

MINUTES

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

February 20, 2018

7:00 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Kraske, Cooper, Campbell, Clifford and Chair Nibbelin
Absent: Commissioners Stegink and Gordon

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Cooper

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Sr. Planner Murdock
Asst. City Attorney Sharma
Asst. Planner O'Connor
Public Works Deputy Dir. Sun

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA Commissioner Cooper moved approval of the Order of Agenda; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Kraske, Cooper, Campbell, Clifford and Chair Nibbelin
Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 26, 2018:

Chair stated that they would not need a liaison.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None

CONSENT ITEMS:

None

STUDY SESSION:

- 1. FILE No. 2017-041** – Study Session Request Filed by James O’Connell of Professional Land Services Corporation to Discuss Potential Annexation into the City of Pacifica and Resubdivision of a Portion of the Tobin Park Subdivision Located in Unincorporated San Mateo County. The Project Area is Located Beyond the Eastern Terminus of Springwood Way and Includes a Land Area of Approximately 8.9 Acres (APNs 023-391-010, 023-391-030, 023-392-010, 023-392-020 and 023-395-020). The Applicant is Considering the Annexation and Resubdivision to Allow Construction of 11 Single-family Residences. A Study Session Allows the Planning Commission to Receive Input from the Public and Provide Feedback to Staff and the Applicant. The Study Session is Open to the Public, Although it is Not a Public Hearing And the Planning Commission Will Take No Formal Action. Recommended CEQA Action: N/A.

Sr. Planner Murdock presented the staff report.

Chair Nibbelin commented that the commissioners probably would have minimal questions and he planned to hear from the applicant, followed by any further questions from the commissioners and then hearing from the public.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the city had any obligation to do this annexation or have it be as the San Pedro Point where they can develop it and feed onto the city streets.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought he touched on a very interesting dynamic with the project. He stated that although LAFCO may not approve the annexation, that does not mean the property could not be developed in some form. He stated that San Mateo County’s land use regulations are restrictive in this area with a formula that metes out the number of units that could be developed based on a number of considerations, primarily on the slope of the site. He stated that he hasn’t done that analysis and the county probably hasn’t either. He stated that there is potential development that can occur with or without the annexation. He also was not aware that the city has the ability to deny the annexation or stop it. He stated that LAFCO determines what was appropriate based on an application for an annexation. He stated that it has certain considerations of state law they have to meet to determine if the annexation should occur.

Commissioner Cooper asked, if they don’t annex it, whether it will turn into something like Pedro Point where the streets are narrow and no semblance of city planning.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it was unlikely that something of the density or intensity of Pedro Point could occur as he understood that the county’s land use regulations would result in a very low density of development, perhaps as low as one unit if any. He added that he is speculating because he was not aware that the county has done that analysis, adding that whatever is developed there would impact the city’s infrastructure and services such as police and fire coming from the city, as well as streets and parks. He stated that without the ability to capture that tax revenue, plan for it, impose impact fees, etc., it would be difficult for the city to offset those negative impacts on its infrastructure and services.

Commissioner Cooper commented that there were two sorts of zoning presented, the R-1-H and Open Space Residential, and he thought they were completely different with one being 1.3 units per acre and the other .2 units per acre. He asked if there was something in between that they could regulate like they did with Harmony @ One regarding the amount of parcels and type of zoning or were they stuck within the zoning parameters.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he was describing the disparity between the General Plan land use designation indicated for the sphere of influence, Open Space Residential, and he stated that was not a zoning classification but a land use designation that has a prescribed density of one unit per more than five acres. He stated that the zoning suggested by the applicant as being appropriate is R-1-H which is single family residential hillside and has a 5,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size which was the applicable standards used to regulate density. He thought the driving factor was the General Plan land use designation indicating what the appropriate densities are and the zoning would be consistent and indicate lot sizes based on that. He stated that the city has a slightly more intensive designation known as the Very Low Density Residential or VLDR, which is the next step up in the city's existing framework for land use, and indicates lot sizes of a half acre to two acres per unit. He didn't have the information on what that would be in units per acre.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the applicant owns any other parcels besides this one that he is requesting.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he was not aware of any other parcels owned by the applicant but they can speak to that.

Commissioner Cooper stated that this falls within the Hillside Preservation District and he asked if this goes up for a vote if it was to be developed or not.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that this area was not within the Hillside Preservation District because it was outside the city limits and the city does not have the ability to impose zoning.

Commissioner Cooper asked if it doesn't become part of that if they annex it.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he was not aware that it would be subject to the Hillside Preservation District by default. He stated that the city could include that as part of its pre-zoning but that only has the effect of law upon completion of the annexation and that would be one of the many considerations the city would need to make and Planning Commission would make in its recommendation on pre-zoning, specifically whether R-1-H alone was adequate or needs to be Hillside Preservation District which would typically be implemented as an overlay with some other type of zoning.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma wanted to clarify the question if LAFCO could do this without the city's consent. She stated that there were two ways of getting this in front of LAFCO, the first being a request by the city and the second being a petition submitted by the landowners and registered voters in the area, with the latter as the only way it would get in front of LAFCO without the city's consent.

Commissioner Cooper concluded that they would have to put something on the ballot and have the cities vote on it.

Asst. Attorney Sharma stated that it would be a signature gathering effort.

Sr. Planner Murdock added that LAFCO has a formula provided in state law based on parcels owned and weighted assessed value and he stated that it was a little complicated to speculate the number of individuals needed to sign the petition to make it successful. With the applicant only having interest in annexing its own property, they would meet all the requirements to file a successful petition on the minimum requirement.

Commissioner Clifford had a question about wastewater. He asked, if the city did not choose to annex the area, whether they would still be required to allow whatever is built up there under the county to hook up to our wastewater system or would they have to put something else to handle their waste.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated he was not aware of a mechanism under which the city would be obligated to provide the wastewater service. He thought those “extraterritorial” service provisions may be subject to LAFCO review where a city is providing those types of services outside of the city limits, but he was not an expert in that area and he deferred to the director or city attorney. He stated that, with respect to the infrastructure within the area, they did have the Deputy Director of Wastewater, Louis Sun, if they had questions, adding that his staff reviewed this application and indicated that there appeared to be sufficient capacity for this proposal but they did not evaluate in detail the broader Tobin Park should that develop at some point. He stated that the county presently would include in its analysis of a development the suitability of septic which is another key consideration. Referring to steep slopes as in this property, he has heard that septic was not always suitable and to develop it may be necessary to obtain city wastewater services. He thought that was a key consideration for the applicant wanting to annex into Pacifica.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the mechanisms when a development is out of an area’s service boundaries, such as wastewater or sewer system, are through an out of agency service agreement which is reviewed by LAFCO. She stated it was typically done when all parties are consenting and willing to provide those services but not mandated upon the agency providing the utility service.

Commissioner Clifford stated that his basic question was whether the city was required to provide the wastewater system to an annexation that it didn’t initiate itself. While he knows they haven’t had a lot of time to look at this, he asked, if they annex the entire area, whether our system was adequate in that area or were they going to do a major reconstruct in that area to be able to get the wastewater out of Tobin Park.

PW Deputy Dir. Sun stated that he did not believe the city was required to provide service if it was not part of the city and, regarding his second question, his staff had an initial look at the collection system in that area and it appears that it was adequate for those units based on the initial plan they saw.

Commissioner Clifford mentioned that staff presented to them that they proceed with an annexation of the entire Tobin Park subdivision, and he asked if the infrastructure would be able to handle beyond the 11 units being proposed.

PW Deputy Dir. Sun stated that he did not know the answer and he would request a study be done to look into that further but they didn't have that information and he would not want to speculate. He felt they would need to have a flow study if something like that was to happen.

Commissioner Cooper thought those were good questions regarding being able to support the infrastructure of this development and future developments in that area. He asked, if the applicant was to show that with his 11 homes he won't go over the cusp but he is right at the cusp, if staff can tell him he is opening up the whole park and force him to improve the streets, sewer main or water main.

Sr. Planner Murdock acknowledged that the city can employ different mechanisms, among them reimbursement agreements that refer to foreseeable additional capacity that will be needed and to avoid subsequent disruptions as each property develops and triggers an incremental additional need for infrastructure, and require the applicant to overbuild but allow him to be compensated for that as other properties develop. He thought there may be other mechanisms as well. He thought it would be more difficult to do that in the event that only this area was annexed into the city and was one of the compelling considerations that the city could impose impact fees or other funding mechanisms that would be imposed on a broader basis rather than just on a project basis in the event the entire area was annexed and the overall infrastructure could be assessed.

Commissioner Cooper stated that his second question was regarding the annexation and special fees. He assumed that he was saying that, if they annex a certain portion, they could feasibly impose a separate fee for that particular area for development.

Sr. Planner Murdock responded affirmatively, adding that it would be subject to an appropriate study of engineering calculations but could be imposed.

Commissioner Clifford referred to their inclusionary housing ordinance, and asked how that would work with these 11 proposed buildings. He asked if they would have to provide inclusionary housing as part of their project.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the ordinance reads that the inclusionary requirements are applicable to projects creating 8 or more units or lots or parcels and she believes there is an argument to be made that it could be applicable but this has not been reviewed by legal.

James O'Connell, Civil Engineer of Professional Land Services, stated with him is the architect, Tyen Masten from Phase Three, and he will also be speaking. He stated that there were a lot of good questions asked but he would stick to his written remarks for now to meet the time requirements. He pointed out the annexation they were seeking, acknowledging that the city prefers to annex the full Tobin Park area which will require support of several other property owners to facilitate. He stated that they can work with the city towards that goal but, if they do not want to participate, they would want to proceed with the annexation as shown, which will be sufficient to allow for the full service of the proposed parcels and allow for future development of the adjoining properties. He stated that the annexation and development can serve as a guide for the other parcels when they decide to develop and/or annex. He stated that the red line represents a portion of several neighboring streets shown on the total subdivision and they are including in the proposed parcel areas. He stated the streets were offered for dedication through the original subdivision map but were not accepted and the city could choose to accept the dedication after annexation but, in doing so, the property owners would request that the city adequately maintain

the streets as required by the acceptance. He thought it was to the benefit of the city and property owners if the city were to vacate their interest and allow a private road to be constructed and maintained by the property owners. Instead they offered easements for public access and utilities. He then pointed out the proposed roadway with some specifics and following the minimum slope of 20%. He understood from the city that they will be asked to provide a minimum slope out of 15% but also understood the Fire Department has asked for them to study the response time and they will have to balance the request to see what the pros and cons are for minimizing either the slope or the response time. They were also proposing a hammerhead at the end of the fire truck turnaround and they understood that the Fire Department will be requesting a 96-foot diameter turnaround and this is also an item with which they will need to work with the city as the grades are quite challenging to support a street section like that. They could provide the ability for a loop in the future which the understood may be acceptable to the Fire Department. He pointed out the proposed homes for the project will likely have to be moved based on some additional constraints for the roadway. He stated that their intention is to have 11 homes after the adjustments with minimal impact on the hillside. He pointed out the properties that were not part of this project but were part of the annexation and the design will allow for them to develop in the future with the ability to connect to facilities constructed by their project. He asked that the properties pay into the cost of the improvements as a percentage of the number of parcels when developed. He stated that he didn't really go into the utilities as he didn't know how much they would be talking about them in this meeting. He stated that they have shown adequate facilities to meet the demands of this project and being aware of the necessary studies for water, etc.

Tyen Masten of Phase Three, stated that they wanted to develop a few of the plans to give the city a notion of what they might be looking to develop on the site, such as adjust the lots to the hillside. As such they had case studies for Lots 5 and 8 to look at how the architecture might step down the hillside and they could have a repetitive house on every lot and they would have components distributed across each lot and adjust to the landscape. They were looking at the local California character etc., as well as create something that adjusts to the local context of Pacifica and the hillside.

Chair Nibbelin opened public comments.

Emil Kolev, Pacifica, stated he lives very close to the area. He read the city report and he agrees that there were a lot of areas where the project does not comply with what would determine it to be a feasible project. He looked at the houses in the project and he thought it was a cheap and incomplete presentation. He suggested that, when they make a presentation, they do it right. He stated that he works with building and renovation and thought that there was no money to be made. He stated that they were doing it for profit but there was no money because of the slope. He mentioned that, when he built his house, it cost him 30-40% just for site work, stating that his slope was 25% and they were talking 65-75% slopes and he didn't see how they will do it without cutting costs which will hurt the city and the environment. He stated that, if they stay with the General Plan, plan development and Hillside Preservation, the entire Tobin Park should have only 14 houses.

Leo Leon, Pacifica, stated, after reading the report and listening to the testimony, that before they start talking about designs the priority needs to be pre-zoning. They have to look at that before they can address what they put there and how it will look. He thought it was obvious, based on the topography, that it was HPD property and they have to have an HPD overlay on it and discuss what is allowed under HPD with that designation. He was disappointed at looking at more

narrow roads and ignoring the concerns of the Fire Department which were well stated in the report. He asked that they get the planning and positioning right and, as they go forward, they have a strong position that was well experienced and well founded in Pacifica's planning and zoning. He was glad the issue of inclusionary housing came up as it was important. He mentioned that, with the Connemara project, the developers took responsibility for the roads. He concluded that they need to look at what the applicant will pay and what the rest of the community is going to pay. He referred to Pacifica having done a lot merge with substandard lots and he thought it would be good to know to what extent that would affect this project.

Gail Benjamin, Pacifica, stated that she lives on Springwood which was their slice of heaven. She asked if anyone has been up that street, and suggested that they take a drive while considering this project. She stated that without seeing how narrow the street and the area in which they live, it would be hard for them to make an accurate determination on the project. She stated that they are between San Pedro Valley Park and McNee Ranch. She stated that it was pristine with no noise. She stated that they have a creek running through their backyard and never have seen it stop, but in 1982 there was a mudslide because it was very steep and there was erosion. It gave way and came down their street and caused extensive damage. She mentioned the problem fire trucks had when there was a fire there, and she did not see how they can widen that street.

Ron Maykel, Pacifica, referred to Mr. Leon's comment on the lot merger, and then stated that he thought this was a pipe dream project. He didn't think they have any idea of the complicated nature of building in Pacifica, especially with hillsides in natural areas with potential mudslides. He stated that the county has a planning department and he suggested that they go through the county as Pacifica doesn't need to be caught up in a complicated thing. He mentioned that the Fassler project has been in the development phase for ten years but it is an easier landscape than this project. He reiterated that they let the county handle it and save the city problems.

Diane Harrold, Pacifica, stated she has always been very concerned around July 4 with many illegal explosions in Pacifica and was concerned about fire, especially following the fires in California. She stated that, on the CalFire map of San Mateo County, there are places on the peninsula that are red but Pacifica was surrounded by a large pink area which is around this area, and she thought if there was a big fire in that area there would be no access except by plane or helicopter to fight it. She thought that was a huge responsibility of the city to keep them as safe as possible and not allow an area like that to be developed with no way of protecting them. She stated that the area is pristine and beautiful with foxes, coyotes, bobcats, etc. She urged them to walk through there, adding that she didn't know how the wetlands would be addressed. She referred to the Fassler project and she would hate to have this get started and be left in a mess.

Carolyn Chang-Macy, Pacifica, stated that she lives at the corner of Rosita and Perez and with the houses there now, she was concerned with the speed of the cars as they gain momentum and she left notes asking them to slow down. She stated that if you add another 30 cars it will be like a freeway. She felt that adding all the houses will not help the city and will be another dead project like Fassler. She stated that when they have a big rain and she personally has rainboots and a raincoat to clear the bottom of leaves so everyone on Rosita will not get flooded. She also has concern about the creek. If they contaminate the creek up there it will end up in the ocean. She asked that they stick with the Board of Supervisors in 1913 who rejected the use on behalf of the public and dedicated it to public use.

Larry Bolander, Pacifica, stated that he lives on Perez and one of the reasons that he moved to this area was because it was quiet and a very special area. He stated that the street was not wide enough, and they could imagine the impact if there was more traffic. He stated that insurance companies won't insure anyone in that area as they consider that area to be a fire zone because of being up against the GGNRA and there was only one access road to the area. He asked, if they had a big fire in the whole area, how the fire engines would get there to fight the fires. He then referred to the floods in the past, where the water went across the street onto Perez and into the house at the bottom of Springwood and also in Valleywood Court with water going into a home with lots of damage. He stated that with more pavement they will increase the amount of water coming down. He suggested they think about donating it to open space with government writeoffs.

Katie Magee, Pacifica, stated she lives around the corner on Galvez and walks the area regularly. She couldn't think of a less suitable location to build homes, stating that it was very pristine open space that hasn't been touched and part of an important watershed and along the ridge line. She knows the CEQA process would address all of them. She stated that she was a registered civil engineer and she referred to the narrow streets and no sidewalks which would be disappointing. She stated that a 20% street grade was above anything she has ever encountered. She thought there was a lot of earth work and 20-foot retaining walls would be needed in some locations. She thought there was a lot of infrastructure that will be required and would take away from the beauty of what it is.

Martin Murray, Pacifica, stated that he submitted a list of things to talk about, adding that a number were covered by staff. He mentioned that a project of this size could take hundreds of trucks going down Linda Mar, Adobe, Rosita, Perez and Springwood and all of them were in rough shape now. He stated that the proposed area was a narrow valley with very steep hills on both sides. He stated that it was one of the few areas that has a free flowing stream that wildlife has access and very few humans go in that area because it was overgrown with vegetation and was difficult to get back there. He thought that was a resource they don't want to ruin, adding that excavation soils, etc., will flow into the creek and it empties into San Pedro Creek. He stated that restoration efforts on San Pedro Creek have been ongoing for decades to get the steelhead back into San Pedro Creek and he thought this would have a devastating effect on the project and bring a lot of silt and soils and possibly toxic matters. He repeated mention of a fire when the trucks had to park single file to get up the street and were having difficulty getting the equipment needed to the fire because of having to be hand carried. He mentioned mud and debris in the proposed development area caused the creek to overwhelm the culvert that runs through the properties and devastated the homes at the end of the street, mentioning the neighbor who had to let the creek and mud run through his house. He hoped one would read the letter into the record.

Clara Lee, Pacifica, stated that her neighbors brought a lot of good points. She lived on Springwood and reiterated that the parking and street situation was not great as it was a narrow street and now one side because it is so steep was already blocked off and not allowed to park there. She thought the only way to make the proposed work would be to widen the street so there would be any traffic allowed for the 11 homes but she didn't see how they could possibly widen the street. They would have to take one side the street where neighbors are parking and would have no driveway or would have to excavate the hillside on the other side of the street where her house is and she didn't see how that wouldn't bring the hillside down. She stated that because it was so steep it would block her driveway. She stated that this was not a great idea adding that

there was no infrastructure for a variety of reasons. She didn't see how it could possibly not be a disaster.

Marcy Milby, Pacifica, stated that they have owned 1540 Perez for more than ten years and the mudslide through their house is of epic proportion and repeated in the neighborhood. She stated that it was a real concern to her family who live there. She mentioned that, if you have been on the Pacifica Garden Tour they have probably had the opportunity to see her yard which is spectacular. She stated that the Planning Commission has approved two homes at the end of her court and has significantly changed the outlook of her home and she cannot imagine what 11 new homes would be. She thought the renderings were beautiful but there was one thing missing. She asked if anyone saw a car. She then showed what the front of her home looks like after the development of two large homes at the end of her court with 10-20 cars parked on Perez. She stated that saying a fire truck could not get down the street was real. She encouraged them to visit the neighborhood but she advised them to park on Rosita and walk up.

Chair Nibbelin closed public comments.

Chair Nibbelin commented that in a study session they are expected to provide feedback to the staff and applicant and he suggested that share their thoughts on this project.

Commissioner Cooper stated that they were not there to say yes or no but be helpful to the applicant and provide feedback on what their concerns are. He agreed that fire is a huge issue and it would need to be addressed as to how they get in and out of the streets, Perez, Springwood, and up to the proposed location. He referred to the zoning and what it looks like. He then mentioned the creek and wildlife corridor which he thought was very critical to the community and they will need to address. He stated that the creek was pristine and feeds into San Pedro Creek watershed and the entire area. He stated that it was one of the last creeks we have and he thought it was very important to the community. He thought they need to address that in total on what it looks like in its present configuration and how they accomplish what they want to do without disturbing the creek which was important. He thought the inclusionary housing was also an issue and they should look at the quantity of housing and what would be required for inclusionary housing. He stated that the streets were very narrow and they need to address the situation on how they get to the property on Springwood, how to negotiate with other property owners to put a wider street and address sidewalks. He stated that the mudslides are a huge issue. He stated he was an avid biker and bikes through those hills all the time and there are massive mudslides. He asked what they need to do in order to address that. He mentioned Manor having a large mudslide and they took out the whole hillside and rebuilt it. He thought doing that in that area was probably impractical but they would need to address it. He agreed that the traffic speeds were an issue and he asked how they solve that with the added cars. He stated that he didn't think he has seen a 20% grade in Pacifica.

Commissioner Clifford stated that one of his concerns was definitely the street. He understood that the actual right of way was 40 feet but they have a 19 foot wide road and asked if he was correct.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he would have to look at the staff report, but he thought that was correct if he was stating those figures from the report.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he took it from the report. He stated that having that large a right of way didn't necessarily mean it was buildable out to the full 40 feet because of the topography. He thought the potential development needs to address the idea that fire trucks have to be able to get up and down the hill and residents also have to get up and down the hill. Regarding the fire concerns, he thought they should be looking at putting in high pressure water lines for their hydrants and not just the standard water lines. He stated that San Francisco was now looking into doing that with the Richmond District and Sunset District because their present water lines were not adequate. Regarding the zoning, he would want to see an HPD overlay on the project going forward.

Commissioner Kraske thanked the public for coming out and providing valuable feedback. He agreed with his fellow commissioners that this project was worrisome on a number of levels, such as fire zone, hydrology and the general traffic flow. He didn't think the project would be feasible based on the information from this discussion.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he was curious to see more explanation of the wastewater capacity for the 11 units. He would also be in favor of an HPD overlay analysis. He didn't see a reason yet to deviate from the existing General Plan density requirement. He stated that sidewalks were a concern as they need sidewalks for kids and pedestrian safety. He stated that he was around when they approved the 20-acre site in Vallemar and required a fire turnaround for that homeowner. He thought fair was fair and they should require the same thing here. He referred to mention of the 20% grade and he thought that seemed substantial. He would be interested in a discussion of the city impact fees and how that takes into account the rest of Tobin Park should it be developed.

Chair Nibbelin characterized himself as an eternal optimist but the various concerns raised by the commissioners were very worthy of further analysis. He would need a good justification of why they would deviate from what is currently stated in the city's General Plan regarding density and the land use designations. He was concerned when listening to the public on their comments on the width of the street and its substandard nature, and pushing through more traffic and having a better understanding of how those streets will accommodate traffic on an ongoing basis, and particularly to the construction traffic with all the trucks and getting equipment up to the site. He would also be interested in knowing more about the biological impacts because of the diversity in addition to the creek and how the project would affect things at a long term level, in addition to the fire hazard, etc. He stated that was the extent of their feedback, and he didn't know if staff had any comments or things to say by closing the matter.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he heard two commissioners with concerns about deviating from the existing General Plan density called for in this area and he thought it would be helpful, considering the General Plan was the driving factor of the city's land use decisions, to hear from the other commissioners if they have opinions on intensifying the density as being acceptable or if they feel that what was in the General Plan currently was where they would feel comfortable.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he would need a better understanding of why it would be appropriate to do but he was not categorically opposed in any instance to amending the General Plan.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he wasn't opposed to modifying the General Plan. He didn't like the proposed density and maybe there is a happy median in between, maybe 4, 5, 3, 6. He

stated that he would have to have a good reason to change his mind from the General Plan use. He thought it would rely upon what the applicant would propose as a development.

Commissioner Clifford stated that they were looking at six times the density and he would like to see it at less than six times the density.

Commissioner Campbell reiterated that he was not seeing the need for the deviation at this point and he would need further explanation. He also echoed Chair Nibbelin's mention about traffic. He stated that the traffic and the roadway width were a big concern for him.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 2. No. 2017-013** **COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CDP-384-17 and**
CDP-384-17 **VARIANCE PV-521-18** to construct a 1,345 square foot (sf)
PV-521-18 addition including a second story and an attached garage with a
PE-521-18 reduced front setback, to an existing 1,080 sf single-story, single-
family residence on a 7,500 sf parcel, removal of one heritage tree;
and demolition of an existing carport and a portion of a garage
located within the public right of way at 400 Belfast Avenue (APN
023-026-040). Recommended CEQA Action: Class 1 and 3
Categorical Exemptions, CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301 and
15303.

Asst. Planner O'Connor presented the staff report.

Commissioner Cooper asked if she has any opinion on whether or not she would prefer the smaller garage or the variance.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that her opinion was that the garage was small and it may not accommodate every car and keeping in mind future owners of the property it may not suit them well. She thought the variance may be a better design for this property in addition to being consistent with the other properties on this portion of Grand Avenue. She stated that it was already set back from the developed portion of the street. She stated that the fact that the garage may be closer to the property line but was still well beyond the developed street.

Andrew Shore, designer, wanted to give a back story on the design and why they did some of the things for this project. He stated that the topography for the site was very steep in the southeast corner and not much building area because of an existing non-conforming deck on the property that they wanted to keep so the only area to build was in the existing carport area. By demolishing the carport area they were sensitive to views in the area and they knew there was a neighbor behind them and above the existing carport and they didn't want to do a two-story edition on that side of the property so they placed the entire second story edition over the existing house which backs up to a wall of trees and would not be affecting any neighbors beyond that wall of trees. They also wanted to keep the roof lines very minimal in front of the neighbor above them. He stated that staff did a thorough report. They also wanted to keep the look of the existing house throughout the edition so it didn't look like they had the existing house and they added on a thousand square feet and doubled the size of the home. He thought their simplistic

roof lines on the single story edition where they have a low roof line helps their neighbors and their views and they put most of the massing over the existing house.

Commissioner Cooper asked which option he preferred for the garage.

Mr. Shore stated the larger garage with the variance due to the ability for their clients to get a bigger car if they want to expand the family. He thought the smaller garage limits them and, if they decide to get a larger car, that will be one more car on the street and they were trying to put as large of a garage as possible without asking for too much on the variance. They figured 20 feet were about 3 ½ feet over the 20-foot setback which the cost benefit was, if they gain 3 feet they can put a larger car in the garage and not out in the street.

Chair Nibbelin opened the Public Hearing and seeing no one closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Clifford stated he was more comfortable with this project with the variance than with the parking exception.

Commissioner Campbell was in agreement with Commissioner Clifford's comments and go with the variance in light of the existing distance of the garage from the street.

Commissioner Clifford moved that the Planning Commission finds the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVE Coastal Development Permit CDP-384-17 and Variance PV-521-18, by adopting the resolution included as attachment B to the staff report, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A to the resolution; and incorporate all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

Ayes: Commissioners Kraske, Cooper, Campbell, Clifford and Chair Nibbelin.
Noes: None

**3. PSD-827-17
CDP-393-17
S-127-17
SE-029-18**

SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PSD-827-17, COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CDP-393-17, SIGN PERMIT S-127-17 and SIGN EXCEPTION SE-029-18, filed by Katie Wicker of SES Branding, to replace one (1) existing 49 s.f. wall sign, Demolish and replace one (1) 20 s.f. freestanding sign and add one (1) 10 s.f. wall sign on the south east elevation, and approve a new Master Sign Program, for the Best Western Plus Lighthouse Hotel at 105 Rockaway Beach (APN 022-026-280) in Pacifica. The project site is located within the Coastal Zone and the application was filed on October 19, 2017. Recommended California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) status: Class 2 and 3 Categorical Exemptions, Sections 15302 and 15303.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that no action is needed. It was on the agenda because it was noticed and subsequently withdrawn.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Clifford stated that since he left the last meeting early he wasn't able to let them know that he did go to the City Council meeting for the Library Advisory Committee and that was moving forward.

Chair Nibbelin thanked him for the information and for his service on that committee.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he went to the City Council meeting on six-unit San Pedro Terrace subdivision, but they didn't have any questions as they had the same concerns the Commission did. He stated that this was his last meeting as he was not going to run for the next term and take a break. He stated that he did enjoy his time.

Chair Nibbelin stated that they were appointed at the same time and it has been a pleasure for him to get to know him and work with him. He admired his ability to get really granular with respect to assessing plans and keep a good focus on the big picture, and they were often aligned in looking at the world. He appreciated serving with him.

Commissioner Cooper also thanked staff as they have been great. The reports have gotten really good and easy to follow.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she didn't want to put him on the spot, but asked if this was his last meeting.

Commissioner Cooper stated that it was his last meeting because his term was up at the end of February.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that he can continue to serve until he is replaced.

Commissioner Cooper stated he would let her know.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he didn't want to acknowledge that he is leaving and he hopes he stays but he will understand if he doesn't. He stated that, if this is his last meeting, it has been a pleasure serving with him.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister reported that 674 Corona was appealed but they have not set a hearing date yet. They will let them know. She stated that the reason why Sr. Planner Murdock left the meeting after his presentation was that on February 10, he and his wife welcomed their first child, a boy named Emery, 7 lbs, 14 oz. and everyone was doing great.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Clifford moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m.; Chair Nibbelin seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Kraske, Cooper, Campbell, Clifford and

Noes: Chair Nibbelin
None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister