

MINUTES

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

September 19, 2016

7:00 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Clifford,
Cooper and Chair Gordon
Absent: Commissioner Nibbelin

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Baringer

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Asst. Planner Smith
Contract Planner Valente
Asst. City Attorney Matthew Visick

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

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
SEPTEMBER 6, 2016** Commissioner Evans moved approval of minutes of
September 6, 2016; Commissioner Clifford seconded the
motion.

Commissioner Evans mentioned that, on page 5, the first line says Chair Campbell, but he was acting chair for that meeting.

Commissioner Clifford stated that, on page 2, he asked if they had any drawings for the new proposed driveway with a 10-foot driveway and then it says driveway strip but it should say landscaping strip and two-car garage driveway, not driveway strip.

Commissioner Campbell abstained as he was not in attendance.

Chair Gordon also abstained due to not being in attendance.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Clifford, and Cooper.
Noes: None
Abstain: Commissioners Campbell and Gordon

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2016:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that there was no need for a liaison.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1, CDP-369-16
PSD-810-16
UP-74-16
PE-167-16
S-120-16 | COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CDP-369-16; SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PSD-810-16; USE PERMIT UP-74-16; PARKING EXCEPTION PE-167-16 and SIGN PERMIT S-120-16 , filed by Michael O'Connell to construct a mixed use development of 1,937 sq. ft. of commercial floor space at first floor level and three residential units (two units of two bedrooms and one studio unit) within two buildings at 195 Carmel Avenue (APN 016-022-120) in Pacifica. A parking Exception is required to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces by two spaces. The project site is located within the Coastal Zone and the application was filed on April 28, 2016. Recommended CEQA status: Class 32 Categorical Exemption, Section 15332. |
|---|---|

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, before the staff report, she wanted to mention that they will hear several options available and they were hopeful to get some directions as there have been additional options added to the mix since the staff report was published. She stated that, because of that and also because of an accidental omission from the resolution, they would like to get feedback and return at the next meeting with a finalized resolution for adoption.

Asst. Planner Smith presented the staff report.

Commissioner Clifford asked what the setback of option B was with the step back of two feet with the parking exception of three and what the actual setback from the existing building on the little lot at that point was.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that the setback from the rear first floor of 185 to the step back elevation of the second floor is 12 feet. He stated that the architect who has not dimensioned the progression of the neighboring building toward the side of the proposed building. He didn't want to assume the dimension, but he thought they could ask the applicant.

Commissioner Clifford asked if the issue came about because the small building is on a non-conforming lot or set in an existing but non-conforming space on the lot.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that the property at 185 Carmel Avenue has a limited setback to the rear boundary. He stated that you would normally expect to see a 20-foot setback and that would make 185 Carmel a non-conforming structure.

Commissioner Clifford asked what the setback from that house to the property line was currently.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that it was currently 7 feet.

Commissioner Clifford then concluded they were missing 13 feet, which was a problem on the existing building, but not on the property at which they were looking.

Asst. Planner Smith responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he was confused about the two-story building at the rear. He stated that, in the summary of the zoning standards and conformances, it says the building was 5,000 square feet existing lot, but there were no setbacks. He was assuming it was for the main building, but not for the rear building.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that the standards for the C1 neighborhood commercial district set a zero setback in the C1 district and there are no required setbacks.

Commissioner Cooper concluded that the building was in conformance.

Asst. Planner Smith responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Cooper asked what the purpose would be for offsetting it back to 5, 3, 2 or 1 feet. He asked if they were offsetting it simply for the neighbors' benefit.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that, in relation to the findings the Planning Commission is required to make for a Site Development Permit relating to light and air, the setback was to give the neighbor at 185 an additional sense of openness of light and air.

Commissioner Cooper concluded that, from a zoning standpoint, it was not required.

Asst. Planner Smith responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans stated that, with moving the building back, there was a huge tree on the other side of the property line on the back side, and he asked if that was going to interfere, adding that it was not eucalyptus.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that he would have to check on which tree he was referring to, explaining that there was an existing tree on the site that runs along the northern side.

Commissioner Evans stated that it was not the lot in question, but the neighbors behind them on the lot to the north of this lot. He stated that it looks like it is next to the property line.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that the heritage tree falls on the applicant's site and the application asks for the tree's removal. He stated that the applicant, through landscape and planning, was

asking for a replacement of that heritage tree with three native coastal compliant trees and it would effectively be removal of the heritage tree and replaced with three trees.

Commissioner Campbell mentioned the single family residence at 195 Carmel, and asked when it was taken down.

Asst. Planner Smith was not sure, but he thought it was demolished at least a few years ago.

Commissioner Campbell stated that they didn't know how close it used to be to the neighbors.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that he could not speak to that.

Commissioner Campbell asked when the 185 Carmel property was built.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that the property at 185 was a historic property, and had been in that location for a number of years, which formed part of the original Brighton Beach development.

Commissioner Baringer stated that he had a major problem with the second building. He asked what the parking calculations would look like if that building went away totally.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that the requirement for the studio unit was one parking space.

Commissioner Baringer concluded that there was one exception that goes away. He asked whether the commercial underneath was one or two spaces.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that the total requirement for the commercial floor space is six spaces with a requirement for one space every 300 feet.

Commissioner Baringer thought the space was about 600 square feet.

Asst. Planner Smith thought that was right.

Commissioner Baringer asked if they could justify granting a parking exception where the exception requirement is created by being extremely aggressive in development. He asked if it gives the Commission the ability to look at it and comment on it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister asked if he was referring to the parking exception itself.

Commissioner Baringer responded affirmatively, adding that the parking exception was created by a fairly aggressive development plan.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it was within the purview of the Commission.

Commissioner Baringer stated that he liked the project and design, but he had a problem with that because, if you use it personally, it will be perpetually vacant. They were building space and he questioned who will want it. He added that they were creating a parking issue and all kinds of practical issues of how you get people in and out of there. He noticed the entrance to the northern apartment was on the main street but they have to walk down a corridor from their parking space to get to the entrance of the apartment. He felt, from a security standpoint, they

would want to flip that and have the entrances in the back of the building where they can access it directly from the parking, but it was important from a practical standpoint day to day. He stated that his main problem was the small building in the back, and he also felt the tree was a substantial tree and he would hate to see it removed to cram a building back there.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he was on the opposite side and would like to see the buildings stay. He referred to the setback that was shown at 12 ½ feet at the second story and 9.9 on the first story. He thought, being a commercial building, they could have proposed putting it up to the property line as the whole lot was zoned commercial. He thought they were currently giving up something to have that building by backing it off the property line. He asked what the uses were in the C1. He knew it was a long list but he didn't think it was necessarily a store but could be a storage unit, etc.

Planning Director Wehrmeister added that it could be a professional office.

Commissioner Clifford stated that there were other uses besides putting a store in the first floor.

Planning Director Wehrmeister agreed, adding that it would probably be some sort of destination spot like a professional office but not a retail store that would rely on pass by trips.

Commissioner Evans referred to the recommendation of removing the parking spot access on Francisco and asked for details on that item.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that, in terms of the function of the parking space, staff felt driver's access and egress came with the expectation that they would be driving into the space between parked cars on either side and they would have to traverse the sidewalk. The vehicle would then be in a situation of having to sheer faced walls on either side once in the actual parking space. A hazard would be created for pedestrians using that sidewalk, when vehicles were entering or egressing. Staff's opinion was that, although it was beneficial for the parking exemption to reduce the number required, it was not necessarily a functional or safe position for a parking space.

Commissioner Evans looked at it today trying to figure out a better way. He understood the parking issue, and asked if they brought the building to the property line and removed the parking spot, making the two garage areas opening up the front by 11 ½ feet and remove the garage areas further to Francisco and move the center area as well, gaining a couple of spots and get rid of the parking spot off of Francisco with one access. He thought, in his calculations, they would gain a parking spot. He wanted to hear from staff about that. He agreed with them, and didn't like the parking spot because of blind access, mentioning that bigger cities have that everywhere. He stated that there was not many driveway accesses on Francisco in that area. His concern was not the back building but the side parking spot.

Planning Director Wehrmeister asked if there was a floor site plan. She stated that she gets what he meant about moving the building to the north, but she asked if he was suggesting that the middle area go further in towards Francisco.

Commissioner Evans responded affirmatively, explaining that, if you narrowed that whole section by 8 feet for 7 ½ feet for a parking spot, brought everything towards Francisco, they could also open up the center area between the garages by 11 ½ feet and you could possibly gain two spots

on each side, just adding one more garage spot basically, and putting the further west garage spot on each end outside the garage and add two spaces in the center and eliminate the one on Francisco.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she wasn't sure she was understanding him correctly, but staff was juggling in reviewing the project, and they thought it was a positive project for the area. She stated that they want to prioritize the General Plan goal of creating a commercial shopping district. She stated that one thing that was difficult with the size of the parcels and no parking district was that the commercial space on the ground floor gets smaller for parking and it ceases to become a very functional commercial space. She stated that was part of the reason they didn't see that as part of their recommendations.

Commissioner Evans understood, adding that he thought, by gaining that 11 ½ feet on the north side, they could convert that into some more commercial space and narrow up the depth from Francisco. He thought it may be a push and shove as far as the amount of space changes, but they might keep the same commercial space but open up more central lot parking area.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they could study that with the applicant if he was willing to do so. She added that it was not only the square footage that was at issue but they hope to attract national tenants to Sharp Park and it was the quality of the space, which requires a certain depth and large enough spaces.

Commissioner Evans admitted that he did not do any calculations, but was just throwing the idea out if they were set on the parking spot or making it work without it.

Commissioner Baringer agreed that the space on the north end was dangerous. He stated that he eats in the area a lot and there was a lot of pedestrian traffic on the sidewalk, looking for an opportunity for someone to get hurt, and he thought it was an excellent recommendation. He questioned how much parking they can pick up by moving the entire building north, adding that you still have to provide access to the north apartment and have to provide some access on the northern point of the building to get to the front from the parking. He thought it was easy to ignore that, but you could probably pick up more space if you flip the garages and have them nose in instead of parallel with Francisco, and backing out. He wasn't sure how it impacts deliveries and trash removal, etc., but the applicant could comment on that. He was a supporter of the plan but was not sure the small building was a value-add for our vision of adding commercial square footage to the community. He understood that it was important, but it has to make sense from a commercial standpoint and he felt that the building does not make a lot of sense. He added that, if you were going to use it personally and it would never get leased out. He might be convinced that there was some value, but he felt they were building square footage that would be vacant for a long time. He felt we have enough of that and we want to create space that leases very promptly. He acknowledged it was shallow but it has great frontage with a lot of activity. He thought they would be able to find good tenants. He added that he also liked the design.

Commissioner Cooper asked to see option 3 again, and then asked what it does to the stair access on the backside. He asked if it was internal rather than external.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that this was the only detailed plan and he wouldn't be able to comment.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he would ask the applicant.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought the floor plan was flipped. She stated that there was no ground floor plan but the access to the studio would now be on the south side.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he saw internal stairs which was why he was questioning it.

Chair Gordon concluded that they would like them to consider option 1, 2A, 2B, 2C. He asked if they were written down anywhere and have copies of them.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that it was on the presentation slide.

Chair Gordon thought this was an unusual approach, planning on the fly. He thought it might help if they go through the options and tell staff the pros and cons and if they have any particular recommendations, referring to the fact that, by the end of the meeting, they would like them to select one. He thought it might help to focus the discussion on those options.

Commissioner Cooper suggested that they listen to the applicant and he may be able to fill them in on what he was thinking and then come back and they can fill them in. He added that he isn't the architect and the applicant might have some better insight.

Chair Gordon heard what he was saying, but he was not sure if those options came from him or from staff. He asked who was the author of those options.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that option 2A was the applicant's proposal. Option 1, where the second story was removed by condition, was staff's recommendation. Option 2B was what was presented in the staff report, where the second story was stepped back. Option 2C was the most recent option the applicant has been discussing with staff after the staff report was published.

Chair Gordon concluded that 2A and 2C came from the applicant and 1 and 2B came from staff.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that 1 was staff's recommendation, 2A was the original proposal, 2B was an option provided by the applicant before the staff report was published and they could put that into the staff report and option 2C was one they discussed with the applicant which was proposed today.

Chair Gordon understood that staff was recommending option 1.

Planning Director Wehrmeister agreed that they were recommending option 1, but she added that there are several findings related to parking exception and the light and air that are obviously codified but also subjective. She stated that was part of the reason they wanted some direction to come back with a finalized resolution and findings. She stated that the Commission may not think that the light and air was negatively affected by the applicant's original proposal and they can go back and revise the findings in order to support that. She thought that was part of the difficulty with this project. She stated that there was some subjectivity to this proposal.

Chair Gordon thought that was helpful.

Commissioner Clifford agreed that they should not have the parking space on Francisco with the little driveway, partly because there was a freeway off ramp not very far from there and people don't slow down as much as they should at that point and they are also looking for parking for the stores. He stated that he didn't know whether he should say anything because they weren't in discussion yet, but regarding the idea of removing the second story studio apartment, it was the closest thing they will get to affordable housing in Pacifica and it will take a small amount of pressure off that market if it was allowed to be built. He wasn't comfortable with removing the second story. He referred to comments on the use of that space, adding that the first story could be used for storage for one of the retail places, and he didn't think it would necessarily be a building without a use.

Michael O'Connell, applicant, stated they felt it was a great project in a great location, providing substantial commercial components, and three units in varying sizes. He mentioned that it was designed by individuals who grew up in the neighborhood and he felt they were in tune with the surroundings. He explained the rationale on how they designed the project, mentioning specifics including alternatives, as well as consideration for the neighbors, adding that the third residential unit was important to their project. He addressed alternatives for safety in regard to parking, but mentioned that they were within the code limits and gave some of the rationale for the parking spaces. He then addressed some of the conditions, including the need for high quality commercial space.

Commissioner Cooper asked him to repeat the list of conditions for which he had issues.

Mr. O'Connell referred to condition #4, removal of the second unit; #3, Francisco Driveway; and #5.

Commissioner Cooper thought condition #5 was an architectural issue.

Mr. O'Connell agreed, stating that it was left over from 1693 Higgins and all the wood siding, etc. Condition #25 addresses installing a fire hydrant, but one exists and he thought they could remove that condition; #30, fire condition which he thought meant working on underground fire main; #50, requiring removal of the bulb out. He stated that Engineering wasn't there to answer questions, adding that a bulb out removes off street parking but it was replacing red curb.

Commissioner Cooper asked for more information on the options, such as the thought process of moving the building to the back side and changing the location of access to the front rather than the back.

Mr. O'Connell asked if he was referring to the rear unit.

Commissioner Cooper stated that if he looks at 2A, 2B, 2C, it looks like they changed the entrance on 2C option to the front of the building, and he asked their thought process besides creating more frontage area.

Mr. O'Connell stated that the entrance was always in the rear and they mirrored the plan with slight modification for a larger setback.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the entrance was now moved to the front.

Mr. O'Connell stated that the entrance was in the back. He thought he was looking at the second floor plan.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he was looking at option 2C.

Mr. O'Connell stated that was the second floor plan, and it doesn't show the entrance. He stated that he had a copy of the first floor.

Commissioner Cooper asked his reasoning behind the offset.

Mr. O'Connell stated that it was in response to the condition that they would lose the second unit. He was trying to figure out why it was an issue, and he asked how they make it work. He stated that one idea was moving the building further away. They were providing almost 10 feet between the two structures, similar to what was between two single family homes. He stated they were trying to accommodate the concerns.

Commissioner Cooper asked if it means there was a 5-foot walkway in the back to access the building.

Mr. O'Connell responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Cooper assumed it was rather than a 10-foot walkway.

Mr. O'Connell stated that it was 3 feet before. He felt this plan was nicer for this unit.

Commissioner Clifford referred to the second story of the second unit, and he asked what they have done to enhance privacy for the non-conforming house in front.

Mr. O'Connell stated that the biggest thing they have done was the clear story windows, and no habitable outdoor space, having eliminated an outdoor deck. He stated that there are no lights other than the entry door, with the windows high and small, and they let in light from the south. He added that they could do skylights on the roof if the windows were a huge issue.

Commissioner Clifford wanted to know what they did to make sure they weren't invading the privacy.

Mr. O'Connell stated that the 3-foot setback was also part of that, and the high level windows reduced overlooking.

Commissioner Baringer addressed staff, stating that he was intrigued by the live/work concept which was a way to make him feel a lot better about the back building. He asked if they can enforce that and make that a condition of approval and how they make sure that happens.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that the implementation of a live/work unit would be managed by the owner and they could potentially craft a condition to ensure that it was operated in that manner. They would have to do some work to formulate a specific, accurate condition to ensure it is retained and operated in that way.

Commissioner Baringer thought it would come up on other projects so he thought they should begin doing research. He asked if the owner was willing to agree to do that.

Mr. O'Connell responded affirmatively, adding that he had a practical suggestion, specifically have the units connected. Now, they don't have access between one or the other, having to leave the live area and go into a different door to the work area. He thought they could modify the design to have connectivity by a shared entrance from the people living there coming into the back.

Commissioner Baringer thought it would make him more comfortable with the building in the back, as he could see a solid purpose and use.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing.

Asst. City Attorney Visick clarified that it was not possible for the public to ask questions of the Commission.

David Lipman, Pacifica, stated that he has owned the commercial buildings next door to this site for years with his family. They like the design and were in favor of the building. He referred to the driveway on Francisco. He stated his mother had a clothing store there for 30 years, and he stated that, when you have cars parked along both sides of Francisco and some turning in, he sees it as being very unsafe. He didn't know if it was the code, but he thought it would cause either a vehicular or pedestrian accident. He didn't think it was good if they want a pedestrian friendly area. He mentioned that, when he was young, they fought to keep the hills from being over built. He was in favor of the building, but he thought they needed to think about keeping Pacifica a beautiful and nice place. He voiced a concern on how parking was going to look like and impact the buildings and businesses on the block.

Jose Sarmiento, Pacifica, stated he was an owner of a restaurant. He had two issues, the parking being the biggest one. He stated that his business was slow during the day because of no parking, and he hoped there will not be a driveway on Francisco because they need the parking space. He stated the other issue was that the building was next to his restaurant and the smoke will go to their windows.

Joanna Van Elk, Pacifica, stated she was a small business owner running a consulting business out of her home. She was interested in a studio apartment with live/work space as presented. She thought it would be ideal. She was working out of her living room and being able to leave living space and go to work space was ideal. She would like to grow her business and bring some employees, and this live/work space would be perfect for her. She didn't need visibility from the street, but a private office. She stated that she frequents many of the businesses and she didn't find a problem with parking, adding that the side along the highway always had parking.

Kris Ennish, Pacifica, purchased the Hair Razors salon about a year ago and his main concern was the parking issue. He felt that taking away any of the parking spots on Francisco for the betterment of one business was not an option. He felt they can't take away parking from the existing businesses. He felt new businesses have to live with the current parking or provide their own parking. He stated that Winters Tavern has their own parking lot and people will go there and park which will affect their businesses and others. He felt parking was a major issue.

Corinne Robinson, Pacifica, stated she was an owner at Winters Tavern. They were concerned about the parking. She stated that they have their own lot and were lucky to have it. She stated that, if they remove any of the spots, it will be an issue as people now park in their lot and go to the restaurants. She stated that they deal with that issue every day. She did think it was important to add more businesses and boost the morale.

Commissioner Clifford concluded that, if he understood the City Attorney's email, they can ask questions of the public on specific agenda items if they have questions for a specific member of the public regarding what they have said.

Asst. City Attorney Visick stated that he was correct. He can ask questions of any member of the public or the applicant during the public hearing. Once it was closed, they cannot, although they could reopen the public hearing if there was a majority vote of the Commission.

Commissioner Clifford thanked him for the clarification. He asked if he could have the owner of El Toro Loco return as he has a question for him. He stated that, in the staff report, it indicated that he was going to be moving his business down the street to an empty building that used to be a taco business.

Mr. Sarmiento stated that they are planning but nothing has been approved and was still in limbo.

Commissioner Clifford asked if his current plan was to stay in the present building until or if that other space becomes available.

Mr. Sarmiento agreed, adding that, when everything is approved, it has to be remodeled and brought up to code. He stated that they have problems with a handicapped bathroom that needs to be brought up to code. He stated that there are a lot of issues with the place but it was still in the process.

Commissioner Clifford concluded that he has not committed to it yet.

Mr. Sarmiento responded affirmatively.

Chair Gordon closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. O'Connell referred to the first speaker wanting to keep Pacifica as it is, and they used the Little Brown Church and Salada Beach Café for their inspiration. He stated that the safest spot for the driveway was in the middle of the block and was the best location for it, acknowledging that people feel differently about it. He heard what was being said about losing off street parking spots and he stated that a third parking exception would be acceptable. He stated that they put the spot as a way to show how to get the most parking but were open to a third exception. He wasn't concerned about the smoke from El Toro Loco, mentioning the direction of the prevailing wind. He also mentioned that mixed uses have different peak parking demands, such as El Toro Loco needs more parking on weekend evenings when people are there for dinner, and the people using the commercial space on their side would not be doing business so peaks are at different times.

Commissioner Evans asked, if it was approved for a third exception and they eliminated the driveway, whether he thought what he would do with that area.

Asst. City Attorney Visick clarified that, if there will be an ongoing dialogue with the applicant, the public hearing needs to be open.

Commissioner Evans stated that he would retract that.

Asst. City Attorney Visick stated that the other option would be to reopen the hearing.

Chair Gordon asked if all were in favor of reopening the public hearing.

Commissioner Cooper asked if they have to make a motion or just take a vote.

Asst. City Attorney Visick stated that it was a motion and a vote.

Commissioner Cooper moved to open the public hearing; Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

Commissioner Evans then asked again if he had any idea of what he would do with that space.

Mr. O'Connell stated that he had discussed that with the Planning Director and it would become some kind of amenity space such as outdoor seating area or a backyard with a gate along Francisco between the two buildings.

Commissioner Evans assumed that he wouldn't add any space to the building, leaving the footprint as is and just make it open space.

Mr. O'Connell stated that was acceptable, adding that having a setback on the north side on Francisco was good and lets them have windows and they won't have to worry about someone building too close to them because they pushed the limits.

Commissioner Evans appreciated that.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he detests fences, especially in that area, as it is commercial space and open to the public. He asked if it would be needed for the travel path to the back work/live unit.

Mr. O'Connell acknowledged that they would need a path, and agreed that a fence was probably not a great solution. He thought it would be open or at a minimum a gate. They envision opening up the area to the sidewalk.

Commissioner Cooper thought a fence would create an area filled with garbage.

Mr. O'Connell stated that he was with him on the fence.

Chair Gordon closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Clifford stated he really likes the project. He didn't like the parking space on Francisco and the driveway, and he would not be bothered by a third parking exception. He did not want to lose the live/work unit, adding that he didn't think it would be fair to the applicant. He reiterated that a unit that size was necessary in Pacifica and, as a live/work unit, the building generates money for the city.

Commissioner Cooper liked the building, adding that it was designed very well for the area and he liked the live/work unit. He didn't agree that the units should be connected, referring to one speaker commenting regarding keeping the separation between living and working. He stated that, if they had a live/work unit go vacant, they would want to separate the tenants out, and the current separation of entrances would be able to provide that easier. He agreed with the removal of the driveway on Francisco which he felt was dangerous but would not like to see a fence but an open pathway to the live/work unit which would provide a nice accent to make it a nice place for people to have access to that. He stated that, in Rockaway, there was a dollar amount to parking exceptions, and how they get money for them. He stated that there are some public lots in the area but he didn't know where they are. He didn't think the signage was good and felt they could be lit better and be more attractive. He mentioned that, in other cities, it was clear where the public parking was and they were well maintained. He thought, if they were gathering money for parking exceptions in cases like this, that would go a long way in promoting a fund to make parking more accessible. He felt that a parking exception to favor the applicant was no more onerous than not allowing the applicant to come in because there was no more parking. He agreed with Commissioner Clifford that there was an issue to be made for affordable housing, and Pacifica was behind. He liked the five-foot offset which was a way to make the area bigger and more open to the neighbors. Overall, he was in favor of the project but had some exceptions on some of the motions, but they will be going back to have the Planning Director revise them and do more checking before it was approved.

Chair Gordon asked if they can put the options up again on the screen. He asked Commissioner Cooper what his preference was.

Commissioner Cooper stated it was 2C.

Commissioner Clifford stated he was going back and forth between 2B and 2C. He stated that he has seen an elevation that shows what 2B was, but he has only seen a floor plan for what 2C is. He would like to see the elevation but he didn't think it was available at this time.

Asst. Planner Smith stated that they only have a copy of the floor plan.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that 2C would be the same elevation, just that the site plan would indicate a greater setback on the south side.

Commissioner Clifford concluded that it was essentially the same but with an additional five feet on the ground floor which would be 14.9, and on the second floor it would be 17.5, which would make him more in favor of option 2C.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that 2C had no stepback. It was the same building as proposed, just that the whole thing was shifted to the north.

Commissioner Clifford understood that was an additional difference, getting a little more floor space on the second floor on the studio unit and they essentially gain two feet on the second floor. He thought the elevation would help but he can do the math. He concluded that 2C would be his favorite option at this time. He referred to charging for the parking exception, and thought they would have to do a study and provide a nexus to create one for this area.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that he was correct, adding that a parking district for the Sharp Park area was something that they have been internally discussing for the future.

Commissioner Clifford stated that there would need to be a process before that and they couldn't state a dollar amount per space at this time, but would have to be a nexus and a study to back up the conclusions.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans stated that he liked the project, and didn't have an issue about the back unit, but he thought 2C would be a nice unit as they aren't changing the plan, but just setting it back from the property line of those at 185. He asked if he was correct in that assumption.

Asst. Planner Smith responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans stated that option would be his also. He would not have a problem with the parking exception as they have done it with others to some extent and degree. He was aware that parking was an issue at times. He stated that he would try to utilize the parking lot further down, especially for employees, and open up the street for customers. He referred to the conditions of approval, and asked staff about their thoughts on what Mr. O'Connell brought up, such as condition #5.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that there were a couple that needed to be corrected and several that they would need to check with colleagues in other departments and come back to the Commission.

Commissioner Evans understood it was the section that was not in planning. He stated that they can't vote on this without anything formal in front of them.

Planning Director Wehrmeister agreed, adding that they are asking them to continue the item to October 3 and they will bring back a final resolution.

Commissioner Evans concluded that the conditions would be cleaned up at that point. He stated that he was in favor of the project. He thought it looked nice and he liked the idea that it was modern but looks old town and blends in nicely with the rest of the area. He stated that it can be seen from the freeway, and he liked the idea of the location. He stated that any place where they can get lower price rentals was a plus, mentioning that he saw a \$6,500 rental price. He felt they need to keep that whole idea in mind.

Chair Gordon asked if he had mentioned his preference as 2C.

Commissioner Evans responded that, if they have to pick a number, that was his preference.

Commissioner Baringer stated that he liked the project and thought it was a great addition to the neighborhood and would bring some new vibrant businesses to our community, which we want. He was a fan of 2C. He was willing to grant a third parking exception in exchange for abandoning the parking space on the north end of the building as he felt that was a bad idea. He was willing to support the smaller building at the back if they have a live/work restriction on the unit, agreeing that it was a great idea. He stated that the applicant was willing, and documenting that would create additional residential and give a better opportunity to utilize it in a commercial application as opposed to separating them and finding two tenants.

Commissioner Campbell thought it was a nice looking building and liked the idea of the live/work space. He thought they need to be careful about planning and zoning and sacrificing everything on the altar of affordable housing. He understood that was the thing now, but he felt they need to be cautious on that. He thought it works here because they have a non-conforming lot which was no fault of the current owners. He felt the parking was a real issue, with local business owners stating that it was a problem. He referred to the public parking by the Thai restaurant, and thought it could be upgraded. He liked making that a focal point for people to park and walk a few blocks to the businesses. He questioned whether there was a way to recommend that Council start some sort of a parking mechanism to get money to light the lot. He stated that he passes by the lot and doesn't know if it is public parking, adding that it was far away from Winter's and El Toro Loco, and didn't know if it was a viable area. He thought, if they had more time, they could explore Commissioner Evans' ideas to squeeze more parking into that lot. He thought it might be able to be done, but thought it was tough to redesign a project on the fly. He agreed with the current business owners that having the parking on Francisco was tough with cars coming off the freeway, mentioning seeing a car coming off the freeway and hit a parked car. He agreed that they should get rid of that as it would impede a lot of traffic if they keep the parking on Francisco. He was leaning to option 2C because it provides more buffer for the occupants. He appreciated the clear story windows and privacy screening trees and felt they were nice features for the neighbor.

Chair Gordon commented that, considering the number of floating issues, it was a remarkable consensus. He was in favor of eliminating the parking space that requires a driveway on Francisco, adding they need to be responsive to the business owners. He stated that it didn't make sense to create a space that interferes with off street parking space. He was fine with the third parking exception and with 2C. He loved the project and building and wanted to do what they can to encourage tasteful commercial construction in Pacifica that will be successful. He thought they have consensus for staff.

Commissioner Cooper wanted to go over the conditions of approval for the record. He stated that #3 was the building permit for the driveway, mentioning that he would like to convert that to a walkway for the second unit. For #4, with 2C, it would create the additional setback of 5 feet with the parking exception #3. For #5, he asked why it was in the conditions of approval. For #25, dealing with the fire hydrant, he asked if it was a real condition or not. For #30, as a deferred submittal for the fire, he asked if he has to wait that long. For #50, that was a Planning Director question for the bulb and he wasn't sure what it does for parking count or spaces, adding that he was not qualified to comment on that.

Commissioner Clifford asked if the area where the bulb was proposed is currently a red zone.

Asst. Planner Smith did not believe it was a red zone.

Commissioner Clifford concluded that there was no red zone on the curb at that corner. He stated that, if there isn't, it does impact parking.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they didn't know if it is or is not.

Commissioner Clifford concluded that it would be part of staff's homework in deciding what to do about the bulb. He then stated that, over a short period of time, parking will be less of an issue because of the combination of self-driving cars and companies like Uber and Lift, as people will move away from owning their own car. He stated that younger people he has met are no longer owning cars and just call for one when they need it, adding that, if it is a self-driving car, they are circulating all the time and you don't have to wait for someone to put their car on the road. He concluded that they will see a big shift in traffic patterns and parking needs, and the city will have to study it as they put together the next traffic plan. He stated that, because of that, he had no objection to the three parking exceptions on this project.

Chair Gordon asked how they complete this item.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they have the direction needed and she would need a motion to continue to October 3.

Commissioner Cooper moved to continue this item to the meeting of October 3, 2016;
Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

2. SP-161-16

SPECIFIC PLAN SP-161-16, filed by applicant, Javier Chavarria, to construct a four-story, 2,385 square foot single-family dwelling with 898 square foot attached garage on a 5,073 square foot vacant lot located at 323 Farallon Avenue (APN 009-085-280) in Pacifica. Recommended California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Status. Class 3 Categorical Exemption, Section 15303(a).

Contract Planner Valente presented staff report.

Commissioner Clifford referred to his comment that there were some slight changes from the approved project, and asked that he enumerate them or should he ask the applicant.

Contract Planner Valente thought it would be good to ask the applicant, but he stated that one major change was that the previous project appeared to be four stories and this one was three with the second story being taller. He wasn't involved in the previous plan, and thought it would be a good question for the applicant.

Commissioner Clifford asked how tall the second story was with the mezzanine.

Contract Planner Valente stated that the overall height of the building was 35 feet.

Commissioner Clifford stated that it meets standards.

Contract Planner Valente stated that the second floor from the first floor to the second floor was 16'8".

Commissioner Evans stated that he noticed that the packet said four story and in the actual definition, it says three story with mezzanine. He stated that it looked like three stories but it was a large middle story with a mezzanine. He asked if they missed it.

Contract Planner Valente agreed, explaining that, in the original application, it was four stories and there was an error in listing it as four stories.

Commissioner Evans stated that they got communications because it scared someone.

Chair Gordon asked if they knew the maximum height for the previously approved project.

Contract Planner Valente stated that it was also 35 feet.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he vaguely remembered a solarium in the previous project. He asked if staff knew what the size was.

Contract Planner Valente stated that he did not know the previous one, but the current is 500 square feet, within the setbacks and the 12-foot height which was allowed in the code.

Commissioner Cooper stated that there were railroad ties used which he thought was odd. He asked if they were new railroad ties because they are usually covered with creosote, and he wondered why it was being allowed.

Contract Planner Valente thought the applicant could answer that.

Commissioner Cooper asked if there were any provisions in the code for the amount of lighting on the building. He was looking at every window that seemed to be lit and he wondered if staff had looked at that.

Contract Planner Valente stated that it was to focus on no spill over with downward facing lighting so as to not spill over onto adjacent properties.

Commissioner Cooper asked if he knew what the off haul was for the excavation compared to the previous one approved.

Contract Planner Valente stated that he did not.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he would ask the applicant.

Chair Gordon stated that, in one of the renderings, it showed the houses on either side of the proposed building. He stated that, in terms of height, they looked like they were both three stories and asked if that was correct.

Contract Planner Valente stated that they were three stories, consistent in size and height with neighboring properties.

Commissioner Cooper wondered if this was a development in the homeowners association.

Javier Chavarria, applicant, stated that he had a detailed power presentation, but Asst. Planner Smith told him it wasn't necessary. He hadn't informed them previously and they weren't ready. He has photographs if necessary. He stated that there were no significant changes on the project and the only reason they were present was because of his oversight. He failed to submit a letter requesting an extension to the project and, at that point, they already had a building permit approved. He stated that there have been some minor modifications with the elevator, family room exit, but size, height, stories, size of solarium have not changed. He reiterated that it was the same project as before, listing all the various aspects. He mentioned that they had included railroad ties before, and they have modified that to use more concrete. He stated that they were trying to keep a softer appearance at the front with landscaping, wood, and permeable pavers, with no creosote materials. He explained their reason for the design of the floating mezzanine, which allowed them to reduce the amount of excavation. He also detailed the ideas connected with the solarium, such as aquaponics and solar. He mentioned that the homes on Farallon were eclectic but they felt this design was going to create a modern appearance that flows well with the other structures in the area.

Commissioner Cooper mentioned a car parked on the sidewalk in the renderings and he was concerned about sidewalks. He asked if there was going to be a sidewalk in front of the place.

Mr. Chavarria stated that there will be no interruption of the sidewalk which was pushed back. He stated one regulation that engineering requires was additional on street parking with a parking bay, explaining that, to provide that, the sidewalk was pushed back behind the area to create the bay and returns to where existing parking was, and there was no interruption in the flow.

Chair Gordon opened the public hearing.

Johnny Cheung, Pacifica, stated that he lives on the adjoining property. His concern was the sidewalk. He stated that neighbors walk on the street with dogs and his concern was that, if the sidewalk was narrow, it becomes an issue especially at night because they have to walk on the street instead. He felt that was an issue. He also mentioned that, with additional building in the area, parking was on both sides, and one driveway was short and the car parked close to the sidewalk, causing people to walk on the street with a potential for accidents.

Commissioner Evans asked staff to address whether it was a standard sidewalk.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it would be a standard sidewalk.

Commissioner Evans asked what the size was.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she did not recall what the standard size was.

Commissioner Evans guessed it was three feet, and asked if it would be the same as on the other side.

Planning Director Wehrmeister agreed that it would be the standard on both sides.

Chair Gordon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Chavarria reassured them that, as the Planning Director mentioned, the sidewalks will be standard as required by the city, 4'6" flat plus the curb which makes it 5 feet. He acknowledged that Farallon was a narrow street which was why there was a requirement of a parking bay. He thought it was a little cumbersome, but the sidewalk was currently there, but was interrupted in certain areas. He stated that they will provide continuity to the sidewalk and improve the conditions.

Commissioner Baringer stated that since this has been vetted, his comments were regarding construction period issues. He referred to other projects with substantial excavation, and stated that they have required the applicant to reach an agreement with staff on a haul route and times. He mentioned that the streets were narrow with a lot of parking on both sides, and he thought it would be a good idea for staff and the applicant to meet and work out the best route for the trucks during that excavation. He also thought, since it was going into the hill, it would be a good idea to verify his geotech to ensure that they have calculated it correctly because, if not, it could be bad. He then referred to the hydroponics and solarium, and he asked if there were solar panels on the rooftop or glass. He asked if they have to reopen the public hearing.

Asst. City Attorney Visick clarified that, if they want to ask more questions of the applicant, they need to reopen the public hearing.

Commissioner Baringer stated he would like to know that and moved to reopen the public hearing; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

Commissioner Baringer asked for more information about the solarium, such as the roof structure, adding that they have already heard from people on the street above who are concerned about the appearance. He asked how that was going to be.

Mr. Chavarria stated that the solarium is halfway into the hill. At the rear of the solarium, there was a 6 ½ foot retaining wall and 4-foot walls that come through the section. He stated that the area will be glass as required for the planting inside. He stated that, if anyone looks into the solarium, they will see a beautiful vegetable garden.

Commissioner Baringer assumed the structure he was looking at had glass panels that were clear and someone could look down into that.

Mr. Chavarria stated that they could look into the garden, adding that it was ideal to create this solarium so natural processes occur and was part of the ecosystem.

Commissioner Baringer asked how big the tanks were.

Mr. Chavarria stated that there are three tanks. He stated that the water department was asking for a separate meter and a back flow prevention valve, adding that it was not necessary. He explained how it worked with the initial water tank, adding that there were a total of four tanks.

Commissioner Baringer asked how many gallons were involved in total.

Mr. Chavarria stated that, for the initial fill, it will be approximately, 1,200 gallons.

Commissioner Baringer felt they need to have the geotech.

Mr. Chavarria stated that there was a geotech.

Commissioner Baringer asked if it takes this into consideration.

Mr. Chavarria responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Baringer stated that most failures on hillsides were related to these kinds of features where they leak and the water gets into the system and suddenly the stable hillside was unstable. He felt they want to be sure they have provided for that.

Mr. Chavarria agreed, adding that it has been done. He stated that the tanks are concrete tanks, built as a swimming pool with proper waterproofing, soft drains, etc., with everything reviewed by CSG. He then referred to the traffic circulation, stating that it was a condition of approval from engineering and, normally, prior to doing any work, they have to present the work to engineering and agree with them on the hauling route, hours of operation, etc.

Commissioner Baringer stated that they were now “belt and suspendering” by having staff involved in it to have another set of eyes looking at it. He explained that they are doing a lot of infill projects and he thought it would be appropriate to have a standard protocol for infill as he felt it was clearly different than a Harmony @One project where it was new on large acreage. He reiterated that he felt they needed to treat it differently than they do a large scale construction.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they did anticipate this because of having several infill projects on steep slopes, and condition #10 speaks to the geotechnical analysis, condition #23 speaks to roads being maintained clear of construction material with dust control and condition #25 was a traffic control plan related to the hauling of dirt.

Commissioner Baringer asked if staff designates construction staging areas, adding that he didn't see how he was going to be able to stage on site and will have to use some of the area in front of his property to stage. He felt it was an aggressive slope and he didn't see how he could stage on that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, through the encroachment permit, they will designate stationary areas.

Commissioner Baringer liked the project and felt it will be a great addition to the neighborhood.

Chair Gordon closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Evans referred to one letter of concern and asked if they got an address on the Diane Yee letter. He stated that, with no address, he couldn't tell where she was talking about.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they didn't get one and they tried to contact her to clarify the four story issue but were not able to contact her.

Commissioner Evans asked that they explain the view issue.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the city does not have a view preservation ordinance.

Commissioner Evans stated that he went to the site and could not see any house that would be blocked with the new house which was not any different from any of the other homes on either side. He did find a couple of homes that looked like four stories, adding that the first floor garages were dug in. He has no problem with the project as they are within specifics. He didn't vote on the original one in 2014, but he read about it. He liked the project, but wanted to address the public's issues.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he was going to bring up that we have no view ordinance in Pacifica and the only place they can consider a view was in the local coastal zone, but don't have to act on it. He liked the project and the mezzanine versus a fourth floor. While it doesn't change the height, it was a nicer design feature. He understood that it is coming forward with a shorter driveway and less fill out, and the building wasn't climbing up the hill, and was at 35 feet but not 35 feet on top of 15 feet more in the back.

Commissioner Campbell echoed Commissioner Clifford's comments, agreeing that it was a nice looking project, stepped away in the back with nice architectural interest in the front and he was in favor of it.

Commissioner Clifford moved that the Planning Commission finds the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVES Specific Plan SP-161-16, by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval in Attachment A; and incorporates all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

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

CONSIDERATION:

None

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Evans stated that he attended the meeting on September 14 Library Advisory meeting. They had a presentation by the Asst. City Manager about budget. They had a draft library building program discussion and a library tour will be coming up on October 15.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he will be having knee replacement surgery on October 13, will be in the hospital for two days and will not be coming to the meeting on October 17. He stated that he will be on oxycodone and his decision making might be slightly impaired.

Chair Gordon extended their best wishes for a quick recovery.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that FogFest will be coming up and the city will have a booth. She invited the public to stop by and say hello. She stated that they did not need a liaison to the September 26 Council meeting, but she reminded them that the annual report for the climate action plan will be on the agenda. She stated that, on September 27, the Council will be scheduled to have a sea level rise study session.

Commissioner Evans asked if it will be in Council chambers.

Planning Director Wehrmeister didn't believe the location or time has been determined yet.

Commissioner Clifford asked staff to bring information at a future date. He will be present on October 3, and would like answers to questions about the Harmony @One project. He referred to condition #22 regarding low light polluting street lights and in another section it also mentioned 5-10 wind-powered and energy neutral lights. He thought they have more than 5 or 10 lights and he didn't know how they were going to be powered so he would like to know. He was also concerned with how they are going to deal with light pollution because of the impact on the species, including the endangered specie, Mission Blue Butterfly. He then referred to condition #23, renewable power and solar energy, which calls for generating clean electrical on site, using wind turbines, and he asked whether those were still in the mix or replaced with some other renewable energy source. He referred to condition #29, natural wild flower project, which speaks to the applicant purchasing seeds and bulbs and working with students and volunteers to spread them throughout the property, and he asked if it was in the works or would it happen later in the project. He also mentioned the 100-tree initiative, and partnering with a local arborist, to provide trees for protection from the wind and minimize visual impact of manmade structures for decades. He mentioned that there was a bird sanctuary under that condition as well. He wanted to know when these are happening. He referred to a habitat model designating a large portion of the project to create protected habitat for animals and plants, adding that he thought that has already happened, but he wasn't certain. He mentioned a buyers' club for anyone wishing to build on their purchasing power for group purchases and reduce the overall cost, mentioning water, solar, etc. He then referred to condition #33, which states applicant will plant trees near all retaining walls as recommended by a certified arborist. He thought the retaining walls were all in

and he didn't know if that should begin to happen now. He referred to condition #37 which states that all homes within the planned development shall provide gray water systems from showers, etc., to be used in an underground system. He then mentioned the Mission Blue habitat which was supposed to be expanded as mentioned in one of the conditions, and he was concerned because of the delays in the project. He didn't know what has happened to the plants that the Mission Blue need. He stated that, since it has been almost ten years since the project was approved, he was hoping to see this habitat expansion start happening now if not having happened already.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he wanted to followup on the idea of better parking signage at the open lot next to the Tai restaurant on Francisco. He didn't know what the best mechanism was to do this, but he asked if they could get this before City Council.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she can mention it to the City Manager and Public Works Director and determine whether that was something they can do or if it needs City Council approval. She stated that she will find out.

Commissioner Cooper reiterated that it was important to start establishing those fees as there are a lot of improvements needed in the lots in Pacifica, especially signage. He felt having a fund to pay for them would be great. He mentioned that the Pacifica Unified School District was going out with the housing development and he was curious about what the Commission's role would be in the approval process, if any. He thought it was a different zoning that he was not familiar with, and he asked that staff do research and tell them.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she has been in contact with the developer, who wasn't necessarily selected to build the project if it goes forward but was helping them figure out the feasibility analysis for the project. She stated that it would need a General Plan amendment. They are considering that the best course of action is for the city to approve the General Plan amendment and act on the necessary environmental documents. She stated that, because the district was a stand-alone district, they could act on the EIR or MND and they could rely on it, but they are thinking that the city would process everything through their regular approval process.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Cooper moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:12 p.m.; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister