

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

This Response to Comments document contains agency comments received during the public review period of the 1335 Adobe Drive project (proposed project) Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND).

BACKGROUND

The City of Pacifica Planning Department, as lead agency, released the IS/MND for public review beginning on October 17, 2018 and ending on November 19, 2018, pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15105. The IS/MND and supporting documents were made available at the public counter of the City of Pacifica Planning Department located at 1800 Francisco Boulevard, Pacifica, California 94044, and also online at the City’s website at <http://www.cityofpacifica.org>. According to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15073 and 15074, the lead agency must consider the comments received during consultation and review periods together with the negative declaration. However, unlike with an Environmental Impact Report, comments received on a negative declaration are not required to be attached to the negative declaration, nor must the lead agency make specific written responses to public agencies. Nonetheless, the City has chosen to provide responses to the comments received during the public review process for the IS/MND.

LIST OF COMMENTERS

The City of Pacifica received four comment letters during the open comment period on the IS/MND for the proposed project:

- Letter 1 Gayle Totton, Native American Heritage Commission
- Letter 2 John Haddad, Resident
- Letter 3 Mary McArdle, Resident
- Letter 4 Sharon and David Martinez, Residents

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

The Response to Comments below includes responses to the comment letters submitted regarding the proposed project. The letters are numbered and bracketed with assigned comment numbers. The bracketed comment letters are followed by numbered responses corresponding to each bracketed comment. Where revisions to the IS/MND text were made, new text is double underlined and deleted text is ~~struck through~~.

Letter 1

On Oct 26, 2018, at 13:47, Totton, Gayle@NAHC <Gayle.Totton@nahc.ca.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon Mr. Murdock,

1-1

I have reviewed the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the above referenced project for compliance with statutes regarding Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources. Since the document is substantially in compliance, I did not want to send a formal comments letter. However, there is one error that needs to be corrected prior to certification of the MND. In Mitigation Measure V-1 (page 42), it states that the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) must make recommendations within 24 hours. Per Public Resources Code 5097.98 (a), the MLD has 48 hours from the time they are granted access to the site to make their recommendations to the landowner.

If you would please correct this item and send me a copy of the revised Mitigation Measure, that should be sufficient. No recirculation is necessary.

Thank you,

Gayle Totton, M.A., Ph.D.
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Native American Heritage Commission
(916) 373-3714

**LETTER 1: GAYLE TOTTON, M.A., PH.D, NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE
COMMISSION, OCTOBER 26, 2018**

Response to Comment 1-1

Consistent with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(a), Mitigation Measure V-1 on pages 42 and 43 of the IS/MND is hereby revised as follows:

- V-1. *During ground-disturbing activities associated with development of the proposed project, archaeological and Native American monitors shall be present at the site. In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, further excavation or disturbance of the find or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains shall not occur until compliance with the provisions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(e)(1) and (2) has occurred. The Guidelines specify that in the event of the discovery of human remains other than in a dedicated cemetery, no further excavation at the site or any nearby area suspected to contain human remains shall occur until the County Coroner has been notified to determine if an investigation into the cause of death is required. If the Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, then, within 24 hours, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will notify the most likely descendants who may recommend treatment of the remains and any grave goods. If the Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendant or most likely descendant fails to make a recommendation within 2448 hours after notification by the Native American Heritage Commission, or the landowner or his authorized agent rejects the recommendation by the most likely descendant and mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide a measure acceptable to the landowner, then the landowner or his authorized representative shall rebury the human remains and grave goods with appropriate dignity at a location on the property not subject to further disturbances. If human remains are encountered, a copy of the resulting County Coroner report noting any written consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission shall be submitted as proof of compliance to the City of Pacifica Planning Department.*

The foregoing revisions are for clarification purposes only and do not affect the conclusions of the IS/MND.

Letter 2

Murdock, Christian

From: John Haddad <johnhaddad16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2018 3:07 PM
To: Murdock, Christian
Subject: 1335 Adobe condo project

2-1

I am a resident of Linda Mar and am very concerned about the condo construction project. I'm against removing the heritage redwood tree and am concerned about the insufficient amount of guest parking planned.

Regards,
John Haddad

Sent from my iPhone

LETTER 2: JOHN HADDAD, NOVEMBER 16, 2018

Response to Comment 2-1

As discussed on pages 38 and 39 of the IS/MND, four existing on-site trees that would be removed as part of the proposed project meet the City's definition of "heritage tree" found in section 4-12.02(c) of the Pacifica Municipal Code. However, Mitigation Measure IV-2, which requires the project applicant to obtain tree removal permits from the City of Pacifica Planning Department and provide for planting of replacement trees, would ensure that the proposed project would not conflict with Chapter 12 of Title 4 of the City Municipal Code (Preservation of Heritage Trees). Thus, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Issues related to parking availability are not covered by the State CEQA Guidelines and, thus, are not analyzed within the IS/MND. It should be noted that the project would provide for resident and guest parking consistent with Section 9-4.2818 of the City's Municipal Code. Specifically, each of the proposed units would include attached garages for resident parking. The project would also exceed the guest parking requirement in the City's Municipal Code by providing a total of four guest parking spaces, including one American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking space on-site. The City's Municipal Code requires only one guest parking space for the project.

The commenter's concerns regarding tree removal and parking will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their consideration.

Letter 3

To whom it my Concern,

November 19, 2018

- 3-1** I am writing in regards to the proposed Adobe Drive Residential Project. As a lifelong resident of Pacifica and a current homeowner on Adobe Drive, I am hoping the City of Pacifica will consider this project and its impact on the residents of Adobe drive quite seriously.
- 3-2** Three years ago an informal meeting to voice concerns took place on the site of the intended project. Since then no one from the city has reached out to hear our concerns nor to my knowledge has anyone been out to physically see the traffic and parking crisis that currently exists. My feeling and that of my neighbors, is that an additional housing project will greatly impact an already existing problem.
- I have read some of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, but admittedly not the whole 223 pages. However, I did not see any neighbor interviews, nor assessment of parking impacts.
- I have commented below on some of what I have read and how I believe the impacts are greater than assessed in the declaration.
- 3-3** The visual character of the site will not be impacted, as it could definitely be cleaned up and groomed. This has not been a concern of the owner, they have done nothing to improve it in several years, and should not be a factor. The owner or the community could work on a community garden that would be pleasing and would not create more car use. The buildings would definitely block sunlight and views of the trees behind the property. Not to mention the wildlife living in those trees. I think the buildings would also block the peaceful sounds of the night owls that occupy these trees. As far as the trees on the property, I imagine the city has had environmental reports by authorized commissions, not bought off by the owners.
- 3-4** The project itself (the homes) may have a less than significant aesthetically displeasing effect, however, the parking crises of which it will immensely impact, with definitely be aesthetically displeasing. This will cause a significant crises to the street and the community. In my opinion the Potentially Significantly Impact box should be checked. All you need to do is drive down the street and imagine at least 10 to 12 to potentially 20, more cars parked on the street add 3 more for the Handicapped spots which will be created.
- 3-5** Highway 1 is scenic regardless of being designated as so. Gosh who wrote this, do you care about Pacifica at all?
- 3-6** I understand the owners of the standing property wanting to develop it and get their investment, however, I think the City of Pacifica owes it to their citizens and particularly the residents of Adobe Drive, to consider the real impact to the community. The increase of people and cars and traffic will be immense. A smaller project which provides adequate parking for its occupants should be considered. With the cost of living the apartments are already impacted which in turn impacts the parking on the street. I live on the south end of this block and often have to park on Rosita. It is a serious problem and the City of Pacifica needs to take this into consideration. The street itself is not well lit and people have to walk from the south end of Adobe down to the apartments already, they shouldn't have to park further away to accommodate this project. I am a home owner, but part of me believes there is less concern from the city because the people who will be the most impacted by this project are apartment dwellers and somehow there is less regard for them by the city. This is discrimination. I sincerely hope that is not the case.

**Letter 3
cont'd**

3-7

In writing this I am hoping the City of Pacifica will take another look into the overall impact this project will have on the community. Talk to the residents on Adobe. Drive down Adobe after 6pm. Walk by the property at night and listen to the wild life. Enjoy the beauty of the existing trees. Think about community and not income. Try to visualize a better more accommodating project or at least one on a smaller scale. Research how the City of Pacifica can do better for its residents as opposed to an out of town property owner.

I thank you in advance for taking the time to read my concerns.

Sincerely,

Mary McArdle

1460 Adobe Drive

650-303-3699

LETTER 3: MARY McARDLE, NOVEMBER 19, 2018

Response to Comment 3-1

The comment is an introductory statement and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 3-2

Please see Response to Comment 2-1 regarding parking issues. Issues related to traffic are Discussed in Section XVI, Transportation and Circulation, of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 3-3

Pages 17 through 24 of the IS/MND include a discussion of potential impacts to aesthetic resources associated with development of the proposed project, including issues related to degradation of the existing visual character and quality of the project site and the surrounding area. Figures 13 and 14 in the IS/MND provide pre- and post-development views of the project site from Adobe Drive looking east across the site. Page 23 of the IS/MND states the following regarding changes to such views:

Figure 13 and Figure 14 present the existing and potential future views of the site looking east from Adobe Drive. Drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians travelling on the roadway are afforded prominent views of the site. Currently, such views consist of a chain link fence surrounding the site as well as the existing on-site vegetation. The backdrop of the site consists primarily of a wooded hillside located east of the site. Following project implementation, the existing chain-link fence would be removed and the proposed townhomes would be clearly visible from the street. However, views of the wooded hillside would be retained, and would complement the new development. In addition, landscaping would be provided alongside the sidewalk fronting the project. Overall, the project would increase the aesthetic value of the site and would blend with existing residential development in the area.

In addition, as noted on page 23 of the IS/MND, visual consistency of the project design, and compliance with all requirements of the City Municipal Code, would be required by the City. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, and a less-than-significant impact would occur. It should be noted that State CEQA Guidelines do not require an analysis of issues related to shading of existing uses. Similarly, while the IS/MND includes an analysis of potential increases in the ambient noise environment occurring as a result of the project, CEQA Guidelines do not require an analysis of potential decreases in the ambient noise environment for sensitive receptors. Potential impacts to wildlife in the project area are discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources, of the IS/MND. The tree evaluation referenced therein was prepared for the proposed project by a certified arborist (Howard Linacre). It should be noted that Mitigation Measures IV-1(a) through (c) in the IS/MND require pre-construction surveys for raptors and migratory birds potentially occurring in the project vicinity. With implementation of such mitigation measures, impacts to special-status species were determined to be less than significant.

The commenters suggestion that the site be developed with a community garden will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their consideration. Nonetheless, the scope of analysis presented in the IS/MND is limited to the currently proposed project.

Response to Comment 3-4

As noted on page 9 of the IS/MND, the project would include vehicle parking in the form of seven attached garages associated with each of the seven proposed units. In addition, the project would include uncovered surface parking in the form of two guest spaces at the north end of Adobe Court, as well as a third guest spot, an ADA parking space, and an ADA loading zone. Thus, as noted in Response to Comment 2-1 above, the proposed project would provide for on-site parking consistent with Section 9-4.2818 of the City's Municipal Code for resident parking, and in excess of such requirements for guest parking. Thus, the project would not be anticipated to result in any substantial issues related to use of street parking. Furthermore, any such use of street parking would not represent a substantial degradation of the existing visual character or quality of the project area, as street parking along Adobe Drive already occurs associated with other existing residential uses.

Response to Comment 3-5

As noted on page 17 of the IS/MND, the proposed project site is not visible from Highway 1, and would not negatively affect scenic resources associated with the roadway.

Response to Comment 3-6

The commenters concerns and suggestions will be forwarded to the decision-makers for their consideration. Note the site's designation in the City's General Plan as High Density Residential, which is consistent with the surrounding development pattern. The High Density Residential designation calls for development at 16 to 21 units per acre which, based on the project site's size, allows for the site to be developed with between seven and nine units. Thus, the project as proposed is at the lower limit of the density range prescribed in the City's General Plan.

With regard to parking issues, please see Response to Comment 2-1. Issues related to vehicle trip generation occurring as a result of the proposed project are discussed in Section XVI, Transportation and Circulation, of the IS/MND. As noted therein, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the City's circulation system, and would not conflict with the San Mateo County Congestion Management Plan. Thus, impacts related to such were determined to be less than significant.

The comment does not specifically address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 3-7

The comment provides a summary of the prior contents of the letter, and does not further address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Letter 4

Murdock, Christian

From: Sharon Martinez <sharon.martinez1444@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2018 3:33 PM
To: Murdock, Christian
Cc: David Martinez
Subject: 1335 Adobe Drive Project

City of Pacifica Planning Department

Attn: Christian Murdock

170 Santa Maria Ave.

Pacifica, CA 94044

- 4-1** We, Sharon Martinez and David Martinez residents and owners of 1444 Adobe Drive, wish to offer comments regarding the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigation Negative Declaration for the 1335 Adobe Drive Residential Project (File No. 2015-002.) The current lack of parking is already a factor that impacts the quality of life for residents on Adobe Drive. With apartments on one end of the street, and a church and pre-school on the other end of the street, those of us living in single family homes on Adobe drive are constantly struggling to find parking. We understand that the proposed project at 1335 Adobe Drive will allow for 2 garage spaces per residential unit and 4 uncovered guest parking spaces, however, this does not guarantee that residents of the new project will actually park in their garages. They will seek street parking. We also understand that several of the units will have more than one bedroom. With reasonably priced housing so severely limited in Pacifica, it seems quite probable that many of the units will be occupied, by more than 2 adults with more than 2 vehicles. Public transportation in Pacifica is lacking. People are reliant on their cars. The potential for having an exponential increase in the number of vehicles competing for parking spaces on Adobe drive is real!
- 4-2**
- 4-3** We are looking forward to spending time with our family and friends this holiday season. We hope that next year we can do the same without our guests having to park a mile away from our house.
- Thank you for providing an opportunity for residents to express their serious concerns about this project.

Sincerely,

Sharon and David Martinez

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

LETTER 4: SHARON AND DAVID MARTINEZ, NOVEMBER 19, 2018

Response to Comment 4-1

The comment is an introductory statement and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.

Response to Comment 4-2

Issues related to parking availability are not covered by the State CEQA Guidelines and, thus, are not analyzed within the IS/MND. Furthermore, as noted in Response to Comment 2-1 above, the proposed project would provide for on-site parking consistent with Section 9-4.2818 of the City's Municipal Code for resident parking, and in excess of such requirements for guest parking. Thus, the project would not be anticipated to result in any substantial issues related to use of street parking.

Response to Comment 4-3

The comment is a concluding statement and does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND.