

MINUTES

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

August 17, 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 participating by Zoom or phone.

Sr. Planner Murdock took a vocal roll call.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Berman, Bigstycyk, Godwin, Hauser, Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Absent: None

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Hauser

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Sr. Planner Murdock
Asst. City Attorney Sharma
Contract Planner Usher

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

Sr. Planner Murdock took a vocal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: JUNE 17, 2020 Commissioner Berman moved approval of minutes of June 17, 2020; Commissioner Bigstycyk 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

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF AUGUST 24, 2020:

Chair Nibbelin stated that he saw it as a parenthetical, and asked if it was because Commissioner Hauser had volunteered.

Sr. Planner Murdock explained that they wanted to make sure that the date works and they have a liaison available.

Chair Nibbelin stated that Commissioner Hauser had her thumbs up and he concluded that they were good to go.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Chair Nibbelin asked if there were any members of the public who wanted to speak.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they did not have any hands raised.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None

CONSIDERATION:

N/A Overview of the Housing Element update process and introduction to site inventory requirements.
Recommended CEQA Action: N/A.

Planning Director Wehrmeister presented staff report, then asked Sr. Planner Murdock if he had anything to add.

Sr. Planner Murdock completed the staff report.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that his understanding was that there might be fewer numbers but if there are fewer numbers, finding sites themselves might be more difficult given what they have to do in order to qualify the sites. He referred to Sr. Planner Murdock mentioning no net loss provisions in state laws, and he asked that he explain what a no net loss provision is.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that no net loss as in a subtraction net result of a decision or action. He stated that there are provisions in state law that indicate that, if the city is to take an action to redesignate or rezone a parcel or parcels, on balance, the city cannot seek to reduce the number of housing units in the city on a citywide basis below what existed at the time that the General Plan was initially adopted. He stated that the idea was that the city cannot take this number of unrelated actions to attempt to circumvent the overall amount of housing that can be developed in the community. As part of the rezoning or re-designation action, the city needs to evaluate and ensure that there is no net loss overall for the amount of housing that will be constructed. He stated that having a surplus of sites identified in the housing element can help the city avoid that. He stated that another way that could come to bear, particularly for the housing site inventory, is if a project is on the housing inventory and for whatever reason it developed in a way that was not anticipated, i.e., either fewer units or different number of affordable units, that could go against the identification of sites in the housing element and having more sites than necessary can help you avoid having a housing element that falls out of compliance during the planning period which then triggers a process of having to redesignate or rezone sites during the eight-year period rather than doing it once every eight years.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if the current inventory differentiates by income level.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it does not, and that is something they will have to enhance with a greater degree of precision in their next housing element to prescribe anticipated number of units by affordability level.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that was something he was looking at as he was going through the list and he concluded that the next list will have to have a differentiation by income level. He stated that, on looking through the list, the one that popped out at him was the old Spanky's site near Oceana and Milagra where they heard development for a motel a couple of years in the past. He thought the developer was trying to put a motel there, and presumably a site like that would not wind up on their inventory site even though by the numbers and the new requirements in theory it could be a development for affordable housing, but because it was not the intended use, it would not appear on the next list. He asked if that was correct.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought that was an example of two different issues, one the judgment that goes into identifying these sites and it is saying that there is serious demonstration that the property owner intends not to build housing and they probably should not use that to satisfy our minimum requirement for the number of housing units on the site. He also thought it was an example of how a site could result in a no net loss issue where a number of units were identified for that site. For reasons outside of the city's control, it is likely potentially to develop with zero housing units and to have a margin beyond the minimum requirement would help the city in those unanticipated outcomes where housing is not built and fewer units than are anticipated are built for a different mix of income levels. He stated that it was almost like an insurance policy to go beyond the minimum in RHNA to help protect against that outcome.

Planning Director Wehrmeister added that, if the application is ultimately withdrawn, the site could be in the next housing inventory, but it was going to be very closely scrutinized by HCD and they would need to do a very detailed analysis especially since there was this project for a nonresidential site development.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that, based on what he was hearing, he thought it sounded like ABAG's timetable for the housing element seems to be on track, but he wondered if any of the timeline has been thrown off by Covid.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it has. She stated that it was on track because they updated that timeline. She stated that, from the original schedule, it was at least a few months off.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought they are on track for what they see in front of them now.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he had a couple of technical questions about the staff report. He stated that under the use of vacant sites in the site inventory, it stated that the site cannot be used to fulfill the jurisdiction's obligation to accommodate development for lower income houses unless – with two points listed. He thought both of those points have to be fulfilled in order to allow for lower income housing.

Planning Director Wehrmeister asked if this is under use of vacant sites in the site inventory.

Commissioner Bigstyk confirmed it was use of vacant sites in the site inventory.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that was how she read that.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that the second point was that the zoning allows for residential development by right if at least 20% of the units are affordable or below income housing. He wasn't sure how to read it and he wondered that means that there is something they have to do on our part to zone it specifically for lower income housing.

Planning Director Wehrmeister confirmed that, if we are in this situation where the two bullets are triggered, the city's zoning ordinance would need to be updated in order to provide for by right development if this threshold is met.

Commissioner Bigstyk concluded that currently we don't provide for by right development.

Planning Director Wehrmeister agreed, except for a single family home in an R-1 district, but if you are not in the coastal zone, etc., you can get a building permit but anything greater than that, generally, multi-family wise, you will be coming in for a discretionary entitlement.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if a by right provision would be income specific in the law and that is how they would have to write it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister explained that, in order to get the by right benefit, there would need to be at least 20% affordable to lower income households.

Commissioner Bigstyk understood, adding that it was kind of like the housing element they already have for the eight units only and instead of it being 15% it would be a larger threshold in various ways.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated sort of like an inclusionary provision.

Commissioner Bigstyk responded affirmatively.

Sr. Planner Murdock added that it was important to realize this would be a significant change to their zoning and it would have a lot more detailed description as far as incomes, but what was important to distinguish is that their current regulations burden a property owner by requiring them to provide below market rate housing. This would be a developer proposing to develop such housing and then to be able to take advantage of a non-discretionary, by-right permitting process. He stated that it was almost a completely different model and it was something they would have to develop because they don't currently have that in the zoning.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he would incentivize development. He was trying to find something analogous with what they already do and that distinction was important and made sense to him. He stated that the next technical question was under the use of non-vacant sites in the site inventory. He referred to a sentence in the last paragraph of that section where it mentions sites identified for housing development that currently or within the last five years contained residential units occupied by lower income households were subject to an affordability requirement or local rent control policy must be replaced one for one with units affordable to the same or lower income levels. He stated that the question that it raised for him was because his understanding was that for multi-family units statewide, they currently have a rent control measure. His understanding of that measure was that, when someone moves out of that unit, the owner is able to raise the rate before the next person comes in, and asked if he was on track with his understanding.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that he was referring to the more recent statewide rent stabilization.

Commissioner Bigstyk responded affirmatively.

Planning Director Wehrmeister agreed.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked, if that was the case, does that sentence mean that there would have to be something in place so that, if someone moves out, they can't do that or would the one

for one be the same rent control part of that. He asked, if the owner were to keep it a low income, would they be able to raise it before the next tenant comes in.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought that was an interesting question.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the Planning Director could add as she saw fit, but he thought it was important to remember that it is categorized or stratified by income. He stated that it wasn't explicitly determining the rent that may be charged as he read it, but it was saying that, if you were in that band of income levels where it was affordable to a very low income individual, you would not be allowed to raise the rent above that band for very low income. He clarified that where you end up within that band was probably fair game for the property owner to charge, but to take that from a unit that was affordable to a very low income individual and make it moderate or above moderate individual, they would clearly want to follow with that provision. He stated that it was not clear as the site is being redeveloped that a unit in a particular location on a particular site would be the same unit, but on balance the number of units could not drop below the number that were affordable to lower income individuals and as stratified by those different levels of affordability on that same project site. He stated that another complex analysis needs to be done and the city has to track those units in a way it hasn't tracked them previously.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought what was interesting was that this provision actually caused a lot of conversation among their colleagues on the Peninsula on some of the housing groups because it seeks to address displacement issues and it is not only talking about a loss of a deed restricted unit but also looking to the individual who may be lower income and living in a naturally affordable unit that is going to be redeveloped. She stated that there was an analysis that needs to be done. Even though it is not a restricted unit, but because the units on whatever site you are redeveloping in Redwood City, etc., it is taken into account under this new law. She stated that, for the cities that have to address this, it is going to be complex as mentioned by Sr. Planner Murdock.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if they would need some restriction in place ahead of time for that owner's property to be able to factor that into the equation of what units they can rely on to be lower income units.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought that was the crux of the issue, because if you get an application in for redevelopment, they don't usually ask for a rent roll or something with that type of development to see where the existing tenants' incomes are or get into their personal business. She stated that they pay cheap rent but it is also their income level.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that there are potentially new administrative requirements as in many parts of town, particularly outside of the coastal zone, demolition of a structure does not currently require any special type of review beyond the basic physical mechanics of the demolition, such as air quality control requirement, but not an assessment of what is there currently and rent and income levels of occupants. He stated that there are a number of practical ways that implementation of this could be challenging under Pacifica's current regulations.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought they were asking them to become more intimately acquainted with the owners and developers than normally and it seems intuitively uncomfortable. He thought that traditionally it was supposed to be. He stated that they were in the middle of a draft General Plan process and, while the city hasn't had a new General Plan for quite a while, his read

on this is that the housing element gets updated over time. He asked if this factors into the timeline through the draft update or something they fit into the General Plan when they have the numbers and ready to fit it in, not necessarily need to hold off or coincide with the process with the General Plan update as a whole.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated she would not wait for the housing element as that is a few years off, and thought what they are seeing is that, even if Pacifica was a jurisdiction that updated the housing element or General Plan on a ten-year cycle religiously, the housing elements are going to come along and necessitate additional changes to the housing element. She thought it feels weird because the community hasn't done it in a long time, but this is fairly normal for an eight-year cycle for housing elements.

Commissioner Leal referred to how the list of sites was put together years ago and looking at the allowable units column, he asked if that factored in commercial units or strictly looking at housing with an assumption of commercial use on that property.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it was strictly looking at the maximum number of units permissible for residential housing but not a feasibility analysis of the amount of the site area or building height or whatever is taken up on the site and that could impact that.

Commissioner Leal referred to the use of several non-vacant sites, and he looked at the language in that section around the development potential for the site and considered the jurisdiction's past experience in converting existing uses to a higher residential development. He thought it was fairly vague and not concrete as to what justified that. He asked if Pacifica would meet that threshold for using some of the existing uses in the housing element or would we have to remove several of them because of existing uses and we all need that criteria where we have done a lot of this in the past.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought that, because they haven't done a lot in the past, it would not preclude the city from calling out non-vacant sites on their inventory list. She thought there were people at HCD that will be reviewing this that may see it for what it is that this is a slower growth community and she thought they will be scrutinizing in greater detail the analysis of the feasibility for that site.

Commissioner Leal thought it was not clear that they need to do so many projects every year to meet that criteria that they have.

Commissioner Berman referred to Commissioner Bigstycyk's question on the Local Coastal Land Use Plan and the General Plan on which they are currently working, and they understood that they would not want to wait to develop those plans on account of the housing element, but given that the land use and zoning is changing to be much more a mixed use friendly and higher density unit friendly, and once they receive direction for the housing element, she asked how those correlate. She thought it would be easier to develop denser sites but the sites currently on the list from before in the staff report may not be a lot of the mixed use sites they are proposing.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she and Sr. Planner Murdock have thought about and, to the extent that Planning Commission and City Council are thought to be supportive of the mixed use friendly policies for the General Plan and Specific Plan, it may make to a certain degree the job of creating the next site inventory a little easier. She stated that some of the lots

along Palmetto are very small, and they have been talking about this during the Specific Plan process. She thought the policies that are currently being developed are going to be helpful, but she didn't think it would be a slam dunk when they get to HCD review.

Commissioner Berman stated that a lot of our mixed use sites are in Sharp Park and extremely small lots. She stated that the restrictions on site designation will block them and she was wondering as they move forward with City Council, she asked if the Commission and Council need to be looking at the ever changing housing element items in parallel with how they are designating land use for the city.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it was important to keep them in mind as they are so intricately related. He stated that, when they were going through the last round of study sessions on the General Plan and the Local Coastal Land Use Plan, staff made an important suggestion and convinced the Commission and Council to incorporate, which may have been too subtle for many to notice at the time, but one was to incorporate standards in the mixed use neighborhood designation that allow a minimum of 30 units per acre which is the minimum density for a presumed affordable housing development on sites of a half-acre or greater. He stated that they are anticipating where they can some of the qualifications and trying to bake them in and will continue to do that. He referred to what she pointed out and stated that they can't change the existing parcel pattern. He added that, to the extent that we have good policies that incentivize consolidation of small parcels that are difficult to develop, up to and including incentives that kick in at minimum parcel sizes like the one he just described, hopefully over time can move towards a better assortment of parcels and ultimately land use designations for that housing site inventory.

Commissioner Berman apologized if this was a rudimentary question, but she stated that, for sites that are currently owned by property owners and they have to redevelop in some fashion, renovate or their store burned down and have to redevelop, but they want to redevelop in kind, she asked if there are any pressures for housing on those sites going to be applied to them or can they rebuild their shops in kind.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it depends, such as a natural disaster, on the applicability of our code requirements associated with those types of incidents. She stated that, if it was a partial damage, they may be able to rebuild exactly what is there, and if it is greater than that, they may need to conform to the zoning requirements. She stated that, to the extent that those have some housing requirement or mixed use or density requirements, they may need to come up to standards.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the important thing to remember is that the housing site inventory itself is not directed as to the use of the site. He stated that with the housing site inventory the output of that analysis is based on the land use regulations and other criteria of state law with respect to the housing element. He stated that what determines what can be built on the site remains the General Plan and zoning. He referred to Planning Director Wehrmeister's mention that, in the event of a disaster of some type, layered on to that are non-conforming zoning provisions about what can be rebuilt under certain circumstances. He stated that it was a little too complicated to answer with a blanket statement, but he didn't believe there was anything across the board contained in what they presented at this meeting that would direct a property owner to end up with something different than what they had to begin with. He stated that different regulations might result in that.

Commissioner Hauser apologized if this was already explained, but she asked, when they are making these designations, whether they are able to use the maximum density allowed across the sites.

Planning Director Wehrmeister asked if, when she mentioned making the designations, whether she meant putting them on the site inventory.

Commissioner Hauser agreed, explaining that if it is up to the 30 DUA, can they assume that they will use the 30 DUA or do they have to use some other methodology and end up like 23 DUA.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought that was part of the analysis, and if it is going to be 30 units an acre but it was really not feasible to do that for a variety of reasons, they may not be able to count that amount of units.

Commissioner Hauser referred to sites where the city would be anticipating, not like a market rate developer who is doing a proportion of affordable housing but where an affordable developer would be coming and would be qualifying for a density bonus, and she asked if we are able to count the extra density in those cases based on an assumption that a density bonus would be allowed or requested.

Planning Director Wehrmeister didn't know if they can boost the number of units they count on their site inventory based on speculative density bonuses. She stated that once a site is approved and developed and what they report annually, they count whatever is constructed there.

Commissioner Hauser asked, feeding into Commissioner Bigstyc's question of where this falls in relation to the General Plan, if staff does an analysis and deems that they can do housing on a site that potentially wasn't zoned for housing but was anticipated to be going in that direction in the General Plan as it would be a good site but they need to make some land use changes to be consistent, would that be something that is allowable and they could consider.

Planning Director Wehrmeister wasn't sure she understood the question.

Commissioner Hauser clarified that, if the zoning and General Plan were not consistent based on timing, were they still allowed to include the site in the housing element.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they would but would be telling HCD that they would be rezoning them in short order, either before or soon after certification occurs.

Commissioner Hauser stated, if the site has some commercial or industrial use but the analysis done was that it was under-utilized, this is almost asking the same question in a different way, and she asked if that was something they could do and tell HCD that the land use is going to be changed in the next update to all land use documents.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought so, adding that she wanted to emphasize the point made by Sr. Planner Murdock that the housing element site inventory is building off of the General Plan and the zoning. She stated that, to the point of making sure that they are thinking about it now while they are doing the General Plan update, if they see the site is suitable for housing, underdeveloped, they may be considering some of those sites for a different type of designation

and they can put that General Plan site into the housing element. She thought the scrutiny will come in when HCD will look at it and say that it was fine that they have that General Plan designation but prove to them that it is a reasonable chance that it could be developed within the planning period. She added that where redesignations and rezoning will be more in play is if our allocation is really big, and a lot bigger than they anticipated and not even the General Plan with a mixed use friendly housing forward policies are enough to cover that, they will definitely be back. They are hoping they will be building this off of the current work they are doing now.

Commissioner Godwin thought most of his questions were answered. He recalled talk a few years about building units that were subsidized or specially assigned to city employees or school district employees such as teachers, policemen, and he asked if that impacts on this or would including the land in this inventory prevent that to be used for such a program in the future if it was finalized.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it was not preventative of any housing in the future if deemed appropriate by the city. She stated that they are processing a Pacifica School District project currently, and said that was a good example of a site where it is used for something else now and, if they were doing their site inventory today and trying to work with HCD and prove that the Oddstad School site is a good site, they would be pointing that we have a proposal and that is an indication that the market is essentially saying and not just the city, that this is a reasonable site to put in the inventory.

Commissioner Godwin was assuming that they can put down for the purposes of this inventory the maximum density that would fit reasonably onto one of those sites, but if a developer came on and proposed an actual lower density site, would that still be okay for them to do that assuming the city approved.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it would, adding that they may get into a situation where they would need to rely on some of the extra units mentioned by Sr. Planner Murdock so they are not in a net loss situation with the housing element. She stated that, if they have extra units that they identified, they can do that. If they didn't, they may need to go back in and make some adjustments.

Chair Nibbelin referred to a slide of results of the last housing element and it came out pretty short with respect to the numbers that were set there, and he asked what impact if any that has in any sort of carry over way as they came up so short with respect to the last RHNA.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought there was some carry over, but she asked Sr. Planner Murdock if he recalls exactly what that is.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he was not recalling that there was a specific sanction for failure to achieve the full development of the RHNA. He recalled that it was a subjective factor that can be considered in preparation of the next RHNA allocation to a city either good or bad. It could demonstrate the city's inability to achieve the RHNA and it is not a suitable location or, if the analysis is that the city put up impediments, it could result in a higher RHNA on the next go around and is a factor.

Chair Nibbelin noted the very high number that they were looking at as original housing allocation and that it is at 441,000 as opposed to 187,000. He stated that he was ruminating

earlier today when listening to the news of how many people are moving out of the area owing to Covid and some changes that might be short term but could be longer term. He was curious about whether there has been any discussion of any possible agility moving forward in terms of adjusting either at state or local level to what might be real medium or longer term consequences of changes that they are dealing with now.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they have had those conversations, as the ABAG Executive Board has questioned ABAG staff about that and it was something they are cognizant of. She can't tell them what the outcome is because many of the deadlines in the schedule are statutory, adding that some of them are but not all. She thought they were moving full speed ahead in order to meet the statutory requirements and it is something that ABAG has heard from their Executive Board and, if she understood it correctly, expressed to HCD. She didn't see anyone budging on taking a pause to relook at the numbers.

Chair Nibbelin stated that it looks like a lot more up front analysis is expected of the city and staff as they work their way through the process, and he was curious about the full range of work that the Planning Department needs to do and how much additional work this is and whether there is a way to quantify it relative to what they were doing before. He recognized that it was an ongoing task, but asked if it was something she could comment on.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they are working with their regional partners and consultants to help with this. She stated that it is going to be a pretty substantial push for staff. She stated that at this meeting they are focusing on much of the technical background stuff they need to do, but they also have to talk to the community and have a community engagement process associated with the housing element. She thought it was going to be a fairly significant undertaking now because of the General Plan and the Specific Plan and getting the LCP through. She stated that they are starting to work with their consultants but on a very minimal level. She stated that it will start up at the beginning of 2021 when they will be able to have some of the bandwidth available to kick it into higher gear.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he saw reference to the ability to use LEAP grant funding to cover the cost of consultants and any additional staff needed to support this effort.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Chair Nibbelin referred to mention of LEAP grant funding and he thought that would be the cost of consultants and any additional staff needed to support this effort.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Chair Nibbelin asked what will be the next thing coming to the Planning Commission in this process.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it might be a few months from now when they will get into some of their site analyses, but she doesn't have the next step schedule for the Commission but she will continue to keep them updated on the RHNA process which will be coming out soon. She stated that they don't give them the draft allocations for a while but they put out a draft methodology and everyone tries to do the math and you can figure out what your allocation is going to be and they will keep the Commission apprised of all that.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he wanted to supplement his answer he gave a moment ago regarding the sanctions for not fulfilling the RHNA. He explained that he was thinking in the longer term of cycle to cycle, but there are consequences for cities under SB 35 when a city fails to approve enough units across its various income categories and that can cause a city to be on a list under SB35 which forces a city to approve as ministerial certain projects that meet affordability criteria. He stated that it was too complex to drop in a summary statement but there are near term consequences for cities that do not approve enough housing units to achieve the RHNA.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she had a silly question and apologized for that. She was looking at the timeline and hypothetically, if they had their RHNA numbers and then had a proposal come through that everyone approved and they started building units in 2022 even though they already had their RHNA numbers, does that count toward the next cycle or do they lose the benefit.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought Sr. Planner Murdock will have to help her. She knows they can report the units when they are entitled but HCD wants to see the building permit final. She stated that when they bridge a housing element cycle, she wasn't sure what would happen at that point, and didn't know if Sr. Planner Murdock had any experience with that.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the tracking has become much more complex within the last two years. He stated that, previously, they would report units at one point in time and you were either in or out of that particular housing ordinance cycle. He stated that now they report them throughout their life cycle from application to discretionary approval to building permit to inspection. He stated, while the trigger is escaping him, he thought the actual number for RHNA purposes is at the building permit stage, not the discretionary permit stage. He stated that the city would report them at that point in time and you may get to count them in a favorable way or a less favorable way depending on your perspective.

Chair Nibbelin opened the public comments.

Sr. Planner Murdock reminded the public of the process for speaking, adding that he was not seeing any hands raised.

Chair Nibbelin closed the public comments. He then thanked Planning Director and Sr. Planner for the very good walkthrough which he thought was very useful. He asked if they needed a motion to receive it or adequate that they received it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought the discussion was adequate.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that, in the past week, he attended the Sharp Park Specific Plan meeting as a member of the public and he thought it was heartening to see how much community participation there was in that meeting. He stated that it was a good overview and was reaffirming a lot of what they have been seeing, and how much the community was participating was heartening. He stated that there have been a lot of people coming into Pacifica on the weekends from hotter locations and want to be cooled by the ocean. He stated that, under normal circumstances, that would be a boon to our community to have them visit, but under the present circumstances it was more difficult in the essential worker arena to encounter those who are not necessarily as well acquainted as to how adept our community is as such as mask wearing. He thought most people understand that when they come into another community, but he thought the more they can remind each other politely that we are all in this together and trying to help each other's health is a great benefit as we march on in this self-discipline and community development.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that there was nothing other than the summary of how the Sharp Park Specific Plan community meeting went. She stated Sr. Planner Murdock's presentation went really well and she asked if he could give a brief update.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they had more than 40 members of the public, over 50 when you count the staff, Councilmembers, Commissioners. He found the dialogue to be really great with a lot of interest as mentioned by Commissioner Bigstycyk. He was most pleased with the poll they asked on how they would rate their level of understanding of the Specific Plan, as no one picked "I'm still lost" so he thought it was a victory. He stated that they do a lot of work to get the word out and they are always happy to answer questions that people have and bringing everyone along in the process all the way to the conclusions some months from now.

Chair Nibbelin thanked the Planning Director and Sr. Planner, stating that he appreciated the communication.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Bigstycyk moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:07 p.m.; Commissioner Berman seconded the motion.

Sr. Planner Murdock took a vocal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister