

**RESOLUTION NO. 2024-006**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PACIFICA APPROVING SPECIFIC PLAN SP-181-23 AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PSD-863-23 (FILE NO. 2023-005), SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A 3,324-SQUARE FOOT (SF), THREE-STORY, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A 460-SQUARE FOOT (SF) ATTACHED GARAGE ON AN APPROXIMATELY 5,618-SF UNDEVELOPED PARCEL IN THE P-D (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT) ZONING DISTRICT AT 327 BEAUMONT BOULEVARD (APN 009-037-470) AND FINDING THE PROJECT EXEMPT FROM THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA).**

---

Initiated by: William Ogle (“Applicant”).

**WHEREAS**, an application has been submitted for the construction of a 3,324 square foot (sf), three-story, single-family residence, 460 square foot (sf) attached garage, on a 5,618-sf vacant lot at 327 Beaumont Boulevard (APN 009-037-470); and

**WHEREAS**, the project is located in the P-D (Planned Development) Zoning District and requires approval of a specific plan prior to issuance of a building permit because development in the P-D district must demonstrate proper orientation, desirable design character, and compatible land uses (Pacifica Municipal Code (PMC) Section 9-4.2202; and

**WHEREAS**, the project exceeds the allowable floor area in PMC Section 9-4.3201(d) and requires approval of a site development permit prior to issuance of a building permit; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission of the City of Pacifica did hold a duly noticed public hearing on April 29, 2024, at which time it considered all oral and documentary evidence presented, and incorporated all testimony and documents into the record by reference.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Planning Commission of the City of Pacifica as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct and material to this Resolution.
2. In making its findings, the Planning Commission relied upon and hereby incorporates by reference all correspondence, staff reports, and other related materials.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of Pacifica does hereby make the finding that the project qualifies for a Class 3 exemption under CEQA. Guidelines Section 15303(a), as described below, applies to the project:

Class 3 consists of construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures; installation of small new equipment and facilities in small structures; and the conversion of existing small structures from one use to another where only minor modifications are made in the exterior of the structure. The numbers of structures described in this section are the maximum allowable on any legal parcel. Examples of this exemption include but are not limited to:

(a) One single-family residence, or a second dwelling unit in a residential zone. In urbanized areas, up to three single-family residences may be constructed or converted under this exemption.

The subject proposal to construct a single-family residence fits within the scope of a Class 3 categorical exemption. Specifically, the project (1) includes one single-family residence; (2) is located in an area where the Pacifica Municipal Code authorizes single-family residential uses; and, (3) will be undertaken within an urbanized area.

All areas within the City Limits of the City of Pacifica qualify as an urbanized area for the purposes of CEQA pursuant Public Resources Code Section 21071 because (1) Pacifica is an incorporated city; (2) Pacifica had a population of 37,234 persons as of the 2010 U.S. Census; and, (3) the population of Pacifica combined with the contiguous incorporated city of Daly City (population 101,123 persons as of the 2010 U.S. Census) equals at least 100,000 persons. For the foregoing reasons, there is substantial evidence in the record to support a finding that the project is categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines,.

Additionally, none of the exceptions to application of an exemption contained in Section 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines apply to the project, as described below:

- Sec. 15300.2(a): There is no evidence in the record that the project will impact an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern in an area designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, State, or local agencies.

The project site is located within a substantially developed residential neighborhood, and is not in an environmentally sensitive area, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, State, or local agencies. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact on the environment..

- Sec. 15300.2(b): There is no evidence in the record that successive projects of the same type in the area would have a significant environmental impact.

The project involves construction of a new single-family residence within a substantially developed residential neighborhood and staff is aware of no evidence of similar projects in the area causing a significant impact on the environment either alone or cumulatively with other projects in the vicinity.

- Sec. 15300.2(c): There is no evidence in the record of any possibility that the project would have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

The project fits within the development pattern in this area. There is no evidence to indicate the site has any value as critical habitat. Therefore, there are no unusual circumstances applicable to the project.

- Sec. 15300.2(d) through (f): The project is not proposed near a scenic highway, does not involve a current or former hazardous waste site, and, does not affect any historical resources.

The provisions of subsections (d) through (f) are not applicable to this project.

Because the project is consistent with the requirements for a Class 3 exemption and none of the exceptions to applying an exemption in Section 15300.2 apply; therefore, there is substantial evidence in the record to support a finding that the project is categorically exempt from CEQA.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of Pacifica does hereby make the following findings pertaining to Specific Plan SP-181-23:

A. *That the specific plan is consistent with the approved development plan.*

Discussion

An approved development plan contains a list of approved uses for an area with P-D zoning. The approved uses in a development plan are then implemented with approval of one or more specific plans which specify the site layout, architectural design, and other detailed parameters of individual projects proposed for construction.

Due to the age of the Fairmont Unit No. 2C development in 1965, staff was unable to locate the original development plan for the neighborhood. Staff has inferred from the type and pattern of development observed throughout the neighborhood that a detached, single-family residence of the type proposed with this project is consistent with the approved development plan for the area. No uses other than detached, single-family residential uses are present in this neighborhood. Staff's inference is supported also by a review of eight specific plan approvals granted by the Planning Commission between 1990 and 2015 for projects along Beaumont Boulevard. All of the projects were single-family residences of the type proposed in the subject application. Therefore, staff recommends that the Planning Commission find the proposed project consistent with the approved development for the site.

B. *That the specific plan is consistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines.*

Discussion

The City has adopted Design Guidelines which are intended to accomplish the following purposes:

- Ensure at least a minimum standard of design through the application of consistent policies.
- Encourage new construction which exceeds minimum standards and discourage construction which falls short of those standards.
- Provide a framework for review and evaluation of design proposals.
- Implement applicable General Plan and Local Coastal Plan goals and policies.
- Expedite and facilitate the planning permit process.
- Provide direction for design and redesign of projects.

The Design Guidelines are advisory in nature and, unlike zoning, do not contain explicit standards for determining strict compliance. Rather, they address significant elements of project design that, when balanced overall, result in the best possible site layout and building architecture for a project. An applicant may propose a project which complies with some but not all guidelines and the Planning Commission may still find the project consistent with the Design Guidelines. It is up to the Commission's discretion to determine

the appropriate balance and relative priority of the guidelines for a particular project when considering whether a project has achieved Design Guidelines consistency.

Staff's assessment of the project is that the proposed improvements at the site are consistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines. Major areas of project consistency with the Design Guidelines include the following (Design Guidelines guidance followed by staff discussion):

#### SITE PLANNING

- i. *Site Improvements. Locate site improvements such as buildings, parking areas and walkways to take advantage of desirable features [...] Lot grading should be minimized and disruption of natural features such as trees, ground forms, rocks and water courses should be avoided.*

#### Discussion

The project proposes to construct a three-story building into a steep hillside. The extreme slope of the site has resulted in a project at the maximum height allowable under the zoning standards, although the project will remain consistent with similarly developed residences in the vicinity. The project proposes stepping back into the hillside similarly to surrounding residences to minimize impact on views from the public right-of-way.

- i. *Building Location. [...] Building placement should take into account potential impacts of adjacent properties. Existing views, privacy and solar access of surrounding properties should be preserved wherever possible.*

#### Discussion

Development surrounding the subject site includes a single-family residence on the adjacent lot to the southeast, a single-family residence on higher elevation to the northeast, and single-family residence across Beaumont Boulevard to the southwest. The lot adjacent to the subject property, 325 Beaumont Boulevard, approved on February 1, 2016, was constructed and finalized in 2023. The subject project will not adversely impact views, privacy, or solar access for 325 Beaumont Boulevard, due to the orientation of the project angled and situated to its right property line such that sufficient horizontal separation will be present to allow outward views from the site and sunlight to enter the site.

The project will not impact views, privacy, and solar access of the residence to the northeast as that residence is located on higher ground. The decks in the front portion of the proposed building are approximately 75 feet away from the residence across the street, with properties in the vicinity on the upslope side of the street having similar views of the downslope property. As such, construction of the proposed project will not introduce new privacy concerns for that property. The residence adjacent to the proposed building on the southeastern side includes windows on the first floor on the side facing the project. While the proposed residence does have windows on the east side, some of these side windows will be partially shielded from view with the natural grade of the slope.

- ii. *Lighting. Exterior lighting should be subdued, and should enhance building design as well as provide for safety and security. Lighting which creates glare for occupants or neighbors should not be used. In general, large areas should be illuminated with a few low shielded fixtures. Tall fixtures which illuminate large areas should be avoided.*

#### Discussion

The proposed lighting is unlikely to create glare for the neighbors through a combination of downlights installed on the exterior soffits and scones near the entry door and walkway alongside the exterior side steps leading up to the rear deck patio. The applicant has included locations and light specifications on the exterior lighting plan sheet (Sheet A1.7 of Attachment C of the staff report).

#### BUILDING DESIGN

- iii. *Design. The style and design of new buildings should be in character with that of the surrounding neighborhood. This does not mean that new buildings should be identical to existing buildings on neighboring lots, but that new buildings should complement, enhance, and reinforce the positive characteristics of surrounding development. This can be accomplished by incorporating the dominant architectural features of an area into the design of new development. Such features may include bay windows, chimneys, balconies, porches, roof shapes, and other architectural details and materials.*

#### Discussion

The proposed building is similar in style to adjacent buildings on Beaumont Boulevard, which are also built into and stepped back on the hillside. The proposed project uses retaining walls and steps, which enhances its compatibility with the surrounding structures. The project also took into consideration the design that was previously approved back in 2019 for this site. The topography of the project site is the dominant factor driving the design choices for the project.

- iv. *Scale. An important aspect of design compatibility is scale. Scale is the measure of the relationship of the relative overall size of one structure with one or more other structures. Scale is also used to refer to a group of buildings, a neighborhood, or an entire city. A development can be "out of scale" with its surroundings due to its relative height, bulk, mass, or density.*

#### Discussion

The proposed building would appear in scale with the surroundings because, overall, the size and height of the proposed structure is similar to buildings in the vicinity. The proposed project's height would be specifically similar to the single-family residence approved for construction at 325 Beaumont Boulevard (34'-6"), and the 2019 approved single-family residence on the subject site of 35'-0" tall.

Among the six existing homes within 300 feet of the project site on the north side of Beaumont Boulevard which staff has referenced as a basis for comparison of building design, four are constructed at the same scale as the proposed project. These four homes have excavated to create garages at the ground floor and have second and third story living

area. The residences approach the maximum 35 feet building height for the zoning district as a result of their orientation on lots with steep slopes.

The proposed project will have a ground floor garage and living area with additional living areas above at the second-story and third-story levels. The proposed project, when compared to those residences situated on lots most similar to the subject site, is in scale with the neighborhood.

- v. *Details. Use architectural features and details to help create a sense of human scale. Wall insets, balconies, window projections, etc., are examples of building elements which may help reduce the scale of larger buildings.*

#### Discussion

The proposed building is considered to be contemporary and characterized by clean surfaces and lines and simple geometry. The proposed building incorporates a significant number of windows on the front façade with decks located at the second and third floor of the building. The exterior door and windows are proposed to have minimal black frames.

Architectural features are incorporated as recommended in the Design Guidelines such as decks, staircases, and view windows to take advantage of the project's location near the ocean. Different exterior treatments of stucco and vertical wood cladding are utilized, and these elements combined with varied setbacks and heights help create visual interest.

- vi. *Materials. Compatibility of materials is an essential ingredient in design quality. In areas with either historic or architecturally significant structures, the use of similar exterior construction materials should be used in new construction in order to maintain neighborhood character. Consistency and congruity of materials and design elements on individual structures is also important.*

#### Discussion

Siding at the ground floor will be primarily white stucco with vertical wood cladding. At the second and third floors, the continuation of vertical wood cladding is complemented by fixed windows and three panel sliding doors. The second and third floor deck, as well as the upper patio deck have railing composed of glass. The color and material change integrates well and creates interest. The materials are consistent and appropriate modern architecture design.

- vii. *Color. Building color should be compatible with the neighborhood and should reinforce and complement the visual character of the building's environment. Multiple colors applied to a single building should relate to changes of material or form.*

#### Discussion

The proposed building integrates a combination of light-colored stucco, which would complement the existing environment of surrounding buildings, and natural-colored vertical wood cladding. The adjacent site (325 Beaumont) utilizes light-colored smooth stucco and natural-colored horizontal wood siding. The adjacent southeastern building (329 Beaumont) to the project site is darker with wood siding and wood railings that lead up to the upper stories of the building from street level.

- viii. *Privacy. Consideration should be given to the impact of development on the privacy of surrounding properties. Use judicious windows placement and appropriate landscaping to help minimize the potential for loss of privacy.*

Discussion

See discussion under “Site Planning” above.

- ix. *Consistency. There should be architectural consistency among all building elevations. All elevations need not be identical, but a sense of overall design continuity must occur. Window treatment and trim, for example, should be carried out around the entire building, not just on the most visible sides.*

Discussion

All sides of the proposed residence include usage of naturally finished concrete, stained wood, stain grade boards, accent wood slats with minimal black frames for exterior door and windows.

HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT

- ix. *Excavation. Large amounts of cut and/or fill are unattractive on hillsides, and can have a detrimental impact on the immediate and surrounding environment.*

*(a) Structures should relate to and follow site topography to work with the slope, not against it.*

*(b) Whenever feasible, buildings and roads should be sited to align with existing contours of the land.*

*(c) Retaining walls should be avoided or, if necessary, their height should be reduced to the minimum feasible.*

*(d) Avoid one-level solutions which would result in excessive lot coverage and more disruption of the site. Multi-level structures which step down the slope can help to minimize cut and fill.*

Discussion

The severe topography of the project site presents significant challenges to minimizing excavation. The applicant has proposed a multi-level design of three stories to avoid a one level solution that would have substantially increased the amount of grading. The living area steps up the slope to the maximum extent practicable with excavation occurring only where necessary. Where required, retaining walls have a profile of 1' to 14'-6 1/2" from the lower adjacent ground level. The retaining walls are terraced to minimize wall height and the tallest of them are located behind the residence with only limited sections visible from the public right-of-way. This trade-off reduces usable outdoor area for the applicant in order to minimize grading and the height of the retaining walls. Also, the majority of the proposed staircases have been designed to be on-grade, in order to minimize grading and not be subject to setback requirements.

The applicant has proposed a project which minimizes the need for grading and retaining walls to the maximum extent practicable while still complying with zoning requirements related to height, lot coverage, and landscaping.

#### INFILL DEVELOPMENT

- x. *Neighborhood Compatibility. Established neighborhoods often have strong design characteristics.*

*(a) Consideration should be given to the context of building design. Relate the height, bulk, style, material, and color of a structure to its surroundings. New development should complement the positive aspects of an existing neighborhood.*

*(b) Landscaping should also be chosen with consideration given to existing vegetation in the area. The use of plants which are similar to those of neighboring properties is encouraged.*

*(c) A design which has the potential to negatively impact a neighbor's view, sunlight, and/or privacy, should be avoided.*

#### Discussion

There are few strong design characteristics present among the residences nearby the project site. The proposed residence has incorporated the limited number of elements common to the existing structures within the neighborhood. Based on what common factors do exist, in particular the siting of the residence, architectural style, materials, and colors, the project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, especially buildings that were recently approved which have a modern, contemporary style and incorporate wood and stucco materials. The topography of the site, building design of adjacent residences will result in a project that will not negatively impact any neighbor's view, sunlight, or privacy.

Based on the foregoing, there is sufficient evidence to support approval of the Specific Plan.

#### **SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT**

Pursuant to Section 9-4.3204, a Site Development Permit cannot be issued if the Commission finds that the project would have one or more of following negative impacts (finding followed by staff discussion):

- A. *That the location, size, and intensity of the proposed operation will create a hazardous or inconvenient vehicular or pedestrian traffic pattern, taking into account the proposed use as compared with the general character and intensity of the neighborhood.*

#### Discussion

The proposed project would not substantially increase traffic since only one new residential unit is proposed. The new residential unit is part of an established subdivision and development pattern. The proposed development will provide adequate emergency access, and will have no effect on alternative transportation modes. Therefore, the location, size, and intensity of the proposed project will not create a hazardous or inconvenient vehicular or pedestrian traffic pattern.



- B. *That the accessibility of off-street parking areas and the relation of parking areas with respect to traffic on adjacent streets will create a hazardous or inconvenient condition to adjacent or surrounding uses.*

Discussion

The proposed land use will not result in a hazardous or inconvenient condition with respect to off-street parking areas. The proposed increase in housing would not substantially increase traffic since only one new residential unit is proposed. Vehicular access will be from Beaumont Boulevard which is a two-way street with sufficient width and visibility for safe ingress and egress from the site. The proposed garage and driveway satisfy code requirements and are easily accessible. Therefore, the proposed project will not create a hazardous or inconvenient condition to adjacent or surrounding uses.

- C. *That insufficient landscaped areas have been reserved for the purposes of separating or screening service and storage areas from the street and adjoining building sites, breaking up large expanses of paved areas, and separating or screening parking lots from the street and adjoining building areas from paved areas to provide access from buildings to open areas.*

Discussion

The proposed off-street parking, garbage and recycling containers, and storage areas would all be located in the residence and have no visual impacts. Adequate landscaping would exist along the periphery of the site, and extend into the public right-of-way in several different locations, to separate and screen the site from neighboring sites and the street. Therefore, sufficient landscaped areas have been reserved for the purposes of separating or screening service and storage areas from the street and adjoining building sites.

- D. *That the proposed development, as set forth on the plans, will unreasonably restrict or cut out light and air on the property and on other property in the neighborhood, or will hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof.*

Discussion

Despite exceeding the floor area threshold for a single-family dwelling set forth in PMC sec. 9-4.3201(d), the scale and massing of the proposed residence are appropriate for the site and surrounding area and are consistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines. Appropriate setbacks for the residence will ensure that there are no light and air impacts to surrounding properties, should these properties eventually be developed. The project also will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof, since the proposed single-family residence is a use consistent with and will be constructed at a scale consistent with the existing development pattern in the neighborhood. Therefore, the project will not unreasonably restrict or cut out light and air on the property or on other properties in the neighborhood or hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood or impair the value thereof.

- E. *That the improvement of any commercial or industrial structure, as shown on the elevations as submitted, is substantially detrimental to the character or value of an adjacent R District area.*

Discussion

The proposed development is a residential project and no improvements to any commercial or industrial structures are proposed. Therefore, this finding is inapplicable to the subject project.

- F. *That the proposed development will excessively damage or destroy natural features, including trees, shrubs, creeks, and rocks, and the natural grade of the site, except as provided in the subdivision regulations as set forth in Chapter 1 of Title 10 of the Municipal Code .*

Discussion

The vacant site is currently covered with weeds and bushes. There are no significant natural features present on the site other than the steep natural grade. The severe topography of the project site presents significant challenges to minimizing excavation. However, the applicant has proposed a multi-level design of three stories to avoid a one level solution that would have substantially increased the amount of grading. Therefore, because of the absence of significant natural features other than the prominent natural grade, and because of the project design that will minimize excavation at the site as necessary to enable development consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Regulations, the project will not excessively damage or destroy natural features or the natural grade of the site.

- G. *That there is insufficient variety in the design of the structure and grounds to avoid monotony in the external appearance.*

Discussion

The proposed development includes sufficient architectural detail for cohesiveness, visual relief, and variety. The style of the proposed project has a contemporary aesthetic, with clean lines and surfaces, large view windows, simple geometry, with naturally finished concrete, stained wood for trim details, and stain grade boards for the decks and soffits. The exterior door and windows are proposed to have minimal black frames. The landscape is designed to accentuate the contemporary aesthetic of the building and proposed with native and low maintenance plants. These features will provide visual interest around the structure. Because of the architectural design and site improvements to the surrounding grounds, therefore, there is sufficient variety in the design of the structure and grounds to avoid monotony in the external appearance of the project.

- H. *That the proposed development is inconsistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines.*

Discussion

See above discussion regarding consistency with Design Guidelines under findings for approval of a Specific Plan (Section 4.B of the staff report). Based on the analysis above, the proposed development is consistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines.

- I. *That the proposed development is inconsistent with the General Plan, Local Coastal Plan, or other applicable laws of the City.*

Discussion

The proposed residential development, as conditioned, is consistent with the General Plan, Pacifica Municipal Code, and all applicable City laws. Specifically, the location, size and design of the proposed residential project is consistent with the character of the surrounding low density residential neighborhood. The proposed development meets or exceeds all applicable zoning standards, including building setbacks, height, landscaping, and off-street parking requirements. The project site is located outside of the Coastal Zone, and the Local Coastal Plan is not applicable to the project. Because of its General Plan and Pacifica Municipal Code (i.e. zoning) compliance, the project is consistent with all applicable laws of the City.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of Pacifica does hereby approved Specific Plan SP-181-23 and Site Development Permit PSD-863-23 for the construction of a 3,324-square foot (sf), three-story, single-family residence, 460-sf attached garage, on a 5,618-sf vacant lot at 327 Beaumont Boulevard (APN 009-037-470), subject to conditions of approval included as Exhibit A to this resolution.

\* \* \* \* \*

Passed and adopted at a special meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Pacifica, California, held on the 29<sup>th</sup> day of April 2024.

AYES, Commissioners: BERMAN, DEVINE, FERGUSON, GODWIN,  
REDFIELD, WRIGHT

NOES, Commissioners: N/A

ABSENT, Commissioners: N/A


ABSTAIN, Commissioners: HAUSER

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alex Ferguson, Vice Chair

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Christian Murdock, Planning Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michelle Kenyon, City Attorney

## Exhibit A

**Conditions of Approval: File No. 2023-005 – Specific Plan SP-181-23 and Site Development Permit PSD-863-23, for the construction of a 3,324-square foot (sf), three-story, single-family residence, with a 460-sf attached garage, on a 5,618-sf vacant lot at 327 Beaumont Boulevard (APN 009-037-470)**

**Planning Commission Meeting of April 29, 2024**

### **Planning Division of the Planning Department**

1. Development shall be substantially in accord with the plans entitled “327 BEAUMONT BLVD. PACIFICA, CA 94044” received by the City of Pacifica on April 11, 2024, except as modified by the following conditions.
2. That the approval or approvals is/are valid for a period of two years from the date of final determination. If the use or uses approved is/are not established within such period of time, the approval(s) shall expire unless Applicant submits a written request for an extension and applicable fee prior to the expiration date, and the Planning Director or Planning Commission approves the extension request as provided below. The Planning Director may administratively grant a single, one year extension provided, in the Planning Director's sole discretion, the circumstances considered during the initial project approval have not materially changed. Otherwise, the Planning Commission shall consider a request for a single, one year extension.
3. In the event of litigation filed to overturn the City’s determination on the approval or approvals, the Planning Director may toll the expiration of the approval or approvals during the pendency of such litigation.
4. Applicant shall comply with all local and state laws and regulations pertaining to excavations and site development, including but not limited to California Building Code section 1804.
5. The project shall provide decorative veneer or contoured and colored concrete for the proposed retaining walls that allows for their blending into the hillside, to the satisfaction of the Planning Director. Prior to the issuance of the building permit, Applicant shall provide samples of such decorative veneer or color and contours for review and approval by the Planning Director.
6. The width of the driveway to the garage shall be no more than 20 feet as allowed by PMC Section 9-4.2813 (c)(4).
7. Development shall adhere to the recommendations identified in the “GEOTECHNICAL UPDATE AND SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS LETTER” prepared by Frank Lee & Associates, dated May 1, 2023, and “SOIL AND FOUNDATION INVESTIGATION”, prepared by Frank Lee & Associates, dated August 8, 2016.
8. In the event grading is required to stabilize areas of undocumented fill in the upper portion of the site as identified in the ‘Soil and Foundation Investigation’ report, prepared by Frank Lee and Associates, dated August 8, 2016, such grading shall be minimized and to the extent practicable, the pre-grading slope shall be restored with engineered fill in a manner approved by a qualified engineer, to the satisfaction of the Building Official.

9. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, Applicant shall submit a final landscape plan for approval by the Planning Director and City Engineer. Landscaping shall include the planting of four (4) small species trees, such as Toyon or City-approved equivalent trees at the rear of the property. Each replacement tree shall be a minimum of one and one-half (1.5") inches measured with calipers and at least a 15-gallon tree, and in the event the original replacement tree(s) fail to establish, a subsequent replacement tree(s) shall be required. The final landscaping plan shall be to the satisfaction of the Planning Director. All landscaping shall be installed consistent with the final landscape plan prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
10. Installation of the landscaping shown on the approved landscape plan in the public right-of-way at the front of the residence will require approval of an encroachment permit by the City Engineer. In the event the City Engineer does not approve an encroachment permit for installation of this landscaping, the Planning Commission's approval of this project shall remain valid with omission of the landscaping in the public right-of-way.
11. Landscaping on the site shall be adequately maintained in a healthful condition and replaced when necessary by the property owner.
12. The project shall include low intensity exterior illumination. All light fixtures shall be down-facing and shall not cause glare on adjacent properties.
13. All exterior metal railings shall be constructed of stainless steel or suitable alternative, which is corrosion resistant, to the satisfaction of the Planning Director.
14. All transformers, HVAC units, backflow preventers and other ground-mounted utility equipment shall be shown on the landscape and irrigation plans and shall be located out of public view and/or adequately screened through the use or combination of walls or fencing, berming, painting, and/or landscaping, to the satisfaction of the Planning Director.
15. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, Applicant shall submit a roof plan with spot elevations showing the location of all roof equipment including vents, stacks and skylights. All roof equipment shall be screened to the Planning Director's satisfaction.
16. All vents, gutters, downspouts, flashing, and conduits shall be painted to match the colors of adjacent building surfaces. In addition, any mechanical or other equipment such as HVAC attached to or protruding from the building shall be appropriately housed and/or screened to the Planning Director's satisfaction.
17. The approval letter issued by the City and all conditions of approval attached thereto shall be included as plan sheets within all plan sets submitted to the City as part of any building permit application.
18. Prior to issuance of a building permit, Applicant shall clearly indicate compliance with all conditions of approval on the plans and/or provide written explanations to the Planning Director's satisfaction.
19. Applicant shall maintain its site in a fashion that does not constitute a public nuisance and that does not violate any provision of the Pacifica Municipal Code.

20. All outstanding and applicable fees associated with the processing of this project shall be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit.
21. The Applicant shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless the City, its Council, Planning Commission, advisory boards, officers, employees, consultants and agents (hereinafter "City") from any claim, action or proceeding (hereinafter "Proceeding") brought against the City to attack, set aside, void or annul the City's actions regarding any development or land use permit, application, license, denial, approval or authorization, including, but not limited to, variances, use permits, developments plans, specific plans, general plan amendments, zoning amendments, approvals and certifications pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, and/or any mitigation monitoring program, or brought against the City due to actions or omissions in any way connected to the Applicant's project ("Challenge"). City may, but is not obligated to, defend such Challenge as City, in its sole discretion, determines appropriate, all at Applicant's sole cost and expense. This indemnification shall include, but not be limited to, damages, fees and/or costs awarded against the City, if any, and costs of suit, attorney's fees and other costs, liabilities and expenses incurred in connection with such proceeding whether incurred by the Applicant, City, and/or parties initiating or bringing such Proceeding. If the Applicant is required to defend the City as set forth above, the City shall retain the right to select the counsel who shall defend the City. Per Government Code Section 66474.9, the City shall promptly notify Applicant of any Proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense.

**Building Division of the Planning Department**

22. The project requires review and approval of a building permit by the Building Official. Applicant shall apply for and receive approval of a building permit, demolition permit, and/or grading permit prior to commencing any construction, demolition, or grading activity.

**Engineering Division of the Public Works Department**

23. Construction shall be in conformance with the City of Pacifica Storm Water Management and Discharge Control Ordinance and San Mateo Countywide Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program. Best Management Practices shall be implemented and the construction BMPs plans sheet from the Countywide program shall be included in the project plans.
24. Prior to approval of the Building Permit, applicant shall provide an erosion control plan.
25. All proposed sanitary sewer system and storm drain system elements, including detention facilities, shall be privately maintained up to their connections to the existing mains.
26. Roadways shall be maintained clear of construction materials, equipment, storage, and debris, especially mud and dirt tracked onto Beaumont Boulevard. Dust control and daily road cleanup will be strictly enforced. A properly signed no-parking zone may be established during normal working hours only.

27. Existing curb, sidewalk, or other street improvements adjacent to the property frontage that are damaged or displaced shall be repaired or replaced as determined by the City Engineer even if damage or displacement occurred prior to any work performed for this project.
28. An Encroachment Permit must be obtained for all work within public right-of-way. All proposed improvements within public right-of-way shall be constructed per City Standards.
29. The driveway approach must be ADA compliant with no more than 2% cross slope for a width of at least 48 inches. The transition from 2% out-slope to the in-slope driveway shall be sufficiently gradual to avoid vehicles to contact the pavement at the grade breaks. Driveway within City right-of-way shall not exceed 18% and portion exceeding 15% grade shall be grooved concrete. Provide structural section of the driveway within City Right of Way.
30. Applicant shall overlay existing asphalt with minimum 2-inch AC to the limits of all utility connection or to street centerline whichever is greater across entire property frontage of Beaumont Blvd. All pavement markings and markers shall be replaced in kind.
31. The improvements shall be consistent with the plans approved by, and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Conditions of Approval. All construction shall meet the latest California Building Code, California Fire Code, City of Pacifica Municipal Code and the City Standard Specifications and Drawings. Securities for all required improvements, and applicable fees and charges, shall be submitted prior to permit issuance. The applicant shall obtain all required permits before commencing work. All required improvements shall be constructed at no cost to the City except where specifically agreed to by the City under the provisions of a written agreement. Grading and improvement plan review and approval by the City Engineer are required before any City Permit is issued. The improvement plans shall include details for on-site and off-site improvements for vehicular and pedestrian access, parking, traffic signs and markings, utility service connections, modifications and extension of the City's sewer, storm drain, safety lighting, landscaping, and other public service and common facilities. All utility services shall be underground unless otherwise approved. Said improvements shall conform to City of Pacifica and affected Agency's standards.
32. All stormwater detention, stormwater treatment, or other stormwater BMP improvements shall be located outside of the public right-of-way and maintained by the property owner. All privately owned and maintained improvements shall be located outside of the public right-of-way. There shall be no private improvements within the public right-of-way. Stormwater measures shall be covered under a separate Maintenance Agreement for Stormwater Treatment Measures recorded prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy and to run with the property. The Maintenance Agreement shall burden the Applicant to maintain all covered improvements to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
33. Provide "will serve letters" from North Coast County Water District for water service. Provide "will serve letters" from Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) for electric services.

File No. 2023-005  
Specific Plan SP-181-23 Site Development Permit PSD-863-23  
327 Beaumont Boulevard (APN 009-037-470)  
April 29, 2024

34. A maintenance agreement must be signed and recorded for the maintenance of the stairs in the right-of-way that are a result of this project. A template acceptable to the City can be obtained from the City Engineer's office.
35. Structural engineering calculations shall be provided for the foundation design based on the recommendations from the Geotechnical Report.
36. Prior to issuance of a building permit, Applicant shall ensure the stormwater tank has an overflow design acceptable to the Building Official and City Engineer.

**North County Fire Authority**

37. Apply for and complete AMMR with NCFA regarding fire apparatus access insufficiency.
38. Fire sprinkler system is required. Submit plans to NCFA under separate fire permit.
39. Provide fire flow information per CFC, Appendix B.
40. Illuminated address identification is required.

\*\*\*END\*\*\*