

MINUTES

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

April 4, 2016

7:00 p.m.

Chair Campbell called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Gordon, Evans, Cooper and
Chair Campbell
Absent: Commissioners Vaterlaus and Nibbelin

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Gordon

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Assist. Planner Farbstein
Public Works Director Ocampo
Asst. City Attorney Matthew Visick

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA Commissioner Gordon moved approval of the Order of Agenda; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Cooper, Gordon, Evans and
Chair Campbell
Noes: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JUNE 22, 2015:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that there are none needed.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Tom Clifford, Pacifica, stated that he was addressing in-law apartments or second units on a property. He stated that they were not in accordance with the state ordinance and he understood they were supposed to get in compliance within the year, adding that he hoped it would be happening soon. He stated that there was a rub around the parking, stating that the state allows tandem parking and Pacifica does not. He stated that it would make a big change for the people having an in-law within their own home. He also stated that, for second units on the property with steep downhill slant, most of those buildings can't be built on because of the steepness of the downhill lot based on city height ordinances. He suggested that it be changed from lowest to highest for these types to highest to highest so that those people can have the use of their property like those with level lots or lots going uphill and they can cut into them. He felt that it was unfair for the people who have steep downhill lots as they can't build or have to go through so many hoops that they would have to come to the Planning Commission to get an okay to do it and they

would be asking for a variance which is often hard to get and it was also relatively costly to go to the Planning Commission. He asked that the staff and Planning Commission bring things in line with what the state says needs to happen by bringing it to the Planning Commission agenda to move it forward. He added that it would help the homeless problem in town and give some seniors extra income if they can have an in-law in their house.

Dan Stegink, Pacifica, stated that he was present to talk about an infrastructure problem that he thought they should pay attention to before they do any expansion. He was talking about the sewer processing under capacity. He stated that the current sewage plant was sold on a 30 million gallon per day capacity. He stated that he was going to go over the sewage system overflows since they first started filming them on November 11, 2014. He listed the gallons at various streets in 2014, and when he filmed it on November 11, it was 203,700 gallons on Linda Mar Blvd., as well as on March 5, 2016 with 70,140 gallons of spilled sewage on Anza Drive. He stated that, if they take out the two outliers, Linda Mar and Anza are getting 2000 times the amount of sewage of any other. He stated that they have had 529,000 gallons of sewage on Linda Mar or Anza since January 1, 2014 versus 2,000 anywhere else in the city. He stated that the amount has jumped since they started filming by about 200,000 per event. He stated that it was a serious problem that whenever they add anything between Calera Creek and Linda Mar Blvd., they have to take a look. He stated that it wasn't as much of a problem from Calera Creek north because it was a completely different set of processing capacity. He felt it was a real problem in Linda Mar and they were tired of the "crap."

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None

CONSIDERATION:

None

STUDY SESSION:

Discussion of a conceptual plan to redevelop the Pacifica Quarry site with a program of wetland and hillside open space, creekside park with recreational trails, a clustered commercial/residential village adjacent to the Rockaway Beach commercial district, and hotel/conference venue.

Assoc. Planner Murdock presented staff report.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the parking aspects and asked what the city's regulations were for live/work type parking.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that the city did not have an explicit standard for a live/work type of arrangement in the zoning code, adding that the code does provide flexibility in that there is not a specific requirement and allows a combination of similar types of uses to aggregate. He stated that they would look to whatever the appropriate residential parking requirement was for that particular type of unit/floor plan/ownership, etc. Depending on the scale of the commercial component, there could be an additional requirement for that. He felt that it was too early to understand the configuration and quantity of parking for this type of development.

Commissioner Gordon wondered if they were familiar with the limitations in the scope of what work can be going on in the live/work units in Pacifica. He mentioned that some cities allow clients coming and going.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that, similar to parking requirements, the city didn't have explicit live/work requirements as it was commonly understood, adding that the city has home occupation regulations which allows a limited business capacity for traditional residences which is considered low impact professional services activities such as a home-based accountant. He stated that there was a provision under the home occupation regulations to allow a limited number of customers, no more than three per day, under certain circumstances to come to the residence. He imagined something similar as a baseline, but those zoning standards would have to be developed if this type of development and concept was approved.

Commissioner Cooper commented that Highway 1 was a sore subject for a lot of people but he was looking at the bypass road going through the property area. He asked if the owner has the right to restrict who is on that roadway.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that was not a level of specificity to which they have reached with the applicant in their discussions. He stated that, if it were a private road and allowed to be a private road, he imagined there may be some ability to restrict the type of traffic. He did understand from conversations with the developer that their intention was to make it a publicly accessible road.

Elizabeth Shrieve, principal with SWA Group, stated they were planners and landscape architects in San Francisco. She understood this was the first of many forums and venues to speak with the city and work with the community on this project through a voter initiative and a full entitlement, design review and environmental review process. She acknowledged that it was an amazing piece of land along the spectacular coastline. She pointed out that there were two separate

parcels, and there was a missing piece between Mori Point and Rockaway with conservation and parkland around it. She mentioned the history of the property as a commercial operation up until it closed in 1987, and the addition of the water recycling plant. She mentioned that a legacy of the commercial use was that the site was degraded, scarred with little healthy soil, etc. She mentioned that it was a challenge and an opportunity at an incredible site. She mentioned that they need a proper balance to find the right program to achieve the goals to connect the community and restore the site, involving significant investment. She stated that they were at the conceptual level, but have come up with a quarry village with retail office and multifamily housing, a hotel and conference venue and an amphitheater along with a series of trails. She stated that over 75% of the site will be retained in open space. They felt it was a good way to treat the site in a responsible way to activate Rockaway. They were paying attention to setbacks and easements along the highway with a highway setback, and all development will stay west of that. She stated that they also gave themselves setbacks along the creek, which was a private site but used by the public and they wanted to continue that. She stated that the owner has done a lot of background geotechnical studies. She stated that they want to safely connect the coastal trails through the site for continuity. She pointed out the new trails and improved existing trails. She mentioned there were also public overlooks. She mentioned that the existing road will be a full service road from Reina del Mar to Rockaway, although could be used by emergency vehicles in the case of a traffic jam on Highway 1. She then pointed out the smaller streets. She addressed storm water issues. She briefly described the hotel space, conferencing, retail, housing, live/work, parking, with preliminary renderings, in addition to open space.

Commissioner Gordon thanked her for the presentation. Being environmentally oriented, he appreciated the emphasis on restoring the green area. He referred to the bungalows, and he asked where they would sit, on the ocean side or non-ocean or top of the ridge.

Ms. Shrieve stated that she didn't have a detailed contour map, but the ridge flattens out and they would tuck them around the ridge and would have ocean views but just under the ridge line.

Commissioner Gordon thought, if they were standing and looking toward the hillside, it will not impact the view.

Ms. Shrieve stated that you might be able to see them from the hotel, but probably not from further away or from the east.

Commissioner Gordon asked, if you are walking along the Creekside path and looking up, whether you would be able to see, again asking if they are on the ocean side.

Ms. Shrieve pointed out the ridge and where it would be hard to see them, but added that they could easily do a visual analysis.

Commissioner Gordon asked her to show them the top of the ridges with the marker.

Ms. Shrieve pointed it out.

Commissioner Gordon concluded that it was tucked on the ocean side.

Ms. Shrieve agreed that they were on the ocean side and a little bit below the ridge. She stated that there was an existing dirt road. She again offered to analyze it using their digital modeling.

Commissioner Evans thanked her for the presentation. He thought it was exiting to look at things like that. He read the initiative measure which stated that the units would not exceed two stories, but in another section it mentioned that no structures will exceed four stories. He asked an explanation on that.

Ms. Shrieve stated that the retail was two-story maximum and the housing is four-story maximum. The hotel is four stories, but it depends where you measure it, stating that it pokes up above the ridge but was measured from the quarry bowl floor.

Commissioner Evans explained that he was asking because of the city's rule regarding 35-foot limitations. He then mentioned the statement that 20% must be designated as affordable for very low, lower or moderate income households. He asked for an explanation on that.

Ms. Shrieve had wondered if someone was going to ask her that question. She didn't know exactly how that is measured or how the city measures affordable housing. She assumed they had an income level and 20% of the 181 apartments would be in that very low, lower or moderate income. She asked city staff how they define affordable housing.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they would follow the standard that the County Housing Authority sets forth, but she didn't have the specific income limits at this time.

Commissioner Evans acknowledged that the figures were set, but he was looking at the 20% must be the designated part. He asked if that would be a negotiable percentage figure.

Ms. Shrieve thought that the initiative was set at this point and has been filed. She stated that it was at least 20% and it was pretty much what was said, but not lower than that.

Chair Campbell also thanked her for the presentation. He referred to the vehicular circulation diagram and saw the San Marlo Way in and out the way it has to be. He then asked how they contemplate the ingress/egress on the Reina del Mar/Quarry Road intersection.

Ms. Shrieve stated that it was currently signalized. They are initiating a transportation study but have not designed the turning movements for the intersections yet. She mentioned that San Marlo is currently right in/right out. She didn't imagine they would want left turns so they kept it the same. She stated that they were existing signals and she thought they would be full turning movements/signalized intersections at Rockaway and Reina del Mar as currently.

Chair Campbell assumed, if going north to San Francisco, they would be at the Reina del Mar intersection.

Ms. Shrieve stated that she would defer to their transportation firm as she didn't know what modifications they may propose to optimize the traffic situations. She stated that, if they had suggestions, she would convey them.

Chair Campbell thought the intersection has been the subject of more suggestions than any other four-way intersection in Pacifica which is the bottle neck for Highway 1, mainly because of the school located there which is the problem during the school year.

Ms. Shrieve thought they were aware of that but she would relay his comments.

Chair Campbell stated that he was just curious about whether they have been thinking of any other traffic improvements.

Ms. Shrieve stated that previous proposals have suggested an additional access point at that location. She stated that they haven't studied it but have seen it on other proposals for the site, but were just getting started in evaluating on site circulation and access.

Chair Campbell asked if they have any timetable for coming up with anything.

Ms. Shrieve thought that, over the next few months, they will be submitting materials to the city, adding that a circulation plan was required for the PD development plan submittal and they would be including their findings in that and would go through the entire CEQA review process.

Commissioner Cooper thanked her for the presentation. He stated that he had some comments for her, adding that it may not be the opinion of all the commissioners. He thought the road would provide a headache for the area, but adding that he wasn't saying they should cut it out. He concluded that the road will be used by commuter traffic as they try to get off Highway 1 and it will back up which will be a concern to the residents living in that area who may be affected by the traffic backing up. He shared a concern for that intersection. He thought there were only 4 or 5 cars that can turn left when headed north, and he can see it bogging up with people getting caught in the intersection which he saw as a problem. He referred to turning right off San Marlo Way off of Highway 1, and thought it was a dangerous intersection for ingress or egress to Highway 1. He stated that, if you try to pull in, you are going off a ledge and if you try to pull out, you are likely spinning your tires because it was so steep in that area. He concluded that he would be concerned about that right turn. He referred to the pictures of San Marlo Way, stating that it was a very narrow street and he didn't understand how they will get two cars down that street along with all the pedestrians. He stated that it seemed there was no on street parking as they made it a sidewalk.

Ms. Shrieve stated that they propose widening it onto their property.

Commissioner Cooper asked if she had the photo, adding that if they look at the crosswalk, there was no on street parking to the right and he wasn't sure if the car in the picture was parked or not, but it was really narrow. He would be concerned about how wide it was and getting cars in and out along with emergency traffic as there will be a lot going on with the plaza and he would be concerned about the fire trucks going side by side.

Ms. Shrieve stated that they will definitely work with the city, but they had the flexibility to make it wider as they can expand to the north.

Commissioner Cooper referred to all the wonderful trails, and asked, with all the guests and traffic on the road, whether they were going to light the trail. He stated that he has biked on it and it was almost impossible to see anyone at night unless they have a light.

Ms. Shrieve asked if he could tell her which trail.

Commissioner Cooper stated that it was the red trail in the picture that goes the distance, and it was currently not a lighted trail. He would be concerned about any guests who might be walking on it. He was concerned about the safety and what it would look like. He stated that, while his idea might not be popular with a lot of people, he thought there was a lot of wetland open space and he believes in public outdoor soccer fields and baseball fields, and there were not a lot of places to play. He thought, if it was next to a wetland open space, people could park and enjoy it. He stated that there was not a lot of parking or anything that would draw him to the north side of the wetlands, with only a small dog park now, but he thought it was not utilized now. He thought, if there was some field that kids could use, it would bring a lot more people to enjoy the area. He wasn't sure that they would have any access near the center of that open space, with only a trail around it, but now people walk through it. He agreed there was a lot of species on that and GGNRA has taken a lot of due diligence in helping with that area. He was glad that they are thinking about restoring it to its natural environment. He stated that he wasn't a big proponent of the hotel design, and didn't think it would fit. He did like the seating on the roof to allow a view and thought the public would enjoy that. He was also concerned about the amphitheater, stating that he thought a concert would be great but he questioned where everyone would park or how they would get there. If the hotel was full, he didn't see a lot of places to hold an event. He did think people would like to hold events there, but he didn't see how that was going to work within their site plan. He also had a concern when she referred to the public trails. He felt it was a steep cliff and there was a concern of the public keeping safe on the trails but he asked if they would put hand rails, lighting, and time restrictions. He liked the ideas of the bungalows but he didn't see any common space for that bungalow area if it was a hotel. He questioned how he would meet with someone if he was a business owner. He thought the live/work layout was not exciting, although he liked the idea of a live/work unit. He thought there were a lot of small businesses in Pacifica that could benefit from a live/work type of arrangement that was affordable. He liked the concept but the layout seemed boxy to him. He stated that he uses the trails, but he was concerned about the amount of grading that will have to take place to get a road up there and improve the trails, especially those on the opposite side of the creekside trail.

Ms. Shrieve stated that it was an existing trail.

Commissioner Cooper agreed that it was existing but it was pretty steep. He was concerned about how much displacement they will have, drainage, etc. He thought they presently had a pretty clean runoff from the quarry into the creek and he assumed that all the storm drains ran into the creek and he asked how they would take precautions that they wouldn't be dipping the oil into the creek. He liked the retention ponds they put in, since he wouldn't want a spill to go into the creek and putting it into a retention pond first was a smart idea, and he would be looking for that to ensure they have taken that into account. He reiterated that parking was a big issue, mentioning that, with an amphitheater, if it was a sunny day, there would be people at the beach going to their plaza, etc., and he didn't think there would be a place for everyone. He didn't know people's feelings about expanding the quarry road to have street parking. He thought that might be a good alternative for more parking, especially if they did something with the northern portion for public access.

Chair Campbell stated that he understood the plans were general and he didn't want to get "into the weeds" yet on the specifics. He agreed that Commissioner Cooper's suggestion of a soccer field, etc., would be good, if they go with the multi-family residential development proposed as there could be a lot of kids. He felt the city had a need for playable fields. He felt the problem

with the intersection at Reina del Mar was not so much the traffic with the hotel and commercial but with the residential development for people getting to work and school. He stated that, if the level of service remains at D or F, they might want to consider scaling back the number of multi-family residential units to allow the traffic to get through the intersection.

Chair Campbell opened public comments.

Peter Loeb, Rockaway Beach, stated that the bungalows are 2,500 square feet which is a four-bedroom, three-bath house, and he didn't think it was a bungalow. He stated that, if the Caltrans Calera Parkway widening program goes through, San Marlo Way is blocked off. He stated that he was doing everything he can to make sure the widening doesn't happen but, if it does, this notion of ingress/egress from San Marlo Way doesn't work. He stated that he didn't get it, and doesn't know why they were here. He thought the Commission's time and staff's time was being wasted, as well as the public's time. He stated that there was an initiative petition being circulated. He asked what happens if that goes to the ballot and what will they be doing in the next several months. He asked what they will say if they don't like the bungalows on the ridge top and they have to go. He asked what it does to the initiative petition and a measure on the ballot. He asked what happens if people vote no or yes, and they have plans that have changed the configuration of the project. He asked why they were there talking about it when there was an effort to put a measure on the ballot with a specific project plan in it. He thought this was a waste of time.

Tom Clifford, Pacifica, stated that his comments will be based on the initiative having been passed and they have something to plan on, otherwise as Peter Loeb mentioned, there was no point to this. He stated that he did not hear the applicant mention that they were talking about a conservation bank in the open space area, which would mean that the area will not be usable for other things, such as soccer fields, and you don't walk in it as it would be strictly to conserve the area. He stated that he liked many things in the overall project, such as bringing Rockaway Beach to critical mass with enough business to bring people in and the hotel because we need the TOT. He stated that brought up the issue of building housing and hotel and bungalows, adding that you have to have it all phased in, so as to not end up with just housing. He felt that it has to be phased in, such as 10% of housing, then the foundation for the hotel, and before you build any of the bungalows, you have to have the hotel in place and 50% of the commercial and housing. He stated that these things have to be thought about if the initiative passes.

Chaya Gordon, Pacifica, stated that there were so many things wrong with the proposal that it was hard to know where to start, stating that she will try to cover five of them. She stated that the quarry could be considered the crown jewel of Pacifica and has been used as public land since it stopped being a working quarry. She concluded, on reading the proposal, that it did not require particular features and allows it to be changed considerably, and the developer wants entitlements based on a nebulous, non-binding plan. She felt it was wrong and troubling, as she thought we could end up with a Costco. She added that there were other scenarios that would be equally undesirable as the proposal was way out of scale for the area. She stated that the plan requires what is currently open space to be commercial with four-story apartments, a hotel, 2,500 square foot units, an amphitheater, all where there is currently fine habitat that the community of Pacifica was currently enjoying. She felt they needed to keep the whole quarry as open space available to everyone. She stated that she would bet that Pacificans do not want this and she didn't think there was a chance that it will pass as a ballot initiative. She also thought a private developer was not the appropriate party to make serious environmental decisions for a coastal area. She referred

to the argument of the hotel bringing a lot of TOT revenue to the city, and thought the developer will make a ton of money by building and selling the components, but there was nothing to stop them from taking the supposed tax generating hotel and not building it and she stated that there was every reason to think that the apartment units could be rented out as AirBnB units and the city would never see a penny. She then referred to the traffic nightmare. She then stated that sea level rise would doom the project if built, concluding that erosion will happen sooner rather than later, such as flooding from the ocean through the wetlands into the bowl. She felt you can't build sustainable development in Pacifica by building on the coast, adding that Pacifica needs to rethink where to build with a thorough, science evidenced based process which includes thorough public comment and part of the General Plan update to inform all future development. She felt anything else will be a failure.

Deni Asnis, Rockaway Beach, stated that the previous speaker ended with what she was going to start with, the issue of sea level rise. She stated that there was a well-attended informative forum the previous week regarding the issue of sea level rise. She felt it was hard to imagine why a developer would want to propose this type of development in this location except for profit but not for the good of Pacifica with any foresight into the issue of sea level rise, and how it was already affecting Pacifica and how it will be affecting Pacifica in the near and distant future. She walks through the quarry to Mori Point daily and is a bird watcher. She loves dogs and she believes they can be compatible in the area. She mentioned that a lot of species would lose their habitat. She stated that the fissures on the hillside have grown dramatically over the past year and she stays on the east side of them. She stated that this area was close to the proposed development and she felt it was not a safe or sustainable area to develop in this manner. She stated that the answer to erosion was not development, and it was a natural process that will continue. She stated that there were many unanswered and disturbing questions about this specific project, mentioning several possibilities such as big box stores, etc. She felt that, before any development is done, there needs to be a serious investigation of the impact of sea level rise in terms of Pacifica as a whole and this area specifically.

Laurie Goldberg, Vallemar, stated that since she has lived in Pacifica, the quarry has always been open space. She stated that she walks through there all the time and people come from all over the world and enjoy the area, but she felt this reminds her of another ploy from someone who doesn't live in Pacifica with all the housing, etc. She mentioned the parking problem, and felt that we don't need an amphitheater. She likes some of what Commissioner Cooper said but she didn't like the idea of taking wetlands for birds, etc., and making it into a soccer field. She was disappointed with the whole development idea. She stated that there was a trail she takes to Mori Point and she saw someone driving a forklift all over and didn't matter where they were going. She felt they caused some of the erosion on the trail and she questioned how they are going to respect it when they don't respect it before they even develop it. She was at the sea level rise meeting and read in the paper that about 33,000 people will be displaced in the Bay Area because of sea level rise. She didn't think there were studies done on how sea level rise will affect the quarry area. She stated that the traffic was already bad in Pacifica. She questioned whether it will take her an hour to get out of Vallemar because of the development in the quarry. She was sad and upset, adding that the whole thing sounds awful and she hopes the Commission and Council think about this before they ruin the beautiful area that people already enjoy. She mentions all the wild creatures she sees in the quarry and questions how they will survive with people trampling over the area. She felt this was a terrible idea.

Dan Stegink, Pacifica, referred to Peter Loeb's question, and he asked what happens if the initiative passes. He stated that the initiative was pretty set and was filed. He stated that it specifically excludes the city from mitigating anything after it has been filed. He wasn't sure if the project manager was aware that we have six different bids to build between 70 and 180 hotel rooms, less than 1.7 miles from the quarry, at 2212 Beach Blvd., stating that it was also shown as being under water at the sea level rise forum. He mentioned that Bob Batallio, the littoral cell expert for the state, said that they can build a library there but they will have to put it on stilts so the waves can go under it. He stated that there has been nothing preventing us from building a hotel there for the last 20 years. He stated that the initiative specifically states that the city will lose all control and it will be the final vote on having areas of the quarry be commercial. He referred to Tom Clifford's comment on the protected areas and mentioned that, looking at all the wetlands purchased by the Army Corp of Engineers, dogs and cats won't be allowed there, but if they don't want to purchase those wetlands, they have the option of them being commercial. He thought the huge carrot for the city was the TOT, stating that we get 12% of every dollar spent, and there is a 72.7% occupancy ratio. He stated that we have 275 hotel rooms in the city and 199 are rented on average. He stated that, if we add 150-200 rooms at Beach Blvd and 200 hotel rooms at the quarry, they were essentially tripling capacity in a very short period of time. He stated that three of the bids for the Beach Blvd. project were Marriott's and if this developer has a Marriott plan, Marriott has a formula on what affects occupancy and where they are willing to build hotels. He stated that we lost 93 units of very low income housing last year and in the Harmony Project, there was an in lieu fee paid of \$342,000 after the fact to avoid building those low income parcels.

Ian Lewis, research director with the hotel and restaurant workers union, stated that hotels were not just a source of revenue and not pretty buildings, but places where people work, comparing them to the factories of the service sector. He stated that the character of the jobs can vary hugely depending on the commitments the developer makes. They can either lift up a community or drag a community down. He stated that there are about 200 residents in Pacifica who work in the hotel industry, either in Pacifica or San Francisco. He stated that this was in the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission because the kinds of jobs that the developer commits to or fails to commit to, impacts the mechanics of the project from a land use perspective and an environmental perspective, and the Commission was charged with looking at that. He mentioned that many workers travel from the Central Valley to work on the peninsula. He urged them to weigh the character of those jobs and the impact they have on the type of use of the land. He thanked the previous commenter for her comments on possibly short term rentals like AirBnBs, adding that it radically changes the land use and, if that is permissible, they have to factor in that they will not have the 200 hotel rooms including the bungalows but hundreds more in the housing units. He suggested that they keep a close eye on that.

Stephanie Betjeman, Vallemar, stated that she and her husband recently moved here and spent time walking the quarry. She liked the idea of a pub and a café. She stated that the applicant mentioned being from the East Coast. She stated that most coastal areas on the East Coast were mediated by private owners. She stated that they appreciate the sensitive approach and tasteful rendition offered by the prospective developer. She stated that, while public relations efforts have taken on a strong preservationist bent, they realize that a construction of a complex of this size and scope was sure to have an impact on the delicate coastal environment and what we hear and see and how we fulfill the day to day tasks. She stated that large restoration, reclamation and conservation without commercialization represents the most appropriate use of the land. She stated that, short of this ideal, the Commission and Council were tasked with balancing revenue

for sustainable growth, coastal conservation and reasonable traffic conditions for all who travel on Highway 1. She thought responsible, sustainable commercial development on a smaller scale was worth entertaining. She thought a private project of this scale, encompassing hundreds of residences and their vehicles were misplaced in Pacifica at this location. She urged all involved to maintain the original zoning specifications under which this parcel was purchased and work with developers to ensure a minimal footprint on this coastal land which ensures visual and physical preservation of natural surroundings for generations. She stated that these plans represent a “beautiful shoe which does not fit.” She asked that they arrive at a unifying resolution to this potential divisive issue and serve as wise stewards of our land.

Jim Heldberg, Pacifica, stated that he was fortunate to have led Segway tours through the quarry for ten years. He loves the quarry and was solidly behind developing the quarry to use it even better. He stated that they have had two proposals come to Pacifica to develop the quarry and were shot down. He felt that was properly so because they were not properly thought through. He stated that we have a strong environmental movement in Pacifica. He felt we should not be fighting about retaining the quarry in some environmental way versus developing it. He felt they could develop it environmentally responsibly and take environmental issues and blend them into the quarry. He was talking about putting in an environmental studies center in the quarry. He thought it might be a college or university extension with a few classrooms, library, study area, to study the unique environment. He asked where else can you study great white sharks and mountain lions within a half mile. They could also study the quarry for geology purposes, study animals, sea level rise, etc., and the world could come to Pacifica to study the environment. He stated he has already submitted that suggestion but he would like to see it studied more. He stated that Pacificans have great ideas but do not like to have ideas shoved down their throat. He encouraged them to bring as many ideas into the project as they can otherwise it won't work.

Dinah Verby, Pacifica, stated she would start with the pluses of the concept. She relished that the wetlands could be restored and enhanced, habitat preserved and soil stabilization could occur, with the hiking trails improved. She stated she would love to see the pampas grass gone. She also had a number of concerns about what was being proposed and echoed the concerns of other speakers that we don't quite understand why this is the first public session of many in trying to shape this proposal. She asked why there was a ballot initiative that would define the parameters of this and, if they want to make changes and put in ball fields, she didn't think that was possible. She encouraged the developer to rethink the strategy of going to the ballot now and wait for the public processes to unfold. She thought it would make for a better project. She thought the initiative was ambiguous as to whether the commercial components of the development would actually be required to be built. She stated that this was a commercial site, and the reason they want to develop it was to generate revenue. She thought commercial should be required but, as written, it says it would be allowed. She referred to another comment that, if not phased in appropriately, they could just build the housing and then stop, saying they don't want to build the hotel, which would completely defeat the whole purpose of developing the quarry from an economic revenue standpoint. She referred to mention of traffic nightmares, and she thought it was unclear whether there would be a public transit hub. She didn't understand where all the parking will go for each of the components. She stated that the public trails appear to run next to the quarry road and she didn't think it made a pleasant hiking experience. She was unclear as to how the public access areas will be maintained and paid for. She thought the possibility of a public vote in the future was ambiguous as the initiative has conflicting language about that. She also questioned if, after the permit is granted, the developer comes in and asks for waivers and

modifications. She thought there appeared to have a new public vote allowed up to the permit but she questioned what happened after that.

Chuck Gust, Pacifica, thanked the Commission for their time and service to the community. He stated that he was set until Peter Loeb spoke and got him confused. He stated that one thing that never comes up was a bond measure for the Coastal Conservancy and GGNRA to get involved and buy the property. He stated that they have gone through this so many times and it does get ridiculous. If the community doesn't want it, he thought Julie Lancelle should spearhead that venture. He mentioned that Rockaway was squeezed now for parking and traffic. He stated that it can't handle the farmer's market anymore. He stated that they complained about buses, delivery trucks, and the Redevelopment Agency pushed forward to do what they did and now they were to the point with beachgoers, bicyclists, etc. passing through the businesses because there was no infrastructure to accommodate the people coming. He felt the quarry deserved a project, but for any project, they have to think about staffing alone. He gave an example of the Ritz Hotel, which after being built in Half Moon Bay, had to buy a piece of property across Highway 1 and bus their staff to the Ritz Hotel to accommodate parking, concluding that it was way under planned and somebody missed it. He stated that his main point was parking. He stated that it has to be for staffing, visitors, etc., and the infrastructure has to be built for it.

Mike Andrews-Schwinn, Pacifica, stated that he loves the quarry just the way it is and would like to see it preserved. He resonates with all the concerns raised by previous speakers. He stated that no one has talked about trash containment. He stated that they were talking about a development that may bring 500 residents to a very small area, plus a hotel. He asked how much trash this will produce and how will it be contained. He stated that the 100 foot offset from the creek sounds nice but a plastic bag blowing out a window will land in the creek that he assumes Pacifica has spent a significant investment in restoring. He thought it would be a shame if the creek was degraded in anyway by the proximity of so much human activity.

Kirsten Andrews-Schwinn, Pacifica, stated that she came with an open mind and wanted to hear more about the proposal. She was aware that we need more housing in the county and the city needs more taxes, but she was struck by some of the unrealistic elements of this proposal. She thought the traffic patterns proposed are not based on reality and it was not surprising that the traffic study has not been done yet. She asked if there was an environmental impact assessment regarding endangered species such as the red-legged frogs in the creek and how would they be impacted by the proposal of lighting. She also asked if the question of sea level rise has been studied for this site. She thought the bungalows were a terrible idea. She agreed with the sentiment that they need to update the General Plan in Pacifica and look carefully where it is safe to develop from an environmental and sea level rise point of view. She felt some elements of this proposal seemed unrealistic at this point.

Claire Ervin Lee, Pacifica, stated that she would vote for Julie Lancelle to spearhead this. She stated that she had very little to say except where was the transit. She stated that no one has mentioned a word about bringing in Samtrans or a Bart shuttle or how they are going to get in and out of the place. She stated that she lives at Pedro Point and the only time she goes into the quarry, she walks there. She stated that she doesn't use the farmer's market, because you can't dream of driving there. She stated that it was a lovely place, zoned commercial and should be commercial. She suggested that they put a hotel there and put a parking lot for the hotel and some retail but not build housing there. She stated that, even if they are thinking about it, they should think transit first.

Julie Lancelle, Pacifica, didn't think the expectations of her abilities are totally warranted, but she appreciated it. She stated that she hadn't planned to come because it was her birthday, but she has notes written on her birthday cards. She stated that she has lived in Pacifica for 30 years and has been through a number of proposals that were presented for the quarry. She was sure many people have been through a couple of them. She stated that the bottom line with the quarry was that it was an endangered species habitat for quite some time and the creek is a home to red-legged frogs. She stated that it was a great place for walking. She stated that the price of the property has gone down over the years and she thought it would be great to work with the park service and coastal conservancy in looking at how they can raise the funds to acquire the property. She also acknowledged that there was a need from Rockaway Beach to expand the area somewhat. She stated that we all realize it hasn't reached its commercial critical mass to really be a place to walk around and spend some time other than going to lunch at one of the restaurants and visit a few shops. She thought it would be nice to "bump it out" to the old quarry road and put in some live/work residential. She didn't think the property can accommodate anything greater than that. She thought it would also provide an easy access from Highway 1 as it was spaced between Reina del Mar and the main street going into Rockaway Beach. She stated that many people think the western part of the quarry was Mori Point. She thought it would be a tremendous loss to the community.

Chair Campbell asked the applicant if she had any response.

Ms. Shrieve appreciated the opportunity to have this kind of conceptual level study and an opportunity to present the proposal at this level because they are not submitting an application at this point and not in a detailed level. She appreciated the concerns of everyone who came out to speak. She felt it was clear that the quarry was a beloved area and they respect that. She thought about comparisons with the previous proposal by Peebles and the Rockaway specific plan proposal and the General Plan update. She thought Peebles had a much larger development program with about 355 units and spread out over the site with mostly single families. The Rockaway specific plan was proposing 2.1 million square feet of development for the site. She thought it was important to keep that in mind, business commercial and visitor commercial, 1.2 square feet of business commercial on the site. She stated that the General Plan update has proposed 435,000 square feet of visitor commercial. She thought, in terms of the scale of the project, she thought it was good to keep in mind that they have scaled down the extent of the project quite a bit. She thought there were some terrific ideas and suggestions for things to study. She stated that they are thinking about transit. Where they have guest parking, they were thinking of looking into a multimodal center, but they were in the beginning stages of those discussions and she didn't want to push too hard because they don't know if it will pan out. She stated that was why they got Nelson Nygard on board with a team because they are transit fanatics and they were excited about working with them. She thought there were great suggestions about parking solutions and she clarified that there was parking within the structure of the hotel and within the structure of the apartments and they were not expecting them to be invisibly parked but parking at the city's required rate for the most comparable zoning of multi-family or C2 coastal zoning. She thought that parking for people coming to use the site was also very important and needs to be considered. She stated that the issue of big-box stores such as Costco was not something that has ever crossed their minds and they could look at the maximum footprint of stores, to provide a level of assurance. She stated that she was kind of scattered as she didn't normally get a chance to respond. She stated that they have looked at sea level rise and will continue to look at it. She stated that one thing that wetlands do was being a safety valve for sea level rise because the water

can come in and, instead of flooding, it fills the wetlands. She appreciated the comments and they would articulate that better as that was an issue that all of us in any coastal environment need to consider. She agreed that management of open space was extremely important, stating that, if not maintained, it can deteriorate. She referred to the question of whether there was an environmental review process and she stated that there would be a full and complete environmental review process with the city as lead agency. She thought, if there was an EIR, which was likely, they would expect to have that running once the project description was submitted. The issue of lighting along trails is a great question regarding safety. She stated that the whole idea was to make the trails and access safe. She mentioned that there were some extremely steep places where people scramble up the south face and they were not proposing any access there as it was not safe. They were working with the Coastal Commission on getting some signage up so unsafe trails are marked. Without investment and love to the property, none of that will happen.

Chair Campbell closed the public comments.

Commissioner Cooper appreciated everyone's comments. He thought there were a lot of great ideas. He had a question for the developer, stating that there was a balance between development and making it an economically viable project. He stated that the developer was not here simply to please Pacifica but also to make some return on his investment. There is a balance and one thing he took to heart was why they have this ballot measure so early. He stated that, if you were for or against Peebles' development, he performed quite a bit of outreach telling them about the project and what he wanted to do. He felt that was missing here. He stated that, from the comments from the public, it didn't seem that they had any of that. He asked the developer why they were doing this ballot measure now versus waiting for more public comment and doing outreach.

Ms. Shrieve stated that there has been some outreach and a clear history of previous projects. She stated that this was essentially a scaled down version of several other projects. They wanted to get the process going as there was a long lead time for an initiative like this and it won't come to the ballot until November and, in the meantime, they can be getting a lot of great input from the community, filling in the studies and evaluations and doing more outreach. They consider it a congruent process that ties in with discussions with the city and the traffic studies. She thought they didn't want to wait for the initiative and then get started but have a congruent process.

Commissioner Cooper asked if, based on the present feedback, they would consider revising the initiative to incorporate some of the comments.

Ms. Shrieve thought the initiative was distinct from the previous initiative and it has definite parameters and direction to City Council with development standards. She thought it was more specific and restrictive to the landowner than the Peebles initiative was. Their strategy was to craft something that had a clear cap and more definition of what the ultimate product was. She mentioned that the Peebles initiative had a lot of flexibility with a huge range, such as a 200 to 400 room hotel, as compared to this one. She stated that their caps are lower and development standards are stricter than the Peebles initiative.

Commissioner Cooper asked, absent the Peebles initiative but considering the comments, if they would consider revising their initiative to incorporate some of their comments.

Ms. Shrieve asked for an example.

Commissioner Cooper stated that there was restriction on the amount of open space. He stated that the plans said they could reasonably build on a specific location for commercial rather than having to build a commercial property, with no restrictions that say they have to do certain elements.

Ms. Shrieve stated that the present initiative says they have a minimum of 75% of the site as open space. She thought it could have more but not less open space. She asked if he was saying they should have a proposal with more commercial development.

Commissioner Cooper explained that there were comments on whether they needed to actually build the hotel or commercial development. He stated that it could give the people an idea that if they are going to build single family homes they are also required to build commercial.

Ms. Shrieve stated that there were no single family homes proposed.

Commissioner Cooper clarified that it was mixed use.

Ms. Shrieve stated that they have to go through an entire EIR process with a full mitigation plan and there was no reason that the city can't deploy other requirements on the project besides the initiative. She stated that there was phasing and it was required to be submitted as part of the rezoning application for a PD and there can be a phasing plan that adds requirements as part of a rezone. She stated that you can add requirements onto the initiative that is good for the city and the people which was why the city wanted them to go through the environmental and review process with the city, but they can't back down, build more, fill in more open space, and there are quite a bit of restrictions built into the initiative. She thought it was a strong and specific proposal compared to previous ones.

Commissioner Cooper stated that it kind of answers his question, adding that there are a lot of smart people in Pacifica, including a couple of attorneys on the Commission. He stated that he hasn't gotten into the initiative and dissected it to have any comment prior to filing. If it was already filed, he would have to dissect it and see if he agrees with the proposal. He stated that this didn't give him a lot of opportunity for review prior to filing it.

Ms. Shrieve stated that it was basically setting caps on maximum development for different types of development, building heights, minimum of open space, and was fairly restricted. She stated that some things, such as where the quarry road goes, how much parking, hasn't been set yet and was a city review process. They were looking forward to that.

Commissioner Evans thanked everyone for their thoughts, acknowledging that Pacifica has a lot of thoughts and feelings. He stated that, with this just being an idea now, he was going to give some rough thoughts on it. He stated that there were several ideas that made a lot of sense and were great ideas. He liked an environmental study center idea, even having classes. He stated that people have come to Pacifica to study sea level rise, etc., and he asked why not have it. He stated that the traffic will be a problem. He stated that they have been having discussions about what to do with traffic in that area now and it has divided the town. He concluded that it was a serious problem that needs a lot of thought. He also acknowledged that the sea level rise is an issue, especially seen this year. He stated that he lives in the north part of town and has seen two

apartment houses torn down, with the third questionable. There were three houses south of that area that have been vacated because of sea level rise and cliff erosion, and he agreed that we can't stop cliff erosion. He didn't think a developer was going to want to put good money into an area that was going to flood within the first 100 years. He liked the idea of the quarry road because in that section, Highway 1 was the only road and if something happens we are stuck. He concluded that the wider the road is, the more it will be used for traffic alternatives, but wasn't saying whether it's a bad or good idea. He was torn on the bungalow issue, stating that even though there are only 12, he thought 2,500 square feet was a big size. He didn't know if that adds much to the development. He stated that the wording in the measure concerns him because there were several points with ifs, ands, maybes. He understood they can't change the measure because it was already in, but if necessary, staff and the Commission need to lock down some of those ifs, ands and maybes. He was sure they can do that, as they have done it before. He mentioned that there has been so much talk over the years about open space and what we love about the town. He also stated that one of the reasons he was on the Commission was that property owners have a right to do something with their property and we can't say that they can't build on it at all, and we have to come up with an alternative. He stated that either the city comes together and gets a savior to come up with enough money to buy the property and turn it into permanent open space or we come to an agreement to build a very responsible development. He acknowledged that no one will like everything, but if they can get the majority to like parts of it, there has to be something. He reiterated that the only other option was to buy the land and give to the parks and not have to worry about this issue coming up again.

Commissioner Gordon thanked Commissioner Evans who captured a lot of what he was going to say. He thought there were a lot of good comments from the public. He thought there was a theme that they love the quarry the way it is and let's keep it that way. He has bicycled in the quarry since he moved to Pacifica and loves the area. He stated that, if they could get the money together to buy it and put it into a land trust that would be great, and the situation is solved, but as mentioned by Commissioner Evans, if they can't do that, they have to look at working with a developer in coming up with a plan that was workable. He stated that he went through the Peebles experience and Trammel Crow before that. He stated that each subsequent developer has scaled down the scope of the project. He mentioned the huge residential housing proposed by Peebles that was spread over the whole area. He agreed that Plan A was to buy the land, but barring that, he liked a lot about the conceptual site plan. He was aware that they were only being asked to give their views on this high level design. He loved that the whole flat area would be restored wetlands, adding that it breaks his heart to see the pampas grass there and spreading. He thought that getting a steward to invest time to restore the land was exciting. He stated that the quarry was blighted and to get someone willing to invest money to restore the quarry site would be wonderful. He stated that the infrastructure problems are very daunting. He encouraged those involved in the design to travel that corridor between 8:00 and 8:30 in the morning as it was a nightmare. He stated that, while one speaker said it wasn't too bad on the weekend, on a nice sunny day on the weekend, Highway 1 is a parking lot. He concluded that the area is maxed out at various times of the day and various days of the week, and it will be a real task for their traffic planners. He thought it made sense to put the housing density in the San Marlo Way area, but he questioned where the commuters would go and make it into the traffic jams of the morning commute. He thought Commissioner Evans was accurate that the quarry road will be used by people stuck in Highway 1 traffic and be backed up just like the highway by people other than those who live there. He loved the beach front plaza idea and some thoughtful retail could be great. He thought the bungalow area was special but was blighted, but not as much in that specific area. He thought it extended the footprint of the plan and that would be the part that he

would do away with as it extends into an area that wasn't used. He stated that, compared to the Peebles project, this was phenomenal. He understands that the developer was scaling down and probably thought they should get it on the ballot and see if it passes and then they can move from there. He didn't think it was as crazy as some speakers mentioned.

Chair Campbell thanked the Commissioners for their comments, stating that a lot of his comments were caught by theirs. He appreciated Commissioner Evans who commented that it was private property, and he agreed with Commissioner Gordon that there was a lot of conceptual plan to like. He thought the commercial, hotel and open space components of the plan holds a lot of promise. He thought the residential multi-family aspect has a problem with traffic. He stated that you can see up to 600 car trips out of the project, northbound in the morning. He stated that, if that traffic is funneled through the Reina del Mar Highway 1 intersection, they will encounter a very vigorous and sustained and vocal opposition to the project. He stated that it will not work for the neighborhoods south of there. He thought, if there was a way to funnel the traffic completely outside of the intersection, that would be a solution. He concluded that the traffic issue was a significant hurdle and would counsel toward scaling back the residential component of the project. He liked Commissioner Cooper's idea that, if you are going to have that many families with children, you will need some sort of a recreational field.

Ms. Shrieve thanked him.

Chair Campbell also thanked all the citizens who showed up, adding that he appreciated their public input.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Gordon thanked Tom Clifford and Dan Stegink at the start of the meeting on matters not related to the study session. He stated that when involved citizens have great ideas, it was great to hear them. He stated that their comments were great.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the Council will consider Planning Commission appointments on Monday, April 11.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Cooper moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:11 p.m.; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Gordon, Evans, Cooper and Chair Campbell
Noes:	None

Planning Commission Minutes
April 4, 2016
Page 18 of 18

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister