay with 35 feet as well, 3 stories. He feels like it is a transition out of the residential area into the more commercial area and he thinks it would fit if they can accomplish the amount of units with 35 feet.

Commissioner Godwin likes the idea that they do here whatever they are going to do in Park Mall so it is one kind of bigger area as a guideline.

Chair Hauser stated that it is 3 stories and 30 dwelling units an acre but still getting the same aggregate amount of units on a bigger blue poly line.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he is hearing aligned with what is likely to occur at Park Mall and he thought what was likely to occur there is probably 45-foot buildings.

Chair Hauser asked if that is not 3-story.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they don't have the zoning, but he is saying in the Sharp Park Specific Plan context, when they talked about mixed use neighborhood, it was really talking about 45-foot height developments. He thought perhaps a horizontal mixed use project could occur in Park Mall, and thought that is generally speaking 30 units per acre with mixed use with up to 45-foot heights. He didn't know if he would say it's a true statement to say that 35 feet would align with what is likely to happen at Park Mall. He hears and agrees that this is a somewhat transitional site and, maybe in its own right, 35 feet is acceptable and he would also need conformation that they are also talking about pushing the boundary deeper into the site perhaps to get the same number of units but a lower height.

Vice Chair Leal would be okay with pushing it deeper into the site, further away from the single family home if they can still hit the setbacks from the creek as he feels it is a limiting factor.

Chair Hauser stated that you can skinny up.

Vice Chair Leal understood if you made it more narrow.

Chair Hauser stated that is correct as you could increase the depth but make it more narrow so it's getting further from the creek but she is looking at 250 feet from the creek to the left and she feels



that is kind of overkill when it's the same creek that winds around the other side of that and she would move it 20 feet further in and let someone develop a row of homes or duplexes.

Planning Director Murdock understood narrower and wider.

Chair Hauser stated narrower and deeper.

Vice Chair Leal stated 35 feet height.

Commissioner Devine thought that would be ideal in this location if they can cap it there.

Chair Hauser stated less proximal to the creek on the south side. She would think 60-foot lot coverage.

Vice Chair Leal asked if she meant 60%, yes..

Chair Hauser agreed, 60% lot coverage, same parking standards as they established on all of them. She thought the poly line can determine the setbacks. She likes the zero setback on the top side and the setback from the single family home makes sense. She thought, for the open space, they can do the same thing as 25 or they can do more open space but she thought by making sure the polygon is far enough from the creek as they are kind of hitting the open space already and she might do the 200 with the 50, 25.

Chair Hauser stated no as she didn't think they are able to get successful commercial as it is not off of Oddstad. The building would be behind a single family home and she didn't think anyone is going to want ... she thought there was grade change from Park Mall and you can only drive down.

Planning Director Murdock thought they might want to revisit this site if a redevelopment of Park Mall seemed imminent and was proposed and they were able to acquire this property, for example, but that is a lot of ifs. If they are thinking about the site now, probably residential only project makes sense.

Chair Hauser stated that was the last one and now they go back to No. 26. She stated that the question that came up in her mind when they were doing the other ones is that she feels like there is a view corridor here that they would impact, as if they are putting buildings here she didn't think a 60-dwelling unit an acre.

Vice Chair Leal stated there are a lot of challenges with this site, one is the intersection which approximate to the highway in the coastal zone.

Chair Hauser stated it is on top of a berm.

Vice Chair Leal stated it is also next to the wastewater treatment plant which might not be the most desirable place to live, especially if they put it towards the north end of that site to meet the HPD intensions of minimizing site disturbance. There are a lot of challenges for the site and he asked what their options are.

Commissioner Devine stated it is very difficult to imagine driving south on Highway 1 and going from no developments on either side of the highway in this area, understanding that there is 4300, 4320 and the Gorilla BBQ in Vallemar Station area and seeing this massive development, she thought that was part of the public perception around this plan that is really difficult to digest. She stated that, being completely honest, it is also really difficult for her to digest it. She apologized for being a stickler on the Vallemar site but she doesn't see this as a practical building area for mostly emergency access reasons but increasing the population and the traffic. She can't foresee how this fits or works.

Chair Hauser has a question for staff which is kind of what Commissioner Devine had asked at the end before they jump to the next one. Because it seems that they are pretty split and they still have two more that need to go through, she asked if they want to wait until they have more commissioners to discuss this and will it mess up the environmental process.

Planning Director Murdock didn't think so. He stated that they have the necessity to get through at least the two other sites and they will hopefully be having another conversation soon and he thought they could package this one up and, if there is any further thinking they can do or factors to consider that they can present, they can bring those at that time and that might help this version of the conversation.

Vice Chair Leal asked if an option is on the table that this gets removed from the list.

Planning Director Murdock stated potentially, but the only challenge is it is a lot of units and they would have to see what the tradeoffs might be elsewhere, depending on the impact to our unit count and our buffer. He stated that this might be one that has more challenges than are worth trying to solve in this type of process at this point in time.

Vice Chair Leal stated he wasn't present for the prior meeting where the Vallemar site was discussed and he doesn't have the context, but he wants to play it through, i.e., they can't remove it from the list, and where do they end up on this site if they have to provide guidance as to what it looks like. He is trying to figure out whether, if they postpone it, it will be a similar conversation or do they have options.

Planning Director Murdock stated that one benefit of postponing it is that they will have some time to think about whether they would want to do this with no net loss in the document and where might those units go. He stated that is one benefit to postponing and they can have time to think about that. They also have the benefit of other commissioners' input that might see the challenge in a different way and provide some paths forward for the Commission to consider.

Vice Chair Leal assumes that, if they can't remove it from the list, they have to provide guidance around height, setbacks, parking, etc., and they get other comments from other commissioners. He stated that there are four of them now and they can provide that feedback if they can't remove it from the list. He wanted to understand, if they can't remove it from the list, what feedback they want to provide under the assumption they are going to postpone this to a future meeting, as they still need to be prepared to come back with feedback if they cannot remove it from the list. That is where he is now and he is trying to provide feedback but he hopes they can remove it from the list as, based on the five issues he mentioned, it is a hard site.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, to be clear, they can remove it from the sites list. The question is whether they are able to just remove it or do they need to add some or all of these units back someplace else. He stated, while they can remove it from the sites list, he doesn't know at this time is what other sites they need to revisit as a consequence and what tradeoffs they might have to accept in order to remove this site. He hoped that helps.

Vice Chair Leal stated that it does. He was in favor of adding this to the list of ones they have to come back to with those other sites with that additional information so they can come to an agreement.

Chair Hauser promised one more public comment period and, thus, she would like to reopen public comments.

Assoc. Planner Lin stated that there is one hand raised.

Remi Tan, Pacifica, referred to the sites around San Pedro, and shared his thoughts about the parcels there being mixed use and made professional recommendations. He then shared his thoughts and recommendations on the Oddstad site by the Park Mall. He referred to his previous comment on the quarry site, and shared his further thoughts on the site.

Chair Hauser closed public comments. She had a thought following his comment regarding the Ace and Pedro Point sites, and she realized that she wanted to go back to the standard they established at the June meeting when they talked about height and were speaking in stories. She thought she heard Planning Director Murdock say 45 feet a couple of times but all the feedbacks they have given for all the sites they have gone through so far has been based on stories and she wants to be sure that is what comes out of this study. She stated that dovetails into her last comment which is about the staff report where it included the Sharp Park Specific Plan standards which included a minimum commercial height for mixed use and she wanted to be sure that, in suggesting those standards, that kind of stuff carries through.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he heard earlier in the meeting that there is a desire to add on whatever of those objective standards are in the Sharp Park Specific Plan and fill in some of the gaps not covered by the six broader objective standards and they will try to formulate that in their follow up work. He stated that the only question he has related to the height guidance is that they talk in terms of stories and feels like he did hear 35 feet in a lot of contexts but above 35 feet, he hear 4 or 5 stories and is a bit internally inconsistent and confusing to him because 4 stories can be well above 45 feet and he didn't know if that is acceptable to the Commission. They did talk in the Sharp Park Specific Plan in terms of stories and in terms of 45, 50, 55 feet. They may need some more guidance at the staff level to understand what the limits are and, in the mixed use context, multiple stories might actually result even higher building heights if you have a 15-foot minimum first floor heights and then residential heights of 3-4 stories above that which could be 45 to 55 feet or higher for a 4-story building. Staff wants to make sure they are carrying forward the guidance clearly from the Planning Commission.

Chair Hauser stated, at the last meeting in June, they were clear that 4 and 5 stories wasn't correlated to a height, and they aren't going to get commercial, stating all the Sharp Park Specific Plan conversations that they really deliberated over but she agrees that there were several times when they threw 35 feet out at this meeting instead of 3 stories and she asked if the

Commission wanted to make it clear that it is 3 stories/ She didn't think there were any sites where they had mixed use and were suggesting 35 feet.

Vice Chair Leal stated he said 35 feet multiple times at this meeting and his intention in that statement was that is our current height limit in the city and was using that to say the current height limitations in the city seem sufficient for this development. He stated most recently they talked about it for the one on Oddstad and that was all residential.

Chair Hauser thought, if you have 3 stories and do 35 feet, it is not going to be the same aesthetic. You might not achieve the same high quality architecture that you would get if you allowed for additional height because she thought a lot of the gabled roof when you have a lower pitches or when you set flat roofs it ends up looking somewhat like and economical construction. She thinks they should talk about it with everybody but her preference would be to make it stories and not feet.so they could get more steep gabled roofs that would look pretty.

Planning Director Murdock stated he would caution, as an objective standard, a story doesn't provide any sort of quantitative limit on the height, i.e., you could have a 4-story building that is 60 feet tall and he didn't know if that is consistent with the intent of the Planning Commission and there may need to be some thought of 4 stories and no greater than a particular height if they want to be more flexible than 45 feet or limit that from the top of the plate to top of ridge to get different types of roof designs but not allow a building mass per se of the usable space to be greater than a particular height. They may need to drill down a little more into that once they have this rough framework of relative heights at the different sites and figure out at the next meeting or in the course of preparing phase 1 objective standards what it really means to translate that into specific objective standards. He stated that it sounds like they aren't there yet, given the desire not to rely on 35-foot height limits, but will work to determine how mass and density can be sufficient to allow the needed densities while also ensuring quality architecture can be achieved. He stated that there may be multiple ways to do that.

Chair Hauser stated that, since this is just suggestions for staff to study and all the sites have to be brought back, the goal is to have a height limit and it's a really good point. She asked if staff wants to make some suggestions as to what 3, 4 and 5 stories equate to and what they equate to when you have the Sharp Park Specific Plan minimum commercial plate.

Planning Director Murdock thought there was more study and refinement that is needed. He thinks they have a sense of relative height and intensity of buildings for these various sites, and they need to iterate on that and translate it into a story and foot height limit for these sites.

Chair Hauser asked if there were any further comments. She thanked staff for bearing with them as it has been a big process.

Planning Director Murdock thanked them for the thoughtful feedback.

**COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

Planning Director Murdock stated that City Council considered the NCCWD appeal on August 14. Commissioner Wright served as Planning Commission liaison and, in his absence tonight, he would briefly report the City Council denied the appeal in part and upheld the appeal in part, ultimately approving the project. Notable changes included allowing angled parking and the third driveway on Clarendon Road subject to obtaining all required approvals to relocate the bus stop.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business for discussion, Vice Chair Leal moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:21 p.m.; Commissioner Devine seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Devine, Godwin, Leal and Chair Hauser
Noes:	None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina  
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

---

Planning Director Murdock