

MINUTES

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

July 20, 2020

7:00 p.m.

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

Chair Nibbelin explained the conditions for having Planning Commission meetings pursuant to the provisions of the Governor’s executive order, N-25-20 and N-29-20, which suspends certain requirements of the Brown Act and pursuant to the orders of the Health Officer of San Mateo County, dated June 17, 2020, to conduct necessary business as an essential governmental function with no public attendance allowed. He also gave information on how to present public comments via email and live if participating by Zoom or phone.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Berman, Bigstycyk, Godwin, Hauser, Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Absent: N/A

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Godwin

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Sr. Planner Murdock
Asst. City Attorney Bazzano
Management Analyst Montemayor
Assoc. Planner O’Connor
PW Assoc. Civil Engineer Marquez

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

Sr. Planner Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Bigstycyk, Godwin, Hauser, Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Noes: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None.

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF AUGUST 10, 2020:

Chair Nibbelin assumed there was no need for a liaison to the City Council Meeting.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. PSD-714-02
UP-904-02
SUB-204-02
Heritage Tree
Removal
Authorization
Authorization For
Logging Operations | File No. 2002-001 – Site Development Permit PSD-714-02, Use Permit UP-904-02, Tentative Subdivision SUB-204-02, Authorization for Heritage Tree Removal and Authorization for Logging Operations for construction of four new townhouse duplex buildings (total of eight dwelling units) and associated subdivision for condominium purposes, on an approximately 53,000-sf (1.217 acres) undeveloped lot located on the east side of Monterey Road approximately 250 feet southeast of the Monterey Road and Hickey Boulevard intersection (APN 009-381-010) in Pacifica. The project would include removal of seven heritage Trees and 50 non-heritage trees. The project is known as “Vista Mar Project”. Recommended CEQA Action: N/A |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the project was nearly ready for consideration but during final preparations to present the item, staff noted some recent changes made that had not been confirmed between staff and the applicant to be in agreement and they were asking for a continuance to give them more time.

Chair Nibbelin asked if any Commissioner had anything to discuss before they entertain the motion to continue.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that they should ask for public comment before entertaining the motion.

Chair Nibbelin again asked if there were any questions before he opened to public comment.

Commissioner Berman mentioned that they received an environmental document for this project a few months ago, and she asked if that was current or will they receive a new document.

Assoc. Planner O'Connor stated that a draft IS/MND was released in January for public review and a final will be attached to the staff report when it is brought back to them.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if the final will be similar to the original draft or will there be substantial changes made to the draft.

Assoc. Planner O'Connor stated that there were minimal changes made and it will be significantly shorter.

Chair Nibbelin asked if there were any public comments.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he did not see any hands raised.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he had a question for the city attorney regarding the need to actually vote on removing an item that is on the agenda but was determined that it was not ready for discussion. He stated that other agencies remove it from the agenda before discussion without a direct vote.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that it was on the agenda and staff was seeking an action from the Commission to continue to a date certain, and the Brown Act requires public comment on any item on the agenda, and in this case it was on the agenda and there will be action by the Planning Commission to continue to a date certain, and that was why she was asking to confirm there is no public comment.

Chair Nibbelin understood that, but was curious because public comment would be required before the board acts on it but they weren't proposing to act on it at all and he was curious about needing to consider it as a separate item as opposed to just striking it from the agenda when they were approving the agenda.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that it was so they can continue it to a date certain so that the notice requirements follow the item itself.

Chair Nibbelin concluded it was because they won't have to republish a notice.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano thought that was the goal.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that she was correct, explaining that the main administrative purpose of the activity so they don't have to spend the money and staff resources to send notice again and that was their preference when they believe they have a date certain to continue them. He stated that in some cases they weren't sure when the item will be ready again and it may not be appropriate to do that.

Chair Nibbelin thought it made perfect sense.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she didn't know if they closed public comment but it looked like there was someone with their hand up.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that she was correct that they have one individual who has raised his hand.

Chair Nibbelin suggested they circle back as he didn't formally close the public hearing and they can hear from that individual.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that Madhu Matthew could speak now for three minutes.

Madhu Matthew, Pacifica, stated that this was his first time that he is attending a Planning Commission meeting and he wasn't sure he was asking the right question or in the right manner, and if he is making a mistake, he apologized. He stated that he lives on Monterey Road and close to the place where this land is set for development. He asked, with so many trees being cut, if there was an opportunity to at least transplant some of them or do they all have to be cut.

Chair Nibbelin closed the public hearing for discussion or move to continue to a date certain.

Commissioner Berman stated that, given the public comment, maybe staff could speak to that feasibility on tree transplanting.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he would prefer to wait on the substance of the project until they are ready to present the item in its totality rather than segmenting factual information about the project.

Commissioner Berman thought that made sense and suggested that staff take note and look into that comment and be prepared to answer it when this item comes back.

Sr. Planner Murdock agreed.

Commissioner Hauser moved that the Planning Commission continue the item to the Planning Commission meeting of August 3, 2020; Commissioner Leal seconded the motion.

Sr. Planner Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Bigstych, Godwin, Hauser,
Leal and Chair Nibbelin

Noes: None

- 2. PSD-847-19** **File No. 2019-036 – Site Development Permit PSD-847-19,**
CDP-418-19 **Coastal Development Permit CDP-418-19, Use Permit**
UP-121-19 **UP-121-19, Parking Exemption PE-188-19 and Sign Permit**
PE-188-19 **S-132-20,** filed by Jacquelyn Gratz and Aaron Gregory, to
S-132-20 construct a two-story mixed-use building with 1,043-square feet (sf)
of commercial space located on the ground floor and a 783-sf
residential unit located on the second floor, on a 2,430-sf
non-conforming lot developed with an existing one-story single-
family residential non-conforming use, located at 184 Paloma
Avenue (APN-016-022-080). Recommended CEQA Action: Class 1
Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15301.

Sr. Planner Murdock presented the staff report.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought the only issue that might come up was parking. He noticed that there was not any parking associated with this property and he wondered if staff could give them a brief history on how they have a house with no parking.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated he will try to address that issue, but first he needed to make a correction to a statement, as the lot was 27 feet wide, not 25 feet wide. He was not sure when this use was established but he believes it was likely before they had the current single family residential parking standards, so it was an old structure and one that was not designed with a garage as current zoning regulations require. He stated that it was not unique in the Sharp Park neighborhood that a home exists on a site with no off street parking such as a garage space. He stated that it was an artifact of a prior period of development.

Commissioner Hauser asked if Pacifica has any FAR requirements for sites like this.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they don't have a floor area ratio standard for projects like this.

Commissioner Hauser asked if this floor area ratio would be consistent with other projects that are in the city.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he didn't know as he hasn't done the analysis but he thought the floor area ratio may be higher because the lot area is so small. He stated that the commercial area and residential unit are both rather small in absolute terms and he wasn't sure how to compare it to other sites.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she felt silly asking the question of whether the applicant was literally proposing to lift up the house and build commercial underneath it.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that was the proposal.

Commissioner Hauser asked if there was any discussion about asking the applicant to underground the joint pole that is fronting the property now.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they have not discussed that with the applicant. The Commission has discussed this issue in prior public hearings as there is no citywide policy for undergrounding of utilities in cases like this. He stated that we have a practice of requiring applicants to install

the utilities underground from the existing joint pole or other point of connection into the project site and it does reduce some amount of visual clutter from utilities. He stated that the expense involved with undergrounding utility poles can be significant. Unless this is an area where there is an established policy or underground utilities district, it was not something they typically look to impose on a project on an ad hoc basis.

Commissioner Hauser referred to the setbacks, stating that the first was the right setback and she understood that there was a 3 1/2 foot setback currently. She stated that, on visiting the site, it looks like the adjacent home is only a few inches away from the property line. She wanted to understand the overall spacing between the two homes. She also wanted to understand the 2 inch setback proposed for the left property line.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that she was correct that the right setback on the west side of the property is just shy of 3 1/2 feet, i.e., 3 feet, 5 1/2 inches as indicated on the plans and it looks as though the dimension from the property line to the adjacent residence may be approximately 1 foot, 3 inches. He stated that, overall, they would have less than 5 feet between the structures. He stated that it was not uncommon in development in the Sharp Park neighborhood where there is a lot older development that predated current zoning standards. He stated that, on the left or east side of the property, she was correct that there was a 2-inch setback on that side and there is no minimum setback requirement in commercial zoning districts. He stated that the setback may be established by the Commission as approved in the site development permit. He thought the applicant could speak more to the decision to pursue this particular setback. As he assessed the situation, he thought they were looking to do what they can on a very constrained site. He stated that, once you construct the stairway that meets current residential code requirements and try not to further constrain the right or west side of the property, you are left with little space in the 27-foot wide lot to comply with a variety of different requirements. He thought any further considerations in that regard are probably best for the applicant to speak to.

Commissioner Berman has a question for staff and will save other questions for the applicant. She noticed the existing driveway to the apartment to the left or east of the applicant's site is overlapping with the applicant's property line and the driveway is shifted and almost in conflict with the fence and property line of 184 Paloma. She noticed in the plans that the new driveway to be installed for this project doesn't take into consideration the adjacent driveway and she wondered if staff or the applicant are tracking to rebuild both those driveways together as one driveway.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought the applicant might have done more analysis and may want to speak to the considerations for how to coordinate with the adjacent driveway approach. He thought there was a consideration to be made about accessibility and how they continue it across both properties.

Commissioner Leal stated he had the same question about the continuous driveway. He stated that his other question didn't necessarily apply to parking for this project but parking in the area. He stated that east and west there are planter bulb outs on the street and he asked if a private vehicle can park next to those planter bulb outs as they are shifted into the street a little bit and he asked if it was legal parking or not and how do they generally come about and he asked if staff knows the history.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he didn't know the answer to that question. He thought it didn't appear that the bulb outs are red curbed or signed for no parking and he thought it was a curious situation. He stated that he would have to check with staff in Public Works Department to determine what regulations might apply to that location but he didn't have the information now.

Commissioner Berman added to her previous question, stating that it looked like the driveway of the residence to the west overlaps as well and this would end up being three parcels that would have a combined driveway. She stated she will wait to hear from applicant.

Chair Nibbelin stated that the applicant has a preview of some of the interests in terms of his presentation. He stated that this was time for the applicant to introduce the project. He stated that the applicant can reserve a portion of the ten minutes to respond to any public comment.

Sr. Planner Murdock explained to Mr. Brinkman that he will be keeping track of his time and let him know when there is one minute left.

Mr. Brinkman, Applicant, stated that they will start with owners and then he will follow.

Jackie Gratz, owner, stated that she and her husband have two small children and have been living at 184 Paloma since 2014. She stated that they have a family-run T-shirt company based off scientific illustrations of prehistoric dinosaurs and marine sea life.

Aaron Gregory, owner, stated that was their company in a nutshell, called Cotton Crustacean, and they have been around since 2012. He stated it was a popup boutique, and their dream was to have a brick and mortar store. When they moved to Pacifica, they were a new company and participated in FogFest and that showed they had an audience for it in a coastal town as well as other nearby communities coming to the FogFest and they thought this would be a great place to start that store. He stated that they were renting and they decided it was important to own their own house and be in control of their situation. He stated that this was the cheapest and most rundown structure in Pacifica since no one wanted it. He stated that it sealed the deal when the owner said it was a commercial location, having several businesses over time. He stated that it interested them because it was a future possibility of opening a store. He stated that it would be hard for them to go anywhere else and they came up with the idea to figure out how to do the best of both worlds. He stated that it was built in 1940 and moved to this location in 1960 which was why it was so close to the neighbor's house. He stated that they put a new roof with solar and they thought it would be logical to pick it up and put a commercial space underneath. He stated that they talked to local contractors and were pleased to hear it was possible. They got quotes and thought everything was in reach. They thought it would be beneficial for the community and unique to Pacifica. He stated that it would create a place for neighbors to come by and communicate. He stated that it would be educational as they will showcase a lot of the local flora and fauna in their designs. He referred to the bulb outs and they were there because of trees in those locations. He stated that most of the trees on the block have started to come down because of age and wind damage. He stated that he has adopted the two adjacent to their property and takes care them, replanting them. He stated that they don't have one in front of their house.

Ms. Gratz stated that they are legal to park and people in the neighborhood do park there.

Aaron Gregory stated that it was randomly, adding that some were legal and some were not with some having red curbs. He stated that the continuous driveway was a weird feature of the

property and it was a different regulation when the house was moved there. He stated that the plan would be to incorporate the curb slant of the driveway all the way across. He stated that they didn't see much reason to have any kind of small stretch of curb which he didn't think would work. He stated that they have a large driveway to the east of the property and it was also commercially zoned and was nonconforming with residents in it but with the Sharp Park Specific Plan it was becoming commercial. He stated that it was a fluid community use space for a driveway as it was the only access to the back of the strip mall that houses several businesses which he mentioned and they all use that driveway to make deliveries and their kids play back there. He stated that they had close relationships with their neighbors and they join them. He stated that there was never an issue with access, and he reached out to the property owner to let them know their plans and he might need to paint a bunch of sharks on the wall, adding that he didn't see why he wouldn't be okay with that. He stated that he brought it up with contractors who have come by and they saw no problem with constructing the wall, doing it from their property. He stated that it comes down to the mural but he was hopeful the property owner will be stoked on it.

Jackie Gratz thought that covered the questions they heard.

Brian Brinkman referred to Sr. Planner Murdock stating that the project meets all the zoning requirements except for parking. On parking, he said that while it appears the project falls short of compliance based on the zoning code, he stated that most of the time the site's impact on the neighborhood will be less than it currently is. He stated that now they both have to park on the street. They will get their cars off the street and will permanently free up those two parking spots and as visitors come, unless there are three or more at one time, the project will be opening up parking to the neighborhood. He stated the owners touched on some of the questions and he will wait and address any further ones.

Chair Nibbelin asked if the Commissioners had any questions for the applicant before they open the public hearing.

Commissioner Berman thanked them for addressing the previous questions. She referred to mention of reaching out to the facility to the east and asked if it was an apartment.

Aaron Gregory stated that it was a three-unit apartment building.

Commissioner Berman asked if he received response from the owner when he reached out.

Aaron Gregory stated that he hasn't received a response and they were told about the inquiry about the access earlier today and he texted and reached out but has not heard back yet.

Commissioner Berman stated that they were on a texting basis.

Aaron Gregory stated that he has texted him about other issues and they were both cordial and understand.

Commissioner Berman stated that from the staff report they were asked to consider if they chose to move and someone else were to live there, she wondered if employees had to drive to the shop so she wondered if they were planning on hiring more employees and how they might handle more than two cars.

Aaron Gregory stated that the plan was that it was a family run business maintained by him and Jackie Gratz and it will be closed a couple of days to give them a break as they don't intend to have employees. He thought, when their daughters are old enough, they will likely be employees but they will already be living there. He mentioned to a couple of neighboring teenagers that, when they want a part time job, they can reach out to him. That appeals to them, but their shop will not be staffed by people who have to drive there. He stated that they can think of it as a visitor's center with a gift shop and he will have his art studio in the back. He felt, if he was going to make his art, it would be nice to have a store where people can come in and buy items.

Commissioner Berman referred to issues on other streets in the Sharp Park area with overflow parking or not being able to find parking. She stated that she didn't live near Paloma and she wondered what the parking was like.

Aaron Gregory stated that it has gotten significantly better while a lot of parts of the neighborhood have gotten worse. He thought it may be because some businesses have moved with less employees coming in. He stated that they have commercial parking across the street with four spots and there is a large parking lot for Winter's and other patrons such as the bait shop will park there temporarily to get a burrito or get bait and move on. He stated that to the east of them, there was a long stretch of Francisco with all commercial parking, a lot green curb two-hour but a lot is 24 hours. He thought it was a couple of dozen spots and it stretches.

Jackie Gratz stated that it was north and south of Paloma.

Aaron Gregory stated that it stretches all the way down to the public parking lot near City Hall so there is quite a bit.

Brian Brinkman added that his office was on Francisco around the corner from Aaron and Jackie. He stated that the area of Francisco close to Winter's did used to get heavily used but once El Toro Loco moved a couple of blocks down the street, it freed up parking and is definitely not impacted all the time as it used to be.

Commissioner Berman referred to their art and that they will be doing T-shirt screening and she wondered if any of the products they use could be hazardous chemicals.

Aaron Gregory stated that eventually they have a goal of having a small screenpress in the back which will be a manually operated press and very old school. They will use water based inks when that happens. He stated that the main goal now is just the retail front as all their shirts are printed locally by other printers such as in South San Francisco and one in San Francisco. When the time comes, the trend in their boutique market of shirts is to use water based inks which are biodegradable and totally nontoxic.

Commissioner Berman referred to their hours of operation, stating that the staff report mentioned that they were seeking being open until 9 pm on Fridays and Saturdays. He asked if they intend to have the shop open until 9 pm or is it for occasional events.

Aaron Gregory stated it was occasional events but also the idea, depending on the future of El Toro Loco and their original location, would be to potentially coordinate hours with a restaurant that may take over that space on Francisco Blvd. He stated that he has talked with them about

coordinating as they used to have a line out the door for people waiting to get in and eat. If they had a cool shop where they could browse and hang out for 15 minutes and look at some cool shirts it might work well. So, they were mimicking their hours but it would open them up to the occasional small art show or event to reveal a new design of a local scientific author coming in for a signing and it gives them the leeway to have people in the place until 9 pm.

Commissioner Berman asked, given the potential for someone else to be living above the commercial space, whether there were any features that could be incorporated in the architectural design or structural design to muffle sound. She realized 9 pm isn't that late for some people but if there was someone with small kids living above it, it might be late to hear noise.

Brian Brinkman stated that the Building Code provides for requirements for sound transmission for situations where you have residential above a commercial space. He stated that they have residents above the commercial space in his building and the same methods of sound attenuation were used and he is not aware of any issues.

Commissioner Hauser stated that, from the drawings, it looked like the commercial space and residential space are intended to have separate entries. She asked if that was correct.

Aaron Gregory responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Hauser asked if they are going to be condominium-ized separately, asking how the ownership structure for the property works.

Aaron Gregory stated that they own the building and are going to live above it and operate the business below. He stated that the only reason they aren't having stairs inside the structure to directly connect the home to the shop is because it was such a small structure and it will take up half the store space. He stated that this gets the stairs out of the building. He stated that you never know what will happen in ten years, but they have every intention of staying in the building and operating the store until the kids are old enough and move out.

Commissioner Hauser thought he was saying that there is a single property owner and nobody will be a tenant unless they move out of the residential and then the residential would be their tenant and no ownership issues.

Aaron Gregory stated that they will always own the entire building.

Commissioner Hauser asked staff, if there was an application to condominium-ize or make two separate legal spaces, would it have to come back for a subdivision.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it would require city approval of a subdivision and that small number of parcels involved may result in a public hearing before the City Engineer as it is an opinion in the Municipal Code. He did think some type of public hearing and approval process would be required to approve a condominium.

Commissioner Hauser asked if the applicant expanded into a larger space, and a different commercial use went in, would there need to be another conditional use permit applied for or would the same permit be an umbrella for multiple users if they weren't doing similar commercial work.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that whatever approvals are granted by the Planning Commission, this application would run with the land and they would remain in effect in perpetuity even if the property ownership changed or the business changed. He added that, if a different use requiring a use permit was proposed, it would require its own initial use permit or if a change of use occurred even if the use may be a permitted use, the zoning standards require a certain change will also need to obtain a use permit in some circumstances. He stated that there are a variety of instances when an additional use permit may be required but if a retail use fitting the confines of whatever approval the Commission may grant, and it came in but was operated by different business owners, it would not need to come back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Hauser referred to the tight property line on the east side, and stated that she wanted to understand what the thought process was for maintenance for doing that mural. She asked if the applicant would be willing to pursue some sort of access easement if one does not exist already over the adjacent property.

Aaron Gregory stated that they would do whatever would be needed. He stated that, given the space, he would be able to do any kind of maintenance needed on the painting within 80% of it by simply leaning over balcony and touching it up. He stated that they were pretty tight with the family who lives downstairs and they know everyone upstairs. He stated that their son comes over and swims in their backyard pool and there is never an issue. He thought he could incorporate their help and get them painting sharks. He didn't see how it would be an issue with Johnstone, the adjacent owner, but if it was, they would do whatever it would need such as a conditional easement. At that point, he would probably paint over it and paint two large panels that he could remove and do the maintenance on the panels on his property without any need to trouble anyone.

Commissioner Hauser thought it sounded like he had good relationship with all his neighbors. Her concern is when property ownership changes such as someone who lives in Oregon who owns the property and she just wanted to be clear.

Commissioner Godwin asked how many T-shirts a month they sell just to give him a sense of the volume of the business.

Aaron Gregory stated that they are a popup boutique and they normally do two days of intense business such as at FogFest and in Half Moon Bay and they range from \$5,000-\$6,000 in sales as the shirts are \$30/each and they are talking about 200 shirts. He stated that the busiest of all weekends is with thousands of people walking by, but he imagined a good day at a brick and mortar store would be 20 shirts versus 200 and they would probably be feeling like they are hustling in their own shop if they are moving 20 shirts. He stated that it is hard to assess as they have never been a solid 5-day week or 7-day week brick and mortar. He stated that if they count that as well as their online sales, it could be 30-40 shirts a week or maybe 50. He could not imagine it being more than that.

Commissioner Godwin asked if he is saying if they add the numbers together, it would be 10,000 shirts a year.

Aaron Gregory responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Godwin referred to deliveries, asking what supplies they get once they put the printer in or if working with subcontractors printing the shirts such as in San Francisco. He asked if there were any time limits on the deliveries.

Aaron Gregory stated that he usually picks them up in person because they are close and he has a working relationship with them. He also needs to check the quality of the product on the spot and he goes to the warehouse and opens the boxes and look at the shirts. He stated that is his one opportunity to say they didn't do it right and they have to redo them. He stated that it is harder to do that if they ship them to him and he is sitting on them for a bit. He stated that there is also the chance that he will get a box of shirts shipped and would go by the same hours as any of their normal Amazon shipments during the day. He stated that the owner of the large screen printer that he uses, called Graphic Sports ware based in South San Francisco, is a long time Pacifica resident. He stated that, if he can't get there to grab them, he will usually deliver them by hand. He stated that, when shipping their own goods on their online store, they set out a couple for the mailman to grab or they hand deliver them to the Post Office in Manor.

Commissioner Godwin asked if they have a delivery truck or anticipate getting any sort of delivery vehicle.

Aaron Gregory stated that his entire pop up shop is all put in his Honda Ridgeline which is also his vehicle for groceries and taking his children to school, as they don't have a van or work truck. He stated that they occasionally rent a U-Haul trailer but they have no large vehicles.

Commissioner Berman stated that no one else seems to have any questions. She forgot to ask about privacy related to once they elevate the dwelling unit, as she thought it looks like it will look straight into the apartments across the way. She knows they are separated by about 25 feet but she asked if they plan to do something for privacy.

Aaron Gregory stated that, at this time, their property looks directly into the apartments on the bottom floor and it will be one or the other. He stated that they can look from their bedroom through multiple windows into their neighbor's living room. He stated that it was an issue but both of them address it in their own way, such as blinds, curtains, window coverings to prevent that. He thought there were more windows on the downstairs apartment and it will be slightly reduced as they go up. He stated that they were kind of a fishbowl with everyone around them looking into their place. He stated that they will be gaining a little bit of privacy by going up.

Commissioner Berman stated that, when she was reviewing the staff report, she thought, rather than elevating the house up, it was going to be reconstructed and she was happy that Commissioner Hauser asked the question as she was interpreting it differently, and her question on privacy was going to be if they could arrange the windows to be more private but she sees that it is likely not the case.

Aaron Gregory stated that one thing working to their benefit is that the house as it is being lifted is going to be pushed back eight feet and will set a lot of the windows ajar from each other more than they are now. He stated that the back of the house will go slightly past the back of the apartment building and those windows won't be looking into the residences at all anymore.

Chair Nibbelin didn't see any more questions from the Commissioners and he turned it over to Sr. Planner Murdock to ascertain whether they have any public comment and opened public comment.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that, at this point, there were two hands raised from the public, and he will introduce each speaker.

Peter Miller, Pacifica, stated that he has lived in Sharp Park for about 40 years. He pointed out that, in talking about 184 Paloma, he pointed out that it was the original Pacific City Hall and from a historical standpoint and everyone should be aware of that when they are talking about altering the property.

Dawn Hope, Pacifica, stated that she was a Sharp Park resident and a business owner about a half block from this proposed location. She stated that, as a family who lives and runs a business in Pacifica, they know the value of such an investment in Pacifica and they staunchly support it. They think it's a creative and architecturally appropriate use of the property, mentioning speaking to the preservation of Pacifica's history by raising the existing town hall up while adding to it by giving retail space below it. They felt it was a creative and appropriate use of the space. They thought it added a lot of vibrancy to the neighborhood by using visual arts and they would love to see more of that. They thought it adds much needed diversity to the existing retail options, not only in Sharp Park but Pacifica as a whole. She referred to comments about parking. She stated that they were at 1614 Paloma and on their northbound and southbound sides there is ample parking. She stated that they have a green curb in front of their shop and limitless parking across the street is about a half block from this project's location. She referred to the sound after 9:00 p.m., stating that they are a retail business with residents above them and they have also had on occasion workshops and private events that go to the 9:00 p.m. range and have never had complaints. She stated that it actually adds a lot of vibrancy and the community loves having a place to meet and it adds to the neighborhood. She referred to the retail sale option, stating that as they are a popup, they are trying to gauge what their sales will be. She stated that they have been in business for a year and a half as a retail space and sell plants and T-shirts with their art on it. She stated that they average 15-30 customers a day and it will be more on weekends and less during the week and no Mondays as everything is closed. She stated that they valued this family's investment in Pacifica as they support local businesses and the investment is substantial so they hope it gets approved.

Mark Hubbell, Pacifica, stated that he has known them for a while and has worked on projects with them. He likes his creativity and vision for Pacifica. He has another friend who started a T-shirt shop in San Francisco called Babylon Burning in the 60s, and their business was awarded the San Francisco Historic Business Certification. He thought these things can be important.

Taylor Ahlgren, Pacifica, stated he is a new resident in Sharp Park and was excited to participate in the Commission as a new resident and he was supportive of the project. He would love to deal with the parking issue. He came from San Francisco and he thought a lot of the thinking around parking was how they provide transportation alternatives. He understood that the General Plan has some guidelines. He stated that he is without any vehicle and will be walking and using a bicycle for transportation. He would love the Planning Commission consider parking alternatives where constraints such as 184 Paloma are presenting themselves and he would love bicycle parking spaces to be provided on the property in lieu of four parking spaces so people can be welcomed through bicycles and other means of transportation besides vehicles.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he didn't see any other hands raised.

Chair Nibbelin asked if the applicants wanted to take a minute to respond to any comment that was raised in the course of public comment they could do so.

Aaron Gregory loved the comment about City Hall. He stated that they were told about that when they bought the place, although they didn't quite believe it until they saw it in the history books. He stated that the building is not historical but it was cool that the history is and it was why they were preserving the building. He stated that they have had contractor friends and people question why they would pick the house up and they asked why they didn't just take the roof off and add another story to it. He stated that the damage they do to the building's overall aesthetic integrity wouldn't be the right choice and he chose to lift the entire building as it is and preserve it entirely to create the first floor of commercial space. He felt that was a cool historic detail. He stated that it was before incorporation so it wasn't City Hall but in a different location when it was City Hall which was by Oceana Market and was moved to this present location after it was City Hall.

Chair Nibbelin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that his fellow commissioners have asked good questions. He referred to the question from the community about bicycle parking and he wondered if staff or the applicant might address whether bicycle parking is feasible in this location.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the project does provide two bicycle parking spaces as required by the Municipal Code which is 10% of vehicle parking spaces or two parking spaces, whichever is greater. He stated that, because of such a small parking standard required for the overall project, the applicant is required to provide two bicycle parking spaces. He stated that they have proposed a bicycle rack at the front right of the project site.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that the community referenced four spaces instead of two, and he asked if that could happen or would it require too much space.

Sr. Planner Murdock would ask the applicant to discuss options for additional parking if they wanted to voluntarily provide it. As he understood it, the member of the public was making an aspirational statement saying it would be better to have bicycle parking instead of vehicle parking spaces, but the project would comply with the city's code requirements for bicycle parking.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked Mr. Gregory or Mr. Brinkman whether more bicycle parking would be something they were interested in pursuing.

Aaron Gregory stated that they would be interested if the space allows it. He stated that they are pretty tight up front with the two parking spaces. A safe walkway to the front door and the two existing bicycle parking spaces are now in the plan, and he was brainstorming and thought they could come up with something creative. He stated that they have the bulb outs he adopted and turned into gardens and they could be cool artistic sculpture, an octopus and you could park the bike next to it and lock it up. He stated that they would definitely love to do it if possible.

Commissioner Bigstyk thanked him for incorporating the standards as they are, and he didn't think another condition of approval is necessary but it was a great idea that the community might be interested in more bicycle spaces if they find they are able to do it.

Commissioner Hauser referred to the mural proposed and she saw there would need to be a sign permit and she asked if it would need to go to the BAC or one of the other committee commissions.

Sr. Planner Murdock did not believe so in his understanding of the mural policy as this is a private mural on private property for business purposes. He stated that it would be under the regulatory authority of the Planning Commission with issuance of a sign permit and was one of the requested entitlements at this hearing.

Commissioner Hauser thought the parking was well addressed and he made a good point on lifting up the building and honoring the historic aspect in the best possible way. She stated that she spent a lot of time on the Economic Development Committee talking about how important it was to get small businesses and local businesses in Pacifica and she appreciated the effort and work they put in. She thought the project was really cool, adding that her 2 1/2 year old is going to love the shark mural. She feels a little bit of concern about future ownership issues and property issues. She didn't know what the solution was for that except encouraging them to make sure they feel comfortable and staff feels comfortable that this project doesn't create property ownership issues in the future for access. She feels fairly good about the project and appreciates all the effort they put into it.

Commissioner Berman echoed Commissioner Hauser on welcoming small business, and she loves that the building used to be City Hall. She didn't think it needs to be a condition of approval, but she thought it would be really great to incorporate some Pacifica history associated with the house, such as possibly a plaque.

Jackie Gratz commented that he has wanted a plaque for about six years.

Aaron Gregory agreed that he has wanted a big plaque out front for a while. He stated that they have been rolling over the idea for three years and he thought about getting it done and have a nice plaque in front or in the shop to show before and after pictures. He stated that they will address the history of the building. He stated that he used to be a member of the Pacifica Historical Society and he has talked to them about it, and they were excited that they had this building.

Commissioner Berman stated that she had two concerns, but she didn't think they would stop them from approving the project. Her first concern was the logistics of elevating the house. She referred to the single family home to the left, stating that it was so close and what if something went wrong. She didn't know if that was in the purview of the Planning Commission but she wanted to make sure for the record that during the permitting process the means and mechanism of construction are very closely checked. She stated that her other concern was the triple combined driveway idea. She stated that effectively it would be 60 or so feet and she didn't know how wide the two driveways are and questioned the 5-8% angle cross slope. It is in ADA compliance but she thought it was not a good experience to walk across the three properties. She was slightly concerned with cars accidentally driving into things if all of that is flush. She didn't know if someone would not be paying attention and drives into the fence or drives into a

pedestrian walking or standing on the sidewalk. She wondered if staff, applicant or other commissioners might have ideas for better addressing those three driveways.

Aaron Gregory asked Mr. Brinkman if he had any thoughts on it. He stated that there was that concern, stating that they have the large driveway next to them and they are very cautious when crossing with their daughters because there are a lot of cars that come and go, but everyone who lives around there and knows there are a lot of kids and foot traffic and people go very slowly in and out of the driveways. He stated that the sidewalk may be improved dramatically as the sidewalk to the west was incredibly damaged by the old cypress tree that used to be there and pedestrians are walking out into the street to go around the damaged spot. He hoped when they get it planned out and turned into the curb that they can address that issue. He hoped the end result will be an improved walkway through that portion of the sidewalk. He wasn't an expert to come up with other solutions to address that.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he was sympathetic to Commissioner Berman's concern about the historical or conventional driveway approach. He wasn't qualified to speak about it, but his working knowledge is that the Public Works Department has a new, modernized plan for driveway approaches which strives to maintain an accessible cross slope wherever feasible based on site conditions and he thought there was a good chance that the design of the new driveway approach and the sidewalk traversing that area will be likely be accessible or at least closer to accessibility than the more traditional type of driveway approach.

Commissioner Berman asked if they need to incorporate anything into their motion that adds the two adjacent driveways for improvement on this project.

Sr. Planner Murdock didn't think so and would prefer that the Commission remain silent on that and defer to the City Engineer as the public right of way is in the City Engineer's purview and is something that they look at and require information to be submitted about adjacent properties within a certain distance within the project site and they can look at the public improvements in totality and ensure that the design of the approach, and sidewalk, curb and gutter is consistent and compliant with applicable standard plans.

Commissioner Leal thought it was overall a great project and a great improvement for the neighborhood, but he referred to the concern mentioned by the applicant about the sidewalk next door. He stated that as he was walking at the property earlier in the day, he nearly tripped on the sidewalk and as he thinks of parking and the exception related to the project in addition to overall pedestrian flow to and from the location, he thought the sidewalk will be used more and, given that it was in front of the neighbor's house, he didn't know what they can do with this project. He stated that it sounded like the owner was open to improving it and making that improvement. He didn't know if they want to add anything to the condition of approval now or leave it up to the city and Public Works Department to make sure that is resolved as well as part of the project.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it would be his preference from a staff perspective to not seek to require this project applicant to fix the sidewalk abutting an adjacent property. He stated that the obligation to maintain the sidewalk is that of the abutting property owner under state law and there is a process the city can follow to bring the property owner to repair the sidewalk. He also thought it was entirely possible that when applying the standard plan to achieve the appropriate grades for accessibility to implement the city's standard plan it was possible that the sidewalk may need to be altered by this project applicant, but that would be in the scope of implementing a

standard requirement triggered by this project. He stated that they don't have sufficient information to determine at this time whether the sidewalk would in fact need to be altered. He thought leaving all options available, they should first have the city reach out to the abutting property owner to construct the improvement and then to see if it was within the scope of improvements required to implement the standard plan for the project site driveway. He would prefer to have the process to play out that way if possible.

Chair Nibbelin thought the project is well conceived and he was generally in support of it. He was dovetailing on comments by his colleagues and was concerned about the notion of the project being owned by different parties but occupied by different parties. He didn't have any issue with the hours of operation or conditions around special events. He stated that, if owners and occupants are the same, upstairs and downstairs, he was not concerned about the hours of operation, but candidly if they get different residents upstairs they might not be as happy to have people doing business until 9:00 p.m. or even 7:00 p.m. on a weekday. He stated with the current arrangements he didn't have any issue with hours of operations unless it bothers those in adjacent properties. He wondered if the conditions of approval could be modified that if he had a non-commonality of occupancy with respect to the residential and commercial uses, the hours of operation might be constrained such as shorter. He thought that might be standard for what happens in that particular area and how commercial space operates. He thought a little more information would be useful.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he would address part of his question and then defer to Asst. City Attorney Bazzano for any other considerations. His perspective on living in a mixed use development, you either accept or don't accept that close intimate relationship with the commercial use below. He thought the right tenant would find it an exciting opportunity to live in a particular location whereas someone else who values complete quiet wouldn't choose to live in that location and he thought it was a landlord-tenant situation to be resolved, and a certain family might not choose to live there. He also thought, as they consider this decision in the framework of other decisions the Planning Commission has made, he thought it has authorized other hours of operation consistent with this around 8:00 or 9:00 pm closing time for other mixed use projects, such as authorizing cannabis retail operations on the ground floor of existing mixed use buildings. He thought, as it came up in those discussions, it was understood that it was a landlord-tenant type of situation to be managed. If a particular business operator was making too much noise, that was an issue for the landlord to regulate, making the fact that there is a business below clear when leasing to a tenant was also an important obligation of a property owner. He then deferred to Asst. City Attorney Bazzano on whether she had some additional thoughts on how the city might be able to address conditions.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano would agree with what Sr. Planner Murdock just said. She was also going to point out the Planning Commission's previous actions relating to the mixed use relating to cannabis. She would add that the hours of operation would run with the land and, if there is any potential transfer, those hours of operation would continue to run with the land and be applicable to any use by a future owner. She stated that the hours aren't going to change and assuming that a landlord conveys the hours of operation to a potential resident, she didn't see any problem with that in the future. She stated that, if they have further concerns, they can discuss it further but she didn't see how that could be a detriment.

Chair Nibbelin referred to the condition of approval that deals with special events, stating it was a very specific condition that pertains very specifically to the particular use the applicants intend to

make of the property. He thought, if they ended up with a different tenant below, it might or might not be problematic and it might suggest that there wouldn't be any special events unless the user happened to be the kind of tenant who was interested in book signings or illustration workshops or presentations by naturalists.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano thought it was very narrow.

Chair Nibbelin thought it would be ordinary non-special events in a commercial use. He wanted to make sure how those things work together, particularly in the context of a commercial tenant who is not in the same space as the present applicants.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought the important point to the special events, from staff's perspective, is the trigger in the Municipal Code for the change of use abutting a residential district. He thought it was their intention, based on the applicant's project description, to not go beyond those special events described in order to minimize potential impacts to the abutting residential district. He thought it would be within the ability of a future business owner to seek and amendment to this use permit or her own use permit to authorize a different type of activity which would further change the use abutting the district. He stated that staff felt comfortable with the nature of these particular special events. He stated that, if they were DJ dance party special events to promote the brand that may have the potential for a different range of impacts on the abutting R district. He stated that, in this case, from staff's perspective, a relatively benign and limited impacts of book signings and special events described, as well as hours of operation within the umbrella hours authorized for the business, it left them feeling comfortable with the arrangement and not wanting to go beyond that.

Chair Nibbelin understood and he shares that sense of comfort, but he wanted to be sure this applicant's special event isn't some other tenant's ordinary commercial activity.

Commissioner Bigstycyk pointed out the very close proximity with Winter's and in some instances, he would be more concerned about the very loud music and other raucous activity going on past 9:00 pm on a weekend. He stated that during the pandemic season, up to 10:00 pm they will have events in their backyard going on now and that was almost more of a concern to him. He thought, if the neighborhood could tolerate that kind of noise activity, he thought the hours of operation stated were in alignment with where the neighborhood is currently. He stated that they heard the idea of this during the LCP update and it immediately occurred to him as being a very cool idea and potential project. He liked the vibe of the project overall. He stated that the concerns by his fellow commissioners were well-taken and at the end he will vote in alignment with the consensus on safety concerns as it is a tight space. Overall, he thought it was a very cool and interesting project, mentioning that even when not leaning toward the project, he thought Mr. Brinkman was always involved with interesting and cool projects and very attractive. Overall, he was in favor of this. He stated that, as they discuss the Sharp Park Specific Plan later, this is very much the kind of project he would think they would want to bring into the area. He was sensitive to concerns raised about safety, etc., and he will vote in consensus with safety but in general he liked this project.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she has been listening to all the commissioners, particularly with the safety concerns by Commissioner Berman and what Commissioner Bigstycyk echoed. She wondered if a mutual solution to property rights and safety concerns would be a condition that wasn't prohibitive but left it in the hands of staff so it was something that stays on the radar.

She didn't know how the Commission would feel about asking the applicant to provide a safety plan during construction and a plan for maintenance of the eastern property line to the satisfaction of city staff. She stated, if that condition or something akin to it was added, she would be willing to support the project with no other changes. She would ask what everyone feels about that.

Commissioner Berman was in favor of that. She stated that when she presented her concerns, the applicant and Sr. Planner Murdock reassured her that her concerns will be thoughtfully addressed during the permitting process and she felt comfortable. If the rest of the Commission and staff wanted to add another condition, she would be in favor of that as well.

Chair Nibbelin proposed that Commissioner Hauser make a motion along the lines that she was thinking and adding terminology along the lines that she was sharing as an additional condition and see if they can get a second to see where it goes.

Commissioner Hauser moved that the Planning Commission FINDS the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVES Site Development Permit PSD-847-19, Coastal Development Permit CDP-418-19, Use Permit UP-121-19, Parking Exception PE-188-19 and Sign Permit S-132-20 by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A subject to incorporating an additional condition that the applicant shall provide a safety plan during construction and a plan for maintenance of the eastern property line to the satisfaction of city staff; and INCORPORATES all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Bigstycck seconded the motion.

Chair Nibbelin stated that, before they vote on it, he asked staff to comment on the motion in case there was any fine tuning they wanted to do with the language or any concerns about the motion as stated.

Sr. Planner Murdock asked the maker of the motion if she would accept a timing component to set this prior to issuance of a building permit.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she would definitely accept that.

Commissioner Bigstycck stated that he will.

Commissioner Berman had a question before they vote. She referred to mention of maintenance of the eastern property line, and asked what was intended by that.

Commissioner Hauser stated that the intention was that with the 2-inch setback the new commercial space outdoor stairwell and mural or piece of public art requires access onto an adjoining property owner's land where easement rights do not currently exist and either some access right would be gained or the applicant can demonstrate the means and methods by which they would actually do the maintenance from their own property line.

Commissioner Berman stated that the only item she disagrees with is the access rights. An easement would have to be coordinated, designed and granted with the adjacent property and not this one.

Commissioner Hauser agreed, and that was why she was trying to incorporate flexibility so whatever that maintenance plan is will be something staff is comfortable with and if it is not an

access easement, that was fine. She stated that it was the idea that if you are building what is a technically zero lot line, there would be some thought into how to go about making sure that, if building materials need to be replaced or fixed or stucco needs to be redone in 5-10 years, there will be a mechanism to do that.

Commissioner Berman understood, stating that she didn't want to end up with a condition that requires an adjacent property owner to do something. She asked if the Asst. City Attorney wanted to revise it.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that she would like to clarify because she did not hear that access was an issue. She heard that the applicant felt that there was sufficient space to maintain the property line. She clarified that this was not a public mural but a private mural and the obligation to maintain the property falls to the property owner and if the mural is not kept in a manner that is appropriate or compatible with the Municipal Code, the city would be able to enforce provisions of the Municipal Code relating to nuisance. At this point, she has not heard anything that would support a need for maintenance of the eastern property line. She asked that they clarify that first.

Chair Nibbelin gathered that the condition of approval didn't require, as Commissioner Hauser noted, that anything negotiated with the adjacent property was required. All that would be required is a showing to a reasonable satisfaction of city staff that there is a plan for maintenance if and when it was needed. He thought that at some point in the future maintenance will be needed and given the small setback, he didn't think it was an unreasonable condition to require.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that they don't typically impose that type of condition. She would like to see or hear that there is some underlying access problem. She suggested that they clarify with the applicant or clarify that there was some discussion in the record that would support that type of condition.

Chair Nibbelin thought they were dealing with an extraordinarily small setback of a couple of inches. He suggested Commissioner Hauser speak to this.

Commissioner Hauser stated that it was a 2-inch setback and during discussion and questions to the applicant, there was a comment that approximately 80% of that would probably be maintained from the current property line as designed, and the question was what happens to the 20%. She understood that it was probably an estimation at this point and maybe everything can be maintained properly from the project site without needing access onto the adjacent property, but she thought it warranted a little bit more thought and she didn't think adding a condition that leaves it at staff's discretion to make sure that thought has been given would be overly cumbersome. She stated that her goal is not to create some sort of cumbersome requirement for the applicant that is impossible but to make sure that everyone thinks this through so they don't get left with some sort of property ownership issue in 5 or 10 years.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano asked if her condition of approval only speaks to the 20% that was identified as potentially being inaccessible or difficult to access by the applicant.

Commissioner Hauser agreed, explaining that there were two components of the condition, the safety plan during construction would apply to everything, and the maintenance for the eastern property line would apply to the 20% of concern.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano clarified that her proposed condition of approval was not specific to the mural itself but to just the eastern property line and the 20%.

Commissioner Hauser agreed, explaining that it was not just the mural but the commercial staircase and the exterior wall of the ground floor commercial building that are at 2 inches from the property line.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano understood and thanked her for the clarification.

Sr. Planner Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Bigstych, Godwin, Hauser,
Leal and Chair Nibbelin

Noes: None

Chair Nibbelin declared that anyone aggrieved by the action of the Planning Commission has ten (10) calendar days to appeal the decision in writing to the City Council.

CONSIDERATION:

3. 2020-007

File No. 2020-007 – Sharp Park Specific Plan Guiding Policy Framework Discussion. Recommended CEQA Action: N/A – Not a “project” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

Commissioner Leal stated that he has a conflict of interest due to ownership or property in this location and he needs to recuse himself from this item. He stated that to do that, he must turn off his video and stay on mute.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he would ask the Asst. City Attorney to confirm that it was appropriate.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that Commissioner Leal will turn off his video and mute himself for the duration of the item.

Commissioner Leal turned off video and muted his microphone.

Sr. Planner Murdock presented two key points of the staff report and then stated that Allison Moore from Dyett & Bhatia will make a more detailed presentation.

Allison Moore of Dyett & Bhatia, presented staff report.

Chair Nibbelin wanted to see if there were questions or clarifying points from the Commission, then take public comment and bring it back for in depth questions and discussions.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they have other key staff on the Plan Pacifica team, i.e., Planning Director Wehrmeister, Management Analyst Montemayor, Assoc. Planner O’Connor, Assoc. Civil Engineer Marquez, and Rajeev Bhatia from Dyett & Bhatia, the city’s consultant.

Chair Nibbelin stated that it sounded like they had a lot of people to help them work through the process.

Commissioner Bigstycyk was clarifying that they were asking the bulk of the questions in deliberation after public comment.

Chair Nibbelin stated that was his intention.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that he would save his questions for after.

Chair Nibbelin opened public comment and asked Sr. Planner Murdock if they had any public comments.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they had one hand raised, Tom Thompson.

Tom Thompson, Pacifica, stated that he has been a Sharp Park property owner for over 33 years. He stated that the vision and enthusiasm in the Sharp Park Specific Plan are spot on, commending them for the work they have done. He stated that investing is the key to converting the plan into results. He stated that, to attract investors for projects like the 2212 Beach Boulevard, they didn’t address what he would call the infrastructure “elephant in the room”, the sea wall. He stated that

the SPSP mentions the seawall only in the existing conditions report section under coastal hazards, and while it states the problem, it only indicates the city is in the process of evaluating options, and the report is telling investors to wait to see if Pacifica ever fixes this problem before investing millions or tens of millions of dollars in a project like 2212 Beach Boulevard. He stated that an RFP will attract interest but unfortunately it will not attract actual investment in Sharp Park unless they show in the SPSP that Pacifica is committed to solving the seawall problem. He stated that he has experience in development, some related to 2212 Beach, that he can share if they would like. He thought that, to turn the problem into a solution that will attract investors, Pacifica needs to be clear in the SPSP that the seawall improvements are a top priority and is committed as a policy to making seawall improvements north of the fishing pier happen ASAP. He stated that the SPSP needs to include the strongest commitment they can make to a policy of fixing the seawall problems to attract financial investment in Sharp Park. He stated that it is obviously in the best interest of present owners and residents of Sharp Park, and in the interest of future owners and investors as well as all Pacificans.

Cindy Abbott, Pacifica, thanked them for bringing this forward, even under less than ideal circumstances of Zoom. She would like clarification, if they are talking about north and south Palmetto, on the cross streets which she thought should be clearly defined in the report and maps provided. She stated that her two primary concerns are parking and higher density. She referred to the third paragraph of the vision for Sharp Park which states it should be easy and pleasant to get around by foot, bicycle and park a car once in the area, yet the section on transportation and connectivity has four bullet points on how to have reduced or flexible parking requirements for new development. She appreciated Ms. Moore stating that more was to come on that, because the robust parking strategy for West Sharp Park must be part of this plan and it needs to be complete and well thought out. She didn't think it was there at this time. She then referred to height and density on page 6 of the staff report, stating it talks about the challenges of staff to explain the difference between a mixed use neighborhood and a mixed use center, particularly the greater building heights that some development would need to achieve in order to produce what staff might be looking for. She stated that there were concerns about that with losing the character of Sharp Park. She stated that a survey was conducted where 43% of the respondents, i.e., the highest number of respondents, noted that they should keep Palmetto as a mixed use neighborhood which reflects the 35 feet with three stories. She referred to a comment listed at the bottom of one of the charts that the business mix is more important than allowing higher buildings. She concurred with that, as she can think of many vibrant, walkable main streets that do not have towering three and four or five story structures that are approachable and fit in the character of the West Sharp Park neighborhood. She hoped that the Planning Commission will keep that in mind of what West Sharp Park is about which is a small enclave of beach cottages such as the little building they were talking about earlier. She stated that it was not about four and five story buildings.

Ana Diaz Hernandez, Pacifica, stated she was recent new resident of Pacifica. She lives very close to the library and she noted when walking on Palmetto that there was a lot of conflict among drivers at all the main intersections along Palmetto, with some having four-way stops and some do not. She stated that some people stop when they don't need to and don't stop when they need to. She stated that she has seen people get out of cars and have confrontations. She wondered how much thought has been given to the design there as in part the issue might be how the painting was done at the intersections and it creates a semblance of stops. She stated that she mostly walks to get around and she cares about pedestrian and bike safety. She was curious about

what planning has been done regarding that issue as she has seen several people get into serious conversations.

Suzanne Drake, Pacifica, echoed Tom Thompson's concerns with regard to attracting developers and investment funds into Pacifica when we are not coming forthright with hard, strong language that Pacifica as a city will drive to maintain the seawall as well as the overall infrastructure. She thought the challenge they didn't have before this Covid problem was that there are a ton of businesses that want to build and Pacifica has seemingly been last or on a no list where properties across the Bay Area but we can't get a developer to save us. She thought Pacifica has had a significant reputation as not being very business friendly or developer friendly which has spilled over. She stated that Half Moon Bay is built up and travel visitor serving, as well as Daly City and South San Francisco, and all these communities have financially benefitted from the economic boom, but we can't get anyone of interest in Pacifica. She thought we have to come out as being business friendly, developer friendly and the seawall needs to be at the top of the list. She encouraged the language to be forthright or we will have problems getting funding. She stated that we must try and put our best foot forward that says we welcome developers and investment dollars and will protect our infrastructure as well as our seawall. She didn't know if it was premature to bring this up, but she asked if there has ever been any consideration regarding residential parking permits.

Curt Kiest, Pacifica, stated that he has lived in the neighborhood for 35 years and he is asking, not what is the vision of current residents, but what is the vision of developers. He thought we need structural and granular information from real developers about not what we guess is why they don't come here but what they actually say. He stated that one concern he has is that fight over height which may get people very involved may be irrelevant if the developers are saying it is all about the permit process or about the seawall. He stated that he has no intention to build a 4 or 5-story building that would be economically prohibitive. He stated that we need to know that information as it will guide the success, specifically what do developers need to put their money in Pacifica. He stated that, on looking at those options, we can choose among the ones that make the most sense for Pacifica, but not guess what the developers like. He thought they already have the result, as we have had the mixed use designation and 35-foot height limits since 1980. On Palmetto and Francisco, they have almost no buildings that are over 1-2 stories, just a couple of 3-story buildings and we have tons of empty lots and unused potential. He asked what was limiting that, adding that he didn't believe it was the developer saying that, if we gave him a chance to build a 5-story building, he would get a permit to build it tomorrow. He was almost sure it would be a different answer. He would be interested in staff or consultants giving us concrete information about what developers actually want.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that there were no further hands raised.

Chair Nibbelin closed the public hearing.

Chair Nibbelin then asked the Commissioners about how they want to address the issues on the table. He stated that Packet pages 70 and 71 have topics laid out in Table 1 but whether there is a particular process they want to use or staff has a recommendation on what is the most helpful way for the Commission to attack the issues, such as one at a time, etc.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it was important for the Commission to figure out how they want to work through the issues. He appreciated highlighting the issues on Packet pages 70 and 71, but

also wanted to draw the Commission's attention to the guiding policy framework on Packet page 77 with Attachment B as it gives a broader overview and will give the Commission a sense of the guiding principles and values they are trying to express as they have heard them through the community through the various engagements in person and online, etc. He stated that this was the starting point and they have to make sure they have a solid foundation with the principles and get the values right to begin the work on actual policy language to put them into policies that they can implement in the future.

Chair Nibbelin acknowledged the guiding principles and they would want to bear in mind the entire document as they work through it.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he came to the meeting with four questions before the three questions specifically before them. He stated that, while he was listening to public feedback, he came up with another six questions. He would recommend starting with the general overview/public feedback and then get into the three specifics and go from there if they want to talk policy framework at all.

Chair Nibbelin thought that sounded good and asked him to be the first one to do so.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that they have done a lot of work updating the LCLUP and he wondered, on talking about the Sharp Park Specific Plan, if they are going to have to go back to the LCLUP or will something be incorporated after they have this discussion or where is the process. He was wondering about the relation of this to the LCLUP process.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that a specific plan is a more particular focused document, generally over a smaller geographic area and generally with more specificity as its name suggests. He stated that a specific plan has to be consistent with the higher level General Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan and they hoped they were able to timely certify the new LCLUP that the Commission has acted on and City Council has approved. He stated that it was with the Coastal Commission now and they were working through that process to respond to some of their informational requests on the document so the Coastal Commission can complete its analysis and consider whether or not to certify the document. He stated that it was staff's intention to hopefully have the LCLUP certified and follow with a certification process for the specific plan.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated there was something in the staff report about priority development areas, and he recalled that prior to the larger process, there was some talk about Eureka Square initially being a PDA but it doesn't sound like that is the case at this point. He stated that it sounds like Palmetto and along Skyline Boulevard (SR-35) will be. He wondered if he could tell them a little more about PDAs and more specifically what they are thinking the plan is for PDAs that we have etched out.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that Planning Director Wehrmeister would like to offer some observations on that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister wanted to clarify that the PDA for the Sharp Park area encompasses the entire Sharp Park Specific Plan area and Eureka Square is part of that PDA.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that he has seen a lot of construction going on at Eureka Square but he has no idea what they are doing as whether there is any kind of residential construction as part of their project or an element that might be included later.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that Eureka Square is doing a major façade improvement and there is no substantial change to uses there except that they are making sure that outdoor dining could be accommodated in the space they already have available for that.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that it was his perception that the city has done a lot of conversation in terms of putting housing on top of the Eureka Square use. He asked if the city has talked to the owners of Eureka Square about that idea or is that a conversation to have down the road if possible.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they are aware of that aspiration that the city has for their property and they have indicated that they are not ready to do that now and they don't know when and if they will be ready, but they are aware of these designations.

Commissioner Bigstycyk asked if they seemed fairly neutral on the point or have a predilection one way or the other.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought they have been focused on the present and they are not interested at this point. She stated that they have been silent, at least in conversations with her, about the future of that site.

Commissioner Bigstycyk referred to regional housing need allocation numbers, stating that it strikes him as very awkward to talk about a property as though it might be a part of the solution when they have no idea if they are going to sign on. He stated that it sounds like they might, but it was good to know where they stand so as they have the discussion going forward it tempers. His overview question is about the RHNA numbers and he understood that, in the future when they soon get the new numbers, unlike previous times when they have gotten the numbers there might be consequences if they can't meet the fullness of them. He asked confirmation that he was near being accurate in his assessment and if they have any insight as to what the numbers might be and talk about RHNA in general which might be helpful.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she can start out and then Sr. Planner Murdock and Assoc. Planner O'Connor can jump in. She referred to his first comment of his instinct to question counting a site that is already developed as a solution site for the RHNA number they need to get and has been identified as an issue by state legislature and there is much more stringent criteria regarding which sites you can count and how much you will be able to count for density on this site in the next housing element round. She stated that they were at the very beginning of that process and she can't say how it will shake out in our community except that the instinct is correct and has been reflected in legislation recently. She stated that, as far as the RHNA process, he was accurate in that the RHNA methodology committee is in the middle of working out its recommendation to the ABAG Board and MTC and she didn't have an indication of what our final number will be at this point. A draft methodology will be put out soon for public comment. They won't assign a number to it but they will be able to do the math and get an idea of where jurisdiction allocation might be. She thought there was another question.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that there was some talk that when the numbers come out there might be consequences if we don't fulfill the entirety of the number. He just thought of another question that they could briefly touch on it. He stated that they don't know if the number might go down depending on the methodology. He thought prior to the present time it was suggested, when he listens to Council, the number might go up given the amount of need we have but since we don't know how they are going to be counting that number we don't know that the number could go down.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it was correct. She stated that the big number for the entire nine county or Bay Area region is bigger but he is correct in how that is now allocated is being debated and our number could go up or down depending on how that shakes out. She referred to his mention of consequences, and she was assuming he meant consequences for not actually building the units. She stated that state law was not there, but it has evolved in that there are consequences for cities that don't approve housing projects at the density they are allowed in the zones they have designated. That means that a city can no longer designate sites, get their housing element through and on the back end deny projects or approve projects at lesser densities. She stated it is very difficult to do that now with the way laws have been changed.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought it sounded like they are holding cities to the standards they set for themselves.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought with the process now, it sounds like it would probably be most beneficial to stick with the numbers we currently have from last time they gave us numbers. He thought it would be helpful to have that number in mind as a baseline. He stated that we have tangible goals as a city that we are trying to achieve in terms of not just creating a community in which they can house people in general but there are large organizations looking at us to make sure that we are fulfilling that obligation. He asked what the current number was that we have unfulfilled and how many more do we have to reach that goal.

Planning Director Wehrmeister asked Sr. Planner Murdock if he knew that number.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he did not know offhand but probably at least a couple of hundred units. The regional housing needs allocation for 2015-2023 was 413 housing units across a variety of income levels and we were far short of achieving that in terms of permitted and constructed units.

Commissioner Bigstyk heard him say at least a couple of hundred, and he asked if it could potentially be higher or was he fairly confident that it was around the 200 number.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he would ask if Management Analyst Josh Montemayor has a better sense of that as he prepared their annual progress report for housing homeless.

Management Analyst Montemayor stated that the number was 334.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought it was helpful to remember that in the back of his mind as they talk about density. He stated that those were his overview questions and other Commissioners

might have questions regarding the public and he will yield the floor. If he doesn't hear his questions asked, he will ask them later.

Commissioner Berman stated that Commissioner Bigstycyk asked a few of her questions such as what our RHNA number designation is currently. She referred to one of the bullet points in the guiding policy framework land use section in Packet page 79, stating it was to explore options for improving vacant sites with interim improvement such as landscaping or temporary uses such as pop-up events and activities. She wondered if the Planning Department intended for those vacant sites to be city sites, or if private sites, how would that be coordinated with the property owner.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they have not envisioned any changes on property ownership by the public as part of their work on this plan. The bullet point is in the context of properties remaining public or private in their current state of ownership. He stated that they currently have a special event temporary permitting process which in many respects was rather cumbersome. The bullet point entails a process to allow an expanding range of temporary uses to have a more streamlined process for special events so we can have more activity in Sharp Park.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he didn't know if it was just his computer, but his comments were a little distorted.

Commissioner Berman stated it was hers as well.

Chair Nibbelin thought he got about 50-60% of what he was saying but there was distortion going on. He stated that it was probably not a good enough quality for most people to pick up what he is saying.

Commissioner Berman wondered if someone else could pick up the sense of what Sr. Planner Murdock was trying to explain.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano thought Sr. Planner Murdock or Assoc. Planner O'Connor could nod their heads or jump in if it needs correction, but she thought Sr. Planner Murdock was trying to say was that the comment was with regard to reservation of potential land uses that could occur in the future should a private property owner wish to develop their property in that manner.

Commissioner Berman thanked the Asst. City Attorney as she was hoping for clarification on that. She agreed with that policy with a great opportunity and flexibility for property owners. She will touch on some of the comments they heard and someone else can comment after her. She referred to asking for verbiage on the city's planned protection of the seawall. She stated that they don't have the full SPSP developed yet as they are in the first steps, but she understood from the LCLUP process that the seawall improvement had very heavy language in there so maybe staff can consider incorporating heavy reference to the LCLUP for development on the seawall and protection of the seawall. She asked if that was possible or did staff recommend incorporating a seawall subsection in the SPSP when it is developed.

Assoc. Planner O'Connor stated that Sr. Planner Murdock was going to sign off and back on. She stated that, in answering Commissioner Berman's question, the Sharp Park Specific Plan will make mention of the desire to create protections and promote resiliency in the Sharp Park area. She stated that it was obviously necessary to support the investment that they are looking to add

to that neighborhood. She stated that the timing of this effort is actually in line with the timing of an effort with the Public Works Department and their feasibility planning effort of the Beach Boulevard seawall. She stated that the discussion of the Sharp Park Specific Plan is already being talked about in conjunction with the proposed and necessary armoring efforts that need to be done. She asked if that answered her question.

Commissioner Berman stated in some way, but she wanted to be sure. She stated that everyone in their virtual room understands that there is the LCLUP and the Sharp Park Specific Plan which homes in on the area and then there is the General Plan. She was sure each one was going to have referenced language to armoring of the seawall and sea level rise mitigations, but her understanding during the LCLUP process is that the heavy bulk of that policy and language will be in the LCLUP and she didn't know if staff didn't want to be duplicative between the SPSP and the LCLUP. She thought about just incorporating references to those but she asked if staff would want to include a whole hazard or armoring section in the SPSP.

Assoc. Planner O'Connor didn't think it would have its own hazard section but would rely on the LCLUP guidance and policies. She stated that there will be references to connect the two, but it won't have its own separate analysis.

Allison Moore emphasized that the Specific Plan has to be consistent with the General Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan.

Commissioner Berman understood. She knows there were a few comments regarding that and hopefully that helps address the community members' concerns. She referred to a request for a definition between the north and south of Palmetto and where it begins and ends. She thought that was a great question because she found herself asking that as well. She asked if they could speak to that.

Sr. Planner Murdock asked if the Commission can confirm his audio is working again.

Chair Nibbelin stated that it was much better.

Sr. Planner Murdock asked Ms. Moore if she would like to comment on that.

Allison Moore stated that, in the survey, they envisioned the cutoff point being San Jose Avenue to account for that pedestrian bridge entryway and most of the development happening at the Council Chamber site, library and that area north of it would help to connect the rest of the area.

Commissioner Berman understood that San Jose Avenue was kind of the separating point.

Sr. Planner Murdock asked if he could touch on the question earlier about temporary uses when he had the audio problem. He stated that the intent of that point is to increase vibrancy with the ability to have a broader range of temporary uses. They currently have a temporary use process but it was rather cumbersome, and they were looking to expand upon that so they can have more interesting and different types of temporary events in the area. Regarding the question of property ownership, the specific plan at this point was not contemplating any change in ownership from public to private or vice versa. That policy in that bullet, if supported by the Commission in advance, enables the property owners to undertake those temporary uses prior to a

full development of the site. He stated that it is interim activity to try to increase interest, foot traffic, visitors, etc., and will demonstrate the viability of the area.

Commissioner Berman assumed any funds required for that will be voluntary by the property owner.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that was one possibility and they are far from having developed a full plan yet, as there could be city support through economic development channels to sponsor or to support some of the events, as well as the Chamber of Commerce or other non-city organizations could support third party temporary events and he thought there were a variety of ways that could manifest but he thought having an improved policy framework and a set of policies that allow that to happen more easily and with less cost and fewer barriers to entry is what they are trying to get at with that bullet point.

Commissioner Berman was going to touch on other public comments but she thought she has spoken a lot and she let other commissioners go first and she can play cleanup.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he was relatively new on the Commission and this is his first Specific Plan. He had some basic things to be answered. He asked if they were mainly interested in insuring they can build a lot more residential units or mainly interested in building infrastructure or mainly interested in facilitating private investment to support tourist activities or resident services. He stated he was a bit lost after all the discussion on what their goal was to accomplish, the time frame and what financial or other resources they can bring to bear or the city can bring to bear on any of the problems.

Chair Nibbelin stated that sometimes it was helpful to have a good framing question and they can ask staff frame the context.

Sr. Planner Murdock thanked Commissioner Godwin for a great point. He stated that they failed to clarify earlier in the staff presentation that many of the commissioners have not been a part of this process. He thought some out of personal interest have been following along but for his sake or members of the community he wanted to touch on a few points. He stated that City Council has generally provided some guidance as they imagine a re-envisioned and more dynamic Palmetto Avenue area. What that has meant is a key tool to achieve that Council vision is implementation of a specific plan. That entails significant community engagement and involvement. They tried to structure this specific plan process and listen to the community and gather information about what their vision is within the guiding parameters that City Council has laid, i.e., that they want to revitalize Palmetto Avenue. He stated that Palmetto Avenue is not an area that exists in isolation and is part of the broader neighborhood and why they have convinced City Council that a specific plan is the appropriate vehicle to achieve a revitalized and more vibrant Palmetto Avenue, as well as other supporting improvements in the West Sharp Park neighborhood and parts of east Sharp Park and all in totality work together to achieve that goal. He stated that, when they laid out the framework in the beginning to help this community conversation begin, they tried to gather broad-based input from the community about their goals and desires for the Palmetto and Sharp Park area, what they like about it now, what do they enjoy doing there, what are things they wished they could do or things they wished could be improved. He stated that, as they shifted through and tried to distill all that wonderful community feedback they received, they boiled it down to those three goals that you see in the documents, achieving vibrancy, supporting great places and improving connectivity. They thought nearly everything

they have heard that Council wants to achieve and the community wants to achieve probably falls within those three buckets in some shape or form. He stated that they are trying to use those three broad concepts to begin to shape more and more specific layers of policy to get to the specific measurable and attainable policies and at the end of the day provide a clear environment for potential developers and property owners as well as the community to understand what they should expect from activity, development, infrastructure improvement to support private property and public development. He hopes that rounds out some of those points and he was happy to speak further on any gaps that may still remain in his understanding of the process.

Rajeev Bhatia stated that in response to Commissioner Godwin's comment, a specific plan is a very powerful tool under state law to help the actual implementation of the designs and overall objectives and standards they will come up specifically. He stated that over the past few years, the state has provided additional incentives and if there is a housing development and mixed use development for a specific plan for which a CEQA review has been completed, which is their intention for the Sharp Park Specific Plan to have a General Plan EIR and an EIR in the specific plan and those projects are exempt from further environmental review. He stated that they would have hashed out issues about design standards, development standards about views, setbacks, etc., so the overall permitting process for development should move much faster. He stated that it also ties in to the housing issue that will the city ratchet down the numbers when push comes to shove. He stated that was the reason why they are taking the time to listen to the community, to engage with them to make sure they get it right. He stated that once they get it right, the development will be streamlined and proceed.

Sr. Planner Murdock thanked him for the input. He then stated that he failed to address one point, which was his question about financing. He stated that, to this point, preparation of the plan has been through an expenditure authorized by City Council, but a specific plan is also a powerful tool that can enable the city to implement various financing mechanisms. That could come in the form of impact fees that are associated with different types of development that the city is trying to achieve. Understanding what the land use framework and other policies are enables the financing mechanisms that can help to improve infrastructure, public realm improvements like streetscapes, bicycle lanes, etc., and it is a strong tool to tie together all the different pieces of what a desirable neighborhood or planning area should be like. They were trying to understand what the area should be like based on a broad-based community feedback that they have been seeking.

Allison Moore added that there will be a section within the specific plan that outlines the financing and implementation strategy.

Chair Nibbelin asked what other questions he had.

Commissioner Godwin stated that was the main one as he wanted to make sure he saw it from the proper viewpoint and covered it and didn't add things that weren't there. That was enough for him to get started.

Chair Nibbelin also appreciated having the framing of it, as that is useful.

Commissioner Hauser stated that many of her questions were asked and answered. She stated that, in relation to the connection section, she wondered if the city has looked at if there is actual right-of-way space for the improvements that have been contemplated.

Sr. Planner Murdock started by indicating that they have not done design level analysis as this more high level policy and community desire level planning. He thought there were a variety of techniques that can be used performing a road diet to shrink vehicle travel lanes to provide non-motorized infrastructure such as bike lanes or widened sidewalks. He stated that there may be unused right of way currently. If that entire street is rebuilt, they can accommodate additional facilities. He asked Assoc. Civil Engineer Marquez to speak a little more about whether the bicycle pedestrian master plan proceeded to any finer level of detail as applicable to the Sharp Park road.

PW Assoc. Civil Engineer Marquez stated that the bicycle pedestrian master plan calls for a couple of possible road diets however it doesn't go through the specificity required to implement them so that means that they would want to look at them on a project by project basis because they could impact parking, travel lanes and they didn't look into that at this point. Regarding the specific area they are looking at in Sharp Park, they did not identify any areas for road diet outside of Oceana as a possibility.

Commissioner Hauser concluded that they haven't contemplated that people might be asked to provide additional right-of-way dedication of their property.

PW Assoc. Civil Engineer Marquez stated that was not considered during the bicycle and pedestrian master plan.

Rajeev Bhatia added that it was not just a matter of a road diet as some of the streets do not have continuous sidewalks let alone additional bike lanes, such as Santa Rosa Avenue. He stated that the sidewalk stops and as a pedestrian you get off and get back on again. He stated that there are certain basic things they would do, such as to complete the sidewalks. He thought that then, beyond that, they will start looking into other mechanisms as to how to achieve additional right-of-way if they need that. He stated that much can be done within the additional right-of-way to enhance the pedestrian walking experience as well as safety.

Commissioner Hauser asked if affordable housing needs additional height incentives. She wanted staff's input, if they are formulating a specific plan that is looking at vibrancy and aesthetics, as to whether there is a reason they would look at doing that and that it would not be able to be accomplished by state density bonus law and whether there was a benefit to doing it on a municipal level.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought that was hard to say. He thought, if they can establish some comparative advantage through our local regulations outside of density bonus law, the city may be able to retain greater control over other aspects of the development. He stated that, as they are aware, when density bonus is triggered, the city is obligated to offer concessions and incentives to a developer and it can often relax other aspects of the project that may be very important to the city like parking or other setback requirements and height standards. He agreed that there was probably limited space to establish such a policy, but they think it may be worth exploring. He stated that, to the extent that they can do that, they may be able to achieve a double benefit in that they provide more affordable housing as well as retaining greater local control in the form of not foregoing other zoning standards they have to give up as incentives or concessions.

Commissioner Hauser stated that, regarding the Coastal Commission input, she didn't know if staff was planning on talking more about that. She stated that there seems to be some Coastal Commission thoughts on the height and she wondered if there was any more specificity that had been given, mentioning that in Half Moon Bay the hotel is five stories. She wondered if there was a new policy they are looking at or what their thoughts were on that point.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that staff understands that the Coastal Commission staff and the Coastal Commission will ultimately have an important role in the final specific plan that comes out of this process. He stated that, to that end, they engaged specifically with the Coastal Commission on the issue of height in April and there had been sort of an urban legend that the Coastal Commission, district staff in our area were not supportive of heights greater than 35 feet. He stated that they wanted to confirm or dispel that urban legend as early in the process as possible, especially given the importance of heights above 35 feet which staff identified within some of the potential options that the Planning Commission is going to discuss. He stated that on that call, the Coastal Commission staff made clear that there is no formal or informal kind of policy about 35-foot height limits. They recognized that, in some cases, heights above 35 feet may be permissible but he got the sense that, as height went above 35 feet and progressively went higher, the Coastal Commission's anxiety about potential coastal resource impacts, such as coastal views from public spaces increased. Their concerns about crowding at the street level increased. He thought the robustness and extent of coastal resource impacts analysis for those heights would also necessarily increase. That means that they have the ability to pursue heights above 35 feet, but they need not do it at the detriment of other coastal resources. They understood that as a requirement of any aspect of the specific plan that they were going to evaluate the full range of coastal resources and they were comfortable with the feedback they received initially. It may look alarming in the comment letter but it was anticipated and an expected part of the process.

Chair Nibbelin referred to a public comment to make sure they are getting information from real developers or investors as to what they see as important to have in place in order for them to have levels of economic revitalization and his recollection of the process was that there had been an economic analysis or something along those lines that was done in the process. He hoped he could get staff to talk about how those considerations have been worked in at this time.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought they have done a couple of activities as part of their planning work so far that touch on these issues. He stated that one was called the existing conditions report or ECR and it did a general type of market analysis for Pacifica, but he doesn't recall it touching specifically on height but it assessed the general marketability and desirability of Pacifica in the broader Bay Area market for uses like retail, office and housing. He stated that the other activity they have undertaken was stakeholder interviews and they included a range of community participants from residents to business owners and to current and potential future developers. He thought Allison Moore could speak more to the type of feedback they received. They have sought input from actual developers.

Allison Moore stated that they have spoken with three local developers in the area. She also wanted to reiterate Rajeev Bhatia's point earlier that this specific plan will provide more certainty and streamlining about what developers can potentially do. They did hear about concerns with the seawall and other concerns about the permitting process, but they really focused on was making Sharp Park a destination. She stated that some developers were saying there was no there

and they need to make sure they have the right draw to bring the foot traffic that is going to make mixed use development viable.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that a couple of other thoughts that come to mind for him his that as the commenter mentioned, they have had these particular development standards for 40 years at this point. He stated that it was his assessment as a planner that more of the same will probably deliver more of the same in terms of development regulations. He thought that, looking with fresh eyes on what our development standards will allow, how they relate to construction costs and other types of typical development occurring in the Bay Area in 2020 as compared to 1980 is a helpful process to go through. He thought, in the limited number of projects that they have encountered outside and inside of the specific plan area over the last few years very often for projects that don't move forward when they have spoken with and met with developers. He stated that quite often the problem is that our development regulations are too constraining and do not allow the number of units they need to make a project profitable and to "pencil out." He stated a common issue is packing in the types of units they need to sell to meet the market demand within a 35-foot height limit while also providing full off street parking. He stated that it was a very difficult equation to balance across all of the different variables and staff thinks trying to rejigger that equation in some fashion that is respectful of the community values would also take into account current conditions in 2020 and into the future as compared to 40 years looking backwards.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he had another question regarding the guiding policy framework, particularly one of the bullets under guiding principles is the promotion of the development of housing in mixed use settings which accommodates residents of all incomes, family types in life stages which he thought was a good guiding principle and he was in favor of it. He stated that they get down to the guiding policy framework, particularly the land use piece of that and there were some bullets under a general heading, one of which is a reference to promoting a variety of housing types and sizes and programs to support the development of housing, affordable to moderate low and extremely low income households. He stated that was something he was especially interested in. He was curious as to whether or not we had the ability at this stage or whether it would be consistent with what they have heard to date going back to the guiding principles and the overarching things. He stated that, as they talk about housing that accommodates residents of all incomes, being able to state a specific desire to ensure that they are focussed on moderate, low and very low income, adding that he was getting at affordability in particular. He stated that recognizing that it is being manifest and articulated in the guiding policy framework and it strikes him that affordability is so central and he would like to see it articulated up at the highest level at a guiding principle level. He recognized that staff has done a good job of reflecting that concern in the framework.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the feedback is well taken. He thought they were striving to create a policy framework that comes at housing affordability from a number of directions. He stated that certainly there was the below market rate housing ordinance that the city currently has as with projects of 8 or more units not less than 15% must be reserved, deed restricted for persons with low, moderate and very low income. He stated achieving projects of that type in Sharp Park now is extremely difficult as for starters the sites tend to be quite small and at current densities they won't come anywhere close to a project with eight units. He stated that the Commission has an option of thinking through the land use framework and ratcheting up densities under certain circumstances so that eight units can be built and formal below market rate housing might actually occur. He stated that another angle to go about it is to consider the types of housing units

that are being built and striving to construct more “naturally affordable housing”. He stated that what they see now most commonly is really much closer to the luxury end of housing and they are often seeing three and four bedroom townhomes and condos and they can understand the type of income that was required to purchase housing of that type. He stated that, if they achieve certain densities, including even minimum densities in these policies they may be able to achieve housing units that are on a smaller end of the spectrum, i.e., studios, one bedroom, two bedrooms, to accommodate people with lower incomes without necessarily achieving full-fledged deed restricted housing. He thought there was some opportunity potentially through those policies. They thought a third way is to innovate in that space that they discussed with Commissioner Hauser earlier which is to see if there is a way to create incentives to providing affordable housing of a deed restricted variety, but for projects below eight units, perhaps outside of the context of the current state density bonus law. He stated that they need to explore that much more critically. They haven’t put a huge amount of effort in that and they want to check the variety of policies that the Commission may or may not support. He stated that was what they are getting at with that policy language and they can highlight housing affordability even at the highest levels of the policies.

Chair Nibbelin was appreciative of all those ideas and all those efforts. He would be in favor of tweaking the language slightly to highlight how they were interested in residents of all incomes as that was necessary for a vibrant community but particularly focused on affordability and the various measures that they are talking about to enhance affordability at the lower income levels.

Commissioner Bigstycyk referred to Mr. Thompson and Ms. Drake’s comments about the seawall that were well taken and as he looked at the policy framework on Packet page 81 under coastal resources and conservation mentioning protecting recreational assets while insuring the coastal resources are protected and enhanced. He wondered if insuring that coastal resources are protected and enhanced by a seawall as well as other methods might not be a bad idea to put in there.

Sr. Planner Murdock asked him to point him to the language.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated it was Packet page 81 under coastal resources and conservation and the last black dot on the page.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought they could explore whether it is under coastal resources and conservation or elsewhere to reinforce the policy emphasis on replacement of the Beach Boulevard seawall without being redundant with a broader range of supporting policies that are in the Local Coastal Land Use Plan which the City is working through the certification process with the Coastal Commission now.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought making sure that the specific notion of a seawall is easily accessible to a developer seems like a good idea. He thought it was very helpful to have an understanding that San Jose Avenue is a delineator between north and south, adding that he wasn’t too far off the mark when he was driving around and thinking San Jose was a good middle ground. He stated that the rest of his questions were about parking and traffic in general. He referred to Ms. Abbott asking about parking strategy in general and he thought talking about a parking structure or other strategies available to them. He stated that Ms. Drake referenced the idea of a parking permit program which seemed interesting to him. He stated that, between the

two questions, he dovetailed into a general parking question. He asked if a permit was on the table and, nonspecifically, what kind of parking strategies are they talking about.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the city is undertaking a comprehensive parking strategy assessment as part of the specific plan process. He stated that Dyett & Bhatia has an expert traffic consultant firm with which they are working for that purpose. He stated that they have been doing work along the way and they will ultimately release the findings and recommendations of that analysis, but they are influenced by the land use decisions that the specific plan will implement and allow. He stated that the parking strategies needed for a high intensity specific plan would potentially be different from a lower intensity specific plan. He suggests that all options are on the table now and they want to find out how to optimize those parking and transportation strategies based on the land use that will be generating that traffic and parking demand. He thought the one thing they can state with certainty now is that the City Council has enacted an in lieu parking fee for the Sharp Park Specific Plan area which is a helpful and important tool related to parking strategies in particular and they will enable the collection of fees in lieu of providing physical parking spaces so centralized common parking facilities can be provided once sufficient funding is available or other financing mechanisms are able to be utilized to speed up that production of off-street parking. He stated that they have the beginning of a toolbox and he thought they will have more tools in that toolbox as they get to later stages of the specific plan process.

Rajeev Bhatia added that their parking consultant, DKS, did a parking survey of Sharp Park, fortunately before the COVID-19 virus affected normal activities. They have very good data on parking utilization during different time periods on different streets and it will be part of the analysis. He stated that they made some recommendations but they are not quite there with the land uses so they need to look through the complete picture and come back to them for actual parking recommendations.

Allison Moore stated that parking will also be considered as part of a larger strategy where they consider other transportation alternative improvements such as bus access, bicycle access, pedestrian improvements, etc. It is not just about parking but how it works in a mobility system as well.

Sr. Planner Murdock rounded out that point to state that they are trying to think critically about the future of single occupant personal automobiles. He stated that we were in an interesting time of technological innovation with ridesharing, self-driving vehicles and the policies, decisions and hopefully developments that follow in reliance on the Sharp Park Specific Plan in the future are going to affect the built environment for 50-100 years in some cases and they want to be mindful of efficient use of land for desired activities. He said those desired activities could be parking and storage of automobiles, or they could be something else. He stated that they are trying to think of how that future of automobiles fits in with land use in this area as well.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought that was helpful for the neighborhood to have a full appreciation for what the process looks like on that point. He stated his other question was much more specific, mentioning that he had a similar circumstance with a different development in which a similar issue brought it up. He stated that, in this instance, it was Ms. Hernandez speaking on stop signs in the area. As she was speaking, he recalled when he was driving around the area earlier in the day and at one point he was traveling down San Jose and came to an intersection. He thought the stop sign was a foot or two behind his view and he wasn't sure if he was at a stop

or if there was no stop there. He stated that it was a disconcerting moment because, if traffic was behind him, there was an impetus to go, but if there is a stop sign, stopping is the more prudent option. He asked if part of the process was assessing signage and, in this case, stop signs to see if the current strategy is the ideal one.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought they were striving to look at all the dimensions that affect the built environment in the Sharp Park planning area. Land use and non-motorized travel have been priorities thus far. He stated that they had a companion analysis about parking and vehicular transportation as well. He thought the feedback they received at this meeting is feedback that has not come through clearly previously about the confusing nature of the intersection controls on Palmetto Avenue. He stated that it is something they will relay to Public Works staff beyond PW Assoc. Civil Engineer Marquez who is present at this meeting and through DKS, the consultant with which they are working for the transportation analysis. He stated that it is relevant for making it an inviting place and a walkable neighborhood. He stated that, if people are afraid of vehicle/pedestrian conflict, i.e., getting hit by a car, that is not a welcoming and inviting place to spend time and to move throughout the neighborhood.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he has had previous experiences involving one-way signs also. He thought it was part and parcel. He stated that was his last question based on public input and he was prepared to start discussing the actual question points, but he thought others had questions.

Chair Nibbelin stated he would see if Commissioner Berman has other questions.

Commissioner Berman stated that Commissioner Bigstyk asked her final cleanup questions. She was also ready to move on to the land use, building height and connectivity items specifically. She thought this was a nice segue way into that section. She appreciated everything staff has done and she understood this was the first step to developing the specific plan for Sharp Park. She hopes, while they deliberate the next three items, their direction will result in more detailed analysis. She knew there were a lot of questions from fellow commissioners about detailed cross sections and traffic impact analyses. She appreciated that they were going through this process, and based on the land use definition that they determine, a traffic impact analysis will be completed. Based on where they choose to look closer at bike and pedestrian improvements, feasibility will be further looked at. She wanted to mention that, knowing that the guiding policy framework is at a high level, they will have another chance to look at more detailed feasibility.

Chair Nibbelin asked Commissioner Hauser if she had any additional questions before they move on to the substance of the conversation.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she is ready for substance as well.

Chair Nibbelin was going to circle back to Commissioner Bigstyk as he had his hand up first to speak on that, so they will start with him, then move to Commissioner Berman, Hauser and Godwin and then himself.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if they were taking it one by one.

Chair Nibbelin thought he could provide his perspective with respect to the subject matters all at once as he thought that was the most efficient way of doing it rather than a round robin.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that, regarding the third point, he wasn't sure if he was prepared to fully dive in as he feels he needs more perspective. He stated the first two, touching on density and height, go hand in hand. He stated that, on looking through the third option under the topic of land use was the most appealing one because he was very interested in affordable units as much as possible, for community reasons as well as meeting the regional numbers. He liked the idea presented on No. 3, reading from the report to get it right. He stated that it triggers the conversation to comment on the next point as to height requirements. He thought that 45 feet was a more pleasant balance across the board and has great trepidations about allowing more than that, especially on the north side of Palmetto. He was sure that there would be a robust argument to what he just stated that 45 feet might be allowable. He also liked the idea of allowing for housing. To tie it together, he asked, if we were to allow above 45 feet, could it be a proposition that would have to come back before the Commission or would it be a ministerial call if they were to implement that policy.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought the Commission would have options on how they recommend that policy to be developed. He stated that he mentioned earlier, regarding Commissioner Hauser's question, that they need to explore more about whether and how they could develop such a policy as No. 3. Staff thought there probably is a way to make it attractive and he thought making it attractive might entail fewer barriers to having project approval, i.e., ministerial type approval or a more limited scope review rather than a full discretionary process. He stated that could be one of the innovations that they try to implement, that is to encourage that greater affordability and the tradeoff is a smoother, faster and cheaper project approval. He stated that there will be a lot of discussion about these individual policies as they take shape. He stated that getting guidance about what he is comfortable with, such as he thinks a discretionary process is important to get higher height, that is feedback they need to hear.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought mixed use center across the board is the more appealing way to go, given his bias toward housing. He also favored that south of San Jose, 45 feet absolutely allowable and was open to 55 feet on the south. In the north, when it gets into the 45 and 50 foot ranges, he hoped that they could put a policy in place that it would have to come before the Commission. He stated that while he is overly keen on getting housing in, he didn't know how keen he was about it being an eyesore to the community and starting to get out of the character of the community. He felt there should be openness toward the projects but also felt that on the north side they should have more control over whether or not they want to do it at any given moment and have a robust community involvement whereas in the south he thought it might be easier to have free range to even venture into the 55 foot range if there is consensus. He referred to the third point, stating that San Jose was absolutely what he thought the middle ground should be and after that he needs more context and he felt the discussion will provide that before he can go deeper into the conversation.

Commissioner Berman stated that she is also on the same wave length as Commissioner Bigstyk in two matters. She wanted to talk about the land use and the height items together first and then come back for the bikes as she did have thoughts on that but are separate. She was in favor of south Palmetto to allow the higher building heights, specifically 45 feet allowable and understanding the feel of the area, she would be open to 55 feet as well. She was also in favor of considering MUC designation throughout Palmetto but she wondered if Ms. Moore can go over it as she had a slide on it. She stated, if they wanted MUC designation, it sounded like it was

almost not worthwhile to only have building heights of 35 feet max. She asked if she interpreted that correctly.

Sr. Planner Murdock asked Allison Moore if she wanted him to try sharing the screen and he can bring up the slide he thinks she is looking for.

Allison Moore stated that it would take a height of 45 feet in order to achieve the capacity of mixed use center on most sites.

Commissioner Berman asked what density they would look at if they tried to make it as dense as possible but maintain 35 feet max height.

Allison Moore stated that, on that 1/3-acre site, mixed use neighborhood would get you about seven housing units whereas mixed use center would get you 14.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it was important to understand the scale of development in this area. A rough estimate for sake of discussion, they were talking about owning nearly all of a block between the cross streets along Palmetto Avenue, most of the block in order to achieve a .3 acre site. He stated that, on some of the smaller blocks, it was right around .3 to .4 acres and on some of the larger blocks, it is maybe .5 to .6 acres and all of the commercially designated area along Palmetto on a particular side of the street. He stated that they have to understand, if they are looking to achieve particular densities, heights or scale of development, they were by and large talking about much smaller sites than this and he thought there was a slide where they talk about a 5,000 square foot lot and what that looks like. He stated that it was the more common type of development they should expect unless they do a really good job of incentivizing lot consolidation with additional incentives or bonuses, in whatever form, either greater height, greater density, greater parking. He stated that there are a number of ways to formulate it. They have an interesting challenge in this area, given the small parcel pattern and the relatively small size of commercial area.

Rajeev Bhatia added that the numbers are based on average unit sizes, and to the extent someone wants to do a development with smaller units, the density may be higher than the ones in the plan and if the units are larger, the density might be lower. He stated that they can come back to the density subject at a later meeting. They will be looking for overall direction on height and the look and feel of the area. He stated that there are many different ways of going about overall density control. He stated that they don't even have to have a density control as they can look at a floor area ratio control such as control of the overall volume and bulk and square footage of how much they can build and leaving the flexibility of how many units there might be to an individual developer. He stated that there are many different ways of going about it and it was worthy of another conversation at a different time with them, as they don't need to have direction on that now. They can come back and have a discussion about the appropriate FAR might be or density might be at a later date.

Commissioner Berman agreed with some of the comments she heard in past community meetings as well as a couple today. She personally felt that north Palmetto should remain the smaller more beach cottage feel and that leads her to feel more comfortable with restricting building heights to 35 feet maximum. She would also want to promote more housing in the area because she thought north Palmetto is a really great area with a bunch of resources for someone who doesn't want a car and wants to live in an apartment near there. She was glad that they could take a closer look

at it at a later date. She feels better about building heights being taller in the south Palmetto area and keeping the 35 foot maximum in the north Palmetto area. She was in favor of increasing the density as appropriate with those heights.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she had a few comments. One is a spillover from the prior item when she asked whether a joint pole was contemplated and staff had remarked that there wasn't a policy. She thought the guiding principles touch on some detailed items like adding furniture, bicycle racks. She thought undergrounding joint poles may not be a requirement but she thought it was something that should be a recommendation or guideline. She stated that, in that section, they talk about being sustainable and beautifying but there is no mention of enhanced plantings. She attended a lot of the community meetings and at every one of them someone has brought up the fact that there are no street trees in Sharp Park. She stated that it was unlike successful downtowns around the Bay Area and she thought adding something of that nature would be really effective. She referred to land use questions, with one in the guiding principles document as to whether or not the city would support office spaces. She thought the direction was potentially where it wouldn't hinder more dynamic commercial spaces like retail and restaurants. She thought even going so far as to say that office spaces should be recommended on second and third floors where they don't need that increased floor plate as it might be a helpful way to do that. She stated that there was a comment on promoting a variety of housing types, and she thought all of them have bolstered that point and said that they care about providing housing and affordable housing. She stated that what jumped out at her was that they specifically called out that they wanted to support developing of housing affordable to moderate, low and extremely low income households. She thought it was important to hit all of the strata, and it would be better to say different income levels, both affordable and attainable. She thought that they wanted very low, medium and what Sr. Planner Murdock had suggested about being able to build attainable housing, whether or not it would be deed restricted. Her last question was the height and density principle. She agreed with both Commissioners Berman and Bigstyk on potentially having north Palmetto be at the mixed use neighborhood and south Palmetto be the mixed use commercial. She was potentially more amendable to having the mixed use commercial everywhere, but she sees the mirror and the feedback and she thought San Jose being that borderline was appropriate. She stated that the thing that jumped out at her, and was really important in understanding the way developers think about mixed use buildings vertically, is that the staff report calls out that 35 feet correlates to three stories, 45 feet correlates to four stories and 55 feet correlates to five stories. She understands how they can make it work, but if the goal is vibrant and dynamic ground floor commercial and retail spaces, she thought instead of restricting it to straight building heights, they need to think in terms of stories. She means that residential development finances mixed use development as developers are not making a lot of money off of the commercial. She stated that, if it comes to where they are going to sacrifice building height to make something better, the sacrifice is going to be made in the commercial in favor of residential. She suggested having three stories of residential above commercial and they have a 45-foot height limit. She stated that a typical residential story is nine feet and you have one foot for the floor plate, so already you are at 30 feet, and you need room for your parapet or whatever roof is appropriate with the architecture. She stated that, if you have a 4-foot parapet, they are now at a 9-foot floor to ceiling height on commercial which many of them know is substandard as a 12-foot to 14-foot ceiling is what makes these optimal vibrant commercial spaces. She stated that, if our goal is to have a 45-foot building height because it correlates to four stores, she thought a better thing to do would be to say they want four stories and they want commercial that is thoughtful with a minimum floor plate height of whatever that minimum floor plate is and then study what that is for successful and vibrant commercial. She thought that would allow flexibility of uses as one

commercial tenant leaves and another one comes and you are getting better and better uses. She concurs with her fellow commissioners but she did think they needed to think in very specific detail about what these measurements mean and what they allow for.

Rajeev Bhatia thought Sr. Planner Murdock might know it better than he does, but while they are talking about building heights, typically most zoning ordinances allow projections beyond that height for certain building elements and they could include parapet walls, chimneys, some other mechanical appurtenances and it was not an absolute max height. He stated that they have to keep that in mind, especially when they talk about decisions with these measurements. He was sure the zoning ordinance already includes rules of measurements and what's allowed and not allowed. He didn't think that was something for them to hash out.

Commissioner Godwin stated that, when he thinks about this problem in cities in which he has lived, it did not seem to him that whether a building was 45 or 55 feet was very significant, but it was important that there was adequate parking for the residents, some parking for commercial use and he was supportive of 55 foot height for buildings. He stated that the only way to get affordable housing in areas that costs as much as this one is pretty high density housing which also drives you to taller and more fully utilized pieces of land and some sort of mixed use parking structures or something so there is some level of people who get into the area conveniently, and would free up some land as well. He was basically in favor of doing something that is much more dense and much taller than what is in the Sharp Park area now.

Chair Nibbelin referred to the first two topics, and with the way it was numbered in the table in the staff report, he would probably be in favor of option No. 3 under the question of MUC designation where it should be applied, which is to say applied in all of Palmetto Avenue but only allow projects in northern Palmetto which maximize affordable housing production by exceeding current inclusionary housing ordinance requirements. He would track Commissioner Godwin's perspective with respect to height. He thinks that option 2 under height is the one that appears the most appropriate to him, which is to create incentives for affordable housing production by granting additional height above 45 feet to projects which exceed current inclusionary housing ordinance requirements. He stated that, in terms of connections, they can circle back to that. He didn't know if Commissioner Bigstycyk was prepared to speak to that at this point.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought he was a little better, but first he wanted to state that Commissioner Hauser articulated what he was trying to say about the north side of Palmetto better than he did. He was in agreement with height in general. He wasn't sure if it might be a good compromise because part of the discussion is the character of the neighborhood. He thought with the wording in No. 2, instead of granting additional height above 45 feet, maybe they could say granting additional height above 35 feet and leaving it a little more general or vague, but putting 35 feet as the baseline and they can come forward with the projects and they can decide from there. He stated that, with something like that, he would favor it potentially coming before the Commission so that there is a little bit more control, but he was open to maintaining it as 45 feet if that is consensus. Referring to No. 3, he stated that San Jose was the connection that he resonated with most and felt more natural as aesthetically it was more walkable. He wasn't sure what the other question is asking him to engage with and he will turn it over to the rest of the commissioners and see what the conversation looks like.

Commissioner Berman stated that, in general, she was looking briefly at the bike and pedestrian master plan which looks like a lot of the same routes included in the master plan were mentioned

by the public. She thought San Jose Avenue is a great addition to that, given the new pedestrian bridge. She was in favor of incorporating three bike priority roads, whether it is class 2 or class 3 but something to make biking in this location safer as well as pedestrian access especially if there is lack of sidewalks in those areas. She thought bikes and pedestrians go hand in hand. She thought if they didn't provide comfortable bike facilities on San Jose Avenue in the middle of Palmetto she thought a biker would still bike there to get to where they want to go. She is not in favor of a centralized corridor beyond what is already provided on Palmetto. She didn't think an east/west centralized corridor would be better than providing three separate bike safe modes throughout the Palmetto area. She stated she will have more comments in the future but for today, she thought option A with Paloma, San Jose and Clarendon

Allison Moore stated that, to clarify for everyone, in the bike/pedestrian master plan, it is Paloma and Clarendon proposed as a bicycle boulevard, Class 3B.

Commissioner Hauser concurred with the idea of having it separated. She didn't have the option number but there was one that was Paloma, San Jose and Clarendon, and those seemed like natural fits to her based on the way that they interacted with Highway 1.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he was comfortable with some bike access on Clarendon. He hasn't thought much about San Jose but it sounds like it makes a lot of sense.

Chair Nibbelin was in support of the analysis of his colleagues, and he thought Paloma, San Jose and Clarendon as identified makes sense.

Commissioner Bigstycck stated that, as he was reading the question, most of what occurred to his appreciation of it was a choice between San Jose and Santa Rosa, and San Jose won that debate. After that, he didn't feel like he had helpful feedback.

Chair Nibbelin asked staff what else they want or need from the Commission in connection with this particular item.

Sr. Planner Murdock thanked the Commission for a lot of really great and thoughtful feedback. He thought, if the Commission wants to spend a few minutes looking at Attachment B and confirming if anything emphasizes what their values and vision is for the specific plan or if anything doesn't resonate and they need to go back and think about it more, that would be helpful to know. He asked if they wanted to do a quick scan and any individual commissioner raise their hands for anything that stands out, good or bad. He stated that a general statement about the process is that he thought it was easy to instinctively think about the tangible which is building heights, etc., and react to how it looks and feels in relation to what they already know and what is in the existing environment. He stated that staff tried to come at this from a fresh perspective, which is to say where they want to go and that was a more vibrant, dynamic Palmetto and Sharp Park area and how they do that. He stated that they already have a really strong visitor component that comes in the summers, weekends when weather is good, but how do they make it vibrant other times of the day or week or season. He thought it was by having more people live there was one of those strategies and achieving that with higher density is one option to do that, and as they have heard from the community, they don't want the more traditional east/west residential streets to change all that much. That means that they heard that the community doesn't want to necessarily densify those any further than they already are. He stated that leaves them with a few options but to think of the north/south areas with Palmetto being foremost among

them but also Francisco Boulevard to a certain extent and realizing that Eureka Square may not manifest into a dramatic redevelopment in the near future and they probably have to think about Palmetto and Francisco. He stated that was where they came from with this perspective about mixed use neighborhood versus mixed use center, higher density meaning higher heights and it was admittedly a departure from the past and what they know, but it was in hope of finding a way to achieve the objective and the end state that the community expressed, which is more activity, more businesses, more things to do and to get that they need people there throughout the day, week and year. He thought they have heard a lot of great feedback from the Commission and the community at this time, but as they move forward in the process, he asked them to keep that perspective in mind as well and it may help them work through some of the tough decisions and some difficult responses from the community potentially as they get to more and more detail on these policies and they think about a fear of loss of what they have as compared to the hopes for the future of what they want to achieve.

Chair Nibbelin asked if anyone had any overreaching comments that they want to offer briefly in deference to the hour with respect to the guiding policy framework.

Commissioner Berman stated that she didn't have any comments or additions on the guiding policy framework but she wanted to come back to the building height items. After her comments there were a couple of additional points added. She likes the idea that Commissioner Hauser came up with designating stories. However, she knows that most of our vetting policies, especially the LCLUP and likely the General Plan coming up once they develop it, often refer to heights. She stated that she will let staff work out if they have inconsistencies between city plans. She stated that, if they were to allow a designated story maximum, she wouldn't feel comfortable saying four stories, because a developer could take that and make each of the four stories 12 feet of ceiling height. She would consider it for something like three stories, but especially in the northern Palmetto area, she wouldn't feel comfortable with much higher than 35 feet, especially going through street view again. She stated that most of the buildings there currently are one or two stories. She understood that not everything is going to be developed all at once, if they allow 55 feet or five stories, they will have what looks like skyscrapers in this area. She knows past housing projects, especially in this area, residents have spoken up against tall building heights. She did not think it was too appropriate to the scale of at least northern Palmetto and she was still against going much higher than 35 feet. She didn't feel comfortable going over 45 feet, and it was hard to control if they only give a story limitation as it is hard to control what height it will actually be. She was in favor of developer flexibility and knows that having kind of a flexible specific plan or precise plan or general plan will allow for more creative development in an area, which she wants to see in Palmetto. She also stated that, while they allow 55 foot height buildings on Palmetto, she doesn't want to get them stuck. Now any building that doesn't for some reason need to come through Planning because they are an affordable housing project and the state doesn't require them to come through Planning for some reason, a big building goes there and no one knows about it. She knows they will get a chance to talk about it again.

Commissioner Bigstycyk referred to Commissioner Berman's previous comments, he goes back to the language that could be tweaked, specifically about the north side of Palmetto, to create incentives for affordable housing production on the north side of Palmetto by granting additional heights above 35 feet and no more than 45 or no more than 50 feet, for projects that exceed current inclusionary housing ordinance requirements and he was in favor of the idea that it comes before the commission so they can make sure that it is a project they really want there and that was in character with the neighborhood. After that, going back through the policies and the

Eureka Square idea, he got feedback that Eureka Square is nothing they can bank on. He wanted to check in as when they were going back through the draft General Plan, they have them down as an MUC.

Allison Moore stated that they were proposing mixed use center at Eureka Square.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought it seemed natural allowing the 55 feet regardless of whether or not they ever go for it. He wanted to make sure it was there with a “knock on wood” sentiment attached. He stated that, in the policy itself, there was mention of office space a couple of times which he appreciated that it might be needed and maybe should be there but his sensibility says that office space is not necessarily something we need to highlight and might already be abundant in Pacifica to a place where more office space doesn’t necessarily seem inviting toward getting people to want to visit. He referred to the 2212 Beach Boulevard site, stating that as he was driving by it today the door was open and he could get a bigger appreciation of the land that he normally can when he is looking at the wall. He stated that it seemed like a really big space which may be great to be completely filled with a hotel. He wondered if it could be feasible to break it apart if a developer has interest in a chunk of it but not all of it.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that anything is possible in terms of a subdivision in light of a future property owner. He stated that currently the city owns it and is interested in a master plan for its redevelopment. He stated that all they can state is what Council has put out there publicly previously and that is that we are looking for the site in its totality.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought it would be great if a developer wants to take it and make it a hotel. He wanted to be sure there were options on the table. He stated that the only other thing that didn’t resonate as fully as it might have was the bit about sustainability which the second reading was a quick one. He stated that, at the very end, coastal resources and conservation was where it jumped out at him. He stated that there might be more about what it means that we are a sustainable community. He thought Commissioner Hauser previously mentioned more trees would be a nice place to start in making the neighborhood more inviting and just checking in on trees in conjunction with sustainability might be a good place to start. He stated that it seems that it could be more robust in terms of what they are trying to accomplish.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she wanted to answer the question on Eureka Square and Francisco. She agreed that Eureka Square would fit nicely under the mixed use center. She thought Francisco’s proximity to Highway 1 might create some visibility challenges where it potentially would cut off the rest of the Sharp Park area west. She stated that, with that one, she would feel more comfortable in a mixed use neighborhood but she could be convinced if someone had a good argument. She responded to Commissioner Bigstycyk’s comment on office space. She didn’t feel partial about this a year or so ago, but on the Economic Development Committee, they spent a lot of time at each meeting talking to people who were residents of Pacifica and were business owners outside of Pacifica or Pacifica business owners who were local. She stated that one of the biggest barriers to having successful restaurants and retail is the fact that there is no weekday lunch time crowd and a lot of businesses commented on the fact that it was due to lack of office workers that needed to eat lunch during the week. While she didn’t see it as a huge economic driver and very exciting and vibrant, she did think it was a necessary infrastructural component of those things that we do want. She was in favor of leaving that in. She thought it would be a great use for a second story rather than a storefront on the first story. She wanted to thank staff for all they have done as there was a lot of time and vision that went

into this and it was very clear in the way it has been written. She appreciated that and looked forward to what else they come up with.

Chair Nibbelin asked Commissioner Godwin if he had any further comments.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he had nothing very specific.

Chair Nibbelin was also impressed by the comprehensiveness of what they have been looking at. He referred to Palmetto Avenue and the reference to first floor space with frontage on Palmetto and 75% of it being devoted to “active uses”, and he was curious about where that 75% number came from as he thought it might even be appropriate for it to be higher level or why they wouldn’t want it all to be an active use.

Sr. Planner Murdock asked Allison Moore if she wanted to talk about that figure.

Allison Moore stated that they had received a few comments at the concepts workshop expressing desire for maybe some kind of ratio in case office were to go in on the ground floor that wouldn’t necessarily be an active ground floor use. At that time, it was believed that the percentage would offer a little bit of flexibility for other types of uses that may not be active, such as office.

Rajeev Bhatia stated that they also have access to upper stories, for example, stairways, etc., that was needed and it was hard to get a full 100% activation.

Chair Nibbelin understood the notion of wanting to build a system where we have people who might need to come back and get discretionary permits in order to build certain projects since we have this in place, but he thought it sort of reflected that this could be a very powerful tool and can be a real incentive for developers when they see a streamlined way in where we have been really prescriptive and very clear about what it is we want and need and create a streamlined process where someone is able to come in and be entitled already by virtue of the document, with the environmental assessment already done. He stated that it was really circumspect in creating additional discretionary processes in the context of the document and the process which part of the power of it is creating certainty for those who might come in and help us to implement this vision that we are putting together. He has been thinking about that as they have been having this conversation.

Sr. Planner Murdock thanked him for highlighting that point. He stated that he would like to share an observation that it was a natural human tendency to want to see something before you say you like it or don’t like it. He thought, when communities can really try to have the vision and courage to put the difficult work in now and have some faith in the plan, you can deliver some greater outcomes and have those difficult conversations and balance the community values now as part of the plan rather than pushing it down the road and fighting the fight every time a project comes through. He stated that it was exhausting for the community and the decision makers and can be difficult for staff because it pulls them away from other work. He thought that, if they come into a process as part of a plan and get messy now, that would be the preference from staff’s end, to make these difficult decisions now when they can publicize it and bring in a broad base. He asked who you most often hear from when they are fighting it out on a project by project basis, stating that it was people who don’t want the project. He asked if that was representative of the entire community. He stated that maybe or maybe not, but when you are outside of that difficult emotional project process you can have a more thoughtful discussion as a

community. He stated that you weigh those various values and competing perspectives and outcomes and strike the right balance in a better way.

Chair Nibbelin thought staff got what they were able to give them today. He stated that they want to close this item unless there is anything else that staff wants them to state.

Sr. Planner Murdock thanked the commissioners for digging into the details and providing thoughtful feedback.

Chair Nibbelin asked if someone can let Commissioner Leal know that he is welcome back. He stated that it looked like he was still hanging in there.

Commissioner Leal re-joined meeting by turning on microphone and video.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Bigstyk thanked staff for putting the report together and working tirelessly and constantly on it. He stated that he had two items to mention. The first is what he has been saying every meeting that there was a gratuitously unpleasant conversation he had with a customer the other day. He stated that as a whole the community is stepping up and putting on the masks. He appreciated it as someone who works in the service industry as when they come through with a mask, it makes them feel that they value their lives as well as everyone else in the community. He stated that it was important now more than ever to flatten the curve and masks are the biggest component they can do amongst each other. He stated that, when you are in a grocery store, do not lick your fingers if you are choosing to bag and trying to open a plastic bag. He was having a stressful night and his best self didn't come out as he was having an exchange the other day. He stated that the second it occurs to you to take off the mask for any reason, let alone adding saliva into the equation, it sparks deep concerns and fears among those trying to serve you. They request that if the thought occurs to you that it is a good idea, he asked that you don't. He stated that the next item was that he mentioned a few months ago about the development of the affordable housing project in Moss Beach, and he stated that it looks like there is a San Mateo County Board of Supervisors meeting tomorrow at 9 am and they will be meeting to discuss changes to the San Mateo County LCP so the Mid Pen Cypress Point affordable housing 71-unit can move forward. He stated that, if anyone has any interest in supporting affordable housing on the county level, they can show up tomorrow as they are now in Zoom form. They can support the Moss Beach affordable housing project as well as the ability to voice concerns if you feel otherwise.

Commissioner Berman stated that she will be attending that meeting. She also mentioned that the City Council had a special meeting on the Unhoused in Pacifica, specifically motor homes, RVs, large vans, etc. She stated that it was an interesting and long meeting but there were a lot of great community comments. She stated that it was close to 50-50 as there were concerns but there was also support for finding appropriate locations to allow on a permanent basis for people living in some form of motor home to locate themselves. She mentioned it so everyone is aware that this is something that City Council is considering. She stated that items may come back to the Planning Commission at some point or if they have any personal concerns or comments, they can listen in on updates on that.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that, since Commissioner Berman invited him to chime in, and he would like to.

Chair Nibbelin responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that, as the Vice President of the Board of Directors for the Pacifica Resource Center, although he is not speaking on behalf of them at this moment, he has been very vested in this process of trying to get something in place to help those in motor homes to find housing. He stated that for him, personally, it was a fairly painful experience to watch that process and especially the conclusion as the silver lining is that Council is interested and hopefully finding solutions that may aid those who are having difficulty finding housing to find housing on one hand and on the other hand it sparked creative juices flowing and he had a similar suggestion to what was proposed that he will be bringing forward. He wants to check in with the Executive Director of the Pacifica Resource Center to make sure it is a decent plan and not just a half-baked one. He continues to think in terms of helping those who just need a hand up and

hopefully the community can find a way to assist those among us who are truly members of our community and who need a moment of stability to find their way toward a more permanent stability. He thanked Commissioner Berman for bringing that up.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the other Council meeting that happened last week was a regular Council meeting. She stated that there were two appeal items on the agenda, the first was the Terra Nova Verizon site and the City Council upheld the Planning Commission's decision and denied the appeal. The other item was the 1300 Danmann project appeal and that was continued to the first meeting in September at the request of both the appellant and applicant. She stated that the last item was that over the last couple of weeks they welcomed a new Public Works Director, Lisa Petersen, who is from the Town of Los Gatos. She stated that eventually they will all get a chance to meet her.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Hauser moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:15 p.m.; Commissioner Leal seconded the motion.

Sr. Planner Murdock took a vocal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Berman, Bigstyck, Godwin, Hauser, Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Noes:	None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister