

MINUTES

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

October 17, 2016

7:00 p.m.

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

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

SALUTE TO FLAG: Commissioner Cooper

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Asst. City Attorney Matthew Visick
Assoc. Planner Murdock
Econ. Dev. Manager Stedler
Public Works Dir. Ocampo
Asst. Planner O'Connor

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

The motion carried **4-0**.

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

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
SEPTEMBER 19, 2016** Commissioner Cooper moved approval of minutes of
September 19, 2016; Commissioner Baringer seconded
the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

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

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF OCTOBER 24, 2016:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they would not need a liaison.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

| None.

PRESENTATION:

1. Presentation of the Palmetto Streetscape Project.

Econ. Dev. Manager Stedler presented the staff report.

Commissioner Cooper thanked her for the report. He stated that, when he goes to cities he was sitting down, observing and watching the people. He thought having the midscape bulbs was an important aspect of our community. He applauded her in keeping the project moving, adding that you can't always have all the things you want and need to work within the budget.

Commissioner Campbell wondered how the streetscape interacted with the golf course.

Econ. Dev. Mgr. Stedler stated that there were particular improvements needed at Clarendon and she invited Public Works Dir. Ocampo to talk about those as they deal explicitly with safety issues and the configuration of curb, etc. She stated that they don't have improvements adjacent to the golf course, but only on Palmetto. She stated that the opportunity in future phases to address that edge still exists and they are able to do phase one which will hopefully pave the way for things that need to be done in the future.

Public Works Dir. Ocampo stated that the intersection of Clarendon and Palmetto will be reconfigured. Now, they have a free turning right if westbound on Clarendon to northbound Palmetto, and that will be reconfigured and the intersection will have stop signs in it and narrowing it so it is easier and safer for the pedestrian. He stated that entire streetscape will encourage walking even to the golf course, but that was the only immediate improvement to the golf course.

Commissioner Campbell stated that the golf course is a resource and it looks like it is staying. He asked if they talk with the city for plans for that side of the course and if there are any joint meetings with the city.

Econ. Dev. Mgr. Stedler stated that they were in touch with the people envisioning the future of the golf course. They realize that it was more productive to work on Pacifica's plans with that edge when they are working on their plans for the golf course at the same time.

Commissioner Baringer thought it was an exciting project. He asked if they were working jointly with the retail and specialty real estate people in the general area to try to attract some additional shops, cafes, etc. and whether they were doing it simultaneously or doing it sequentially.

Econ. Dev. Mgr. Stedler stated that she was doing that sequentially with the streetscape, not having begun that work in a full campaign. She stated that they have the industry group of economic development staff which meets regularly with the brokerage community, specifically they meet once a year with San Mateo County and cities and the brokerage community and present their current status of projects and things of interest to them. She stated that it was critical to have that link. She stated that, in addition to the streetscape, there was other work that needs to be done in order to prepare spaces and work with landlords and understand their goals for their space. She stated that she was doing that work at this point in time, adding that it was a precursor to doing more work with the retail brokerage community. She stated that the other component was that it will be much easier for a retail broker to lease space on Palmetto when the proposed

hotel and library are assigned to be constructed, that is, when the financing for those projects was in place. She stated that those events will green light other projects to go forward because it assures the success of their investment. She agreed that all the pieces have to pull together in order to make the main street that is envisioned in the General Plan.

Commissioner Baringer stated that he was going to suggest that they try to do it simultaneously for one reason, specifically that they might have some tenants that are interested and they could accommodate their requirements now before the hard scape is finalized and constructed, rather than have to amend, modify or adjust it. He agreed that the hotel will bring traffic to the area, adding that he wasn't sure a library will bring a lot to a retail project, adding that it could help but the hotel would generate a substantial amount of traffic and the shops and cafes would like that. He also suggested that a whale statue might be interesting.

Econ. Dev. Mgr. Stedler stated that one of the terrific opportunities when doing outreach on this was to track people's reactions and comments, and the whales are a repeated icon. She stated that, in the effort to revitalize streets and bring people and community together around a street, they are looking for opportunities to mix public sector destinations, such as a library with retail destinations, clarifying that there will be a place where some members of the families can hang out while other members shop or go to the pier, etc. She stated that it was without question that they want to be family oriented in Pacifica. She stated that, when the time comes, Dir. Wehrmeister's work with the library will give them ample opportunity to find out the statistics and how much they are anticipating that the library will bring to Palmetto.

Chair Gordon thanked her for addressing them and sharing the exciting information on the streetscape project.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

2, PSD-366-16 **COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CDP-366-16**, filed by co-applicants, Kelly Kellerman of the Pacifica Land Trust and Samuel Herzberg of the San Mateo County Parks Department to perform grading and landscaping activities on an approximately 640 linear foot segment of the Middle Ridge trail on an approximately 32-acre parcel (APN 023-730-020) owned by the State of California and located in the Pedro Point Headlands.

Assoc. Planner Murdock presented the staff report.

Sam Casillas, President of Pacifica Land Trust, gave a brief history of the Land Trust, stating that the project started as a restoration project following two major landslides. He stated that the portion of this project was a natural expansion of what they were doing in getting more sustainable trails. He stated that they have been decommissioning unstable trails and replacing them with new sustainable trails better for runoff control and recreational access. They will see switchbacks and wider trails with multiple access for eventual recreational activity. They have received positive feedback from trail users who appreciate that the engineered trails are more interesting and less steep and will be a nice hike. He stated that they have representatives from their engineering companies to answer questions.

Commissioner Baringer asked who was doing the work, specifically was it a volunteer group.

Mr. Casillas stated that the volunteer groups do a lot of the revegetation and they have an on site nursery where they collect native species seeds and plant them. He stated that the work with bulldozing and trails was being performed by Go Native but the pre-engineering work was done by Fall Creek Engineering and they had a recon biological services to put everything together.

Commissioner Baringer asked how they insure that there is no unauthorized activity when they do the decommissioning process.

Mr. Casillas stated that they put tree limbs to block off access but, because there was so much erosion in some places, they will collapse the areas, explaining that, with rain, they don't want it to pour in one specific gully but evenly fall over a hill and evenly disperse. That was what they were in the process of doing, and you can't walk in those areas as they will be revegetated. They put down burlap cloth in huge sections and plant native species within that. They also put up signage letting them know they can't go in that area which is being revegetated and blocked off in lots of ways.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing.

Julie Lancelle, Pacifica, stated that staff and Mr. Casillas have done an excellent job of describing what was going on. She stated that she was going to mention the history but what was pertinent was what it was now and becoming, thanks to this work. She explained that the property was a motorcycle club for many years. She stated that the Open Space Committee in 1990 took an interest as a possible extension of open space in Pacifica. She stated that the environmental community and those on the Open Space Committee moved ahead, helping facilitate the acquisition by working with the city and the Pacifica Land Trust. They had help from different environmental organizations in the county. She stated it was an extraordinary thing when it happened and it was wonderful now to see all the work getting done to really make it accessible and easy to traverse, adding that it has been challenging over the years, with the erosion, etc. She appreciated the work of the Land Trust over the years.

Sue Digre, Pacifica, thanked them, stating that it was an awesome trek and a wonderful thing, adding that our environment is our economy in her mind. She felt they will reap many benefits.

Chair Gordon closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Cooper felt they did a wonderful job, and thought there were still trails that need rehabilitation due to erosion, so the work they are doing is super. He thanked them for presenting this project to them.

Commissioner Campbell moved that the Planning Commission finds there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before it, that the project as revised and as implemented in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, may have a significant effect on the environment; and APPROVES Coastal Development Permit CDP-366-16 by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval in Exhibit B; and incorporates all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Campbell, 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.

- 3. PSD-790-14** **AMENDMENT OF PSD-790-14, PV-513-14 and PE-160-15**, filed
PV-513-14 by applicants, David Blackman and Mike O'Connell, to construct a
PE-160-15 single three-story, 3,169 square foot apartment building comprised of
four dwelling units on the top two floors and an attached ground
floor garage at 4009 Palmetto Avenue (APN 009-402-270) in
Pacifica. Recommended CEQA status: Class 3 Categorical
Exemption, Section 15303(b).

Asst. Planner O'Connor presented staff report.

Chair Gordon stated that he was toying around with the median density residential language. He stated that the initial sentence gave the ratio of 10-15 dwelling units per acre and the following sentence appears to give some discretion by saying site conditions will determine specific density. He stated that she was saying the Commission's discretion must be applied with a floor and a ceiling according to the ratio in the first sentence. He asked if he summarized that correctly.

Asst. Planner O'Connor responded affirmatively.

Chair Gordon asked if that was consistent with prior interpretations of this kind of language in our statutes. He stated that he raised the question because you could say it was ambiguous and he thought that was a lawyer question.

Planning Dir. Wehrmeister thought the intent of the General Plan designation is to have a property developed within that range. If there are very specific reasons why it can't be developed within that range and it needs to be lower, she thought the language would allow the city to move forward with the project with the appropriate findings in that case.

Chair Gordon asked her to briefly elaborate on that process. He thought they would need to make a finding that there exists environmental sensitivity that would recommend a lower departure from the range.

Planning Dir. Wehrmeister agreed that they would need to have a strong record for that reason.

Chair Gordon asked if they could make that finding and would it need to go before City Council before the Commission could act or do they have discretion.

Planning Dir. Wehrmeister stated that, where a General Plan amendment is necessary, the Planning Commission would make a recommendation and the whole package would go to City Council.

Chair Gordon stated that the only reason he was saying that was because the location of this particular parcel was pretty environmentally sensitive and it seems like they would have some material to work with.

Commissioner Cooper asked if it would require an amendment to the General Plan or simply require the Commission to find that there is an exemption from the General Plan. He thought, in this case, the Coastal Commission has deemed the area was environmentally sensitive because of that willow tree which was a circumstance not typical to every parcel. If they found someone wants to build a duplex rather than a quad, they could make that finding without having to modify the General Plan, just make an exception to the General Plan. He asked if he was correct.

Asst. City Attorney Visick stated that, to the extent that he was looking for some flexibility in the language, the flexibility was probably found in the word "average" which defines throughout the range of projects in similar land use designation that they are to be an average of this size. He mentioned that the Commission has seen other projects where there was similar language in the General Plan in other areas, adding that there was a project in the very low density residential land use designation not long ago with a similar question. He stated that, to do a thorough analysis of what the average density was within that land use designation would take a considerable amount of work on staff's part to make sure whatever might be built would maintain that average. He stated that the General Plan lays out a range of 10-15 and it was within that range that the Commission has discretion about what was appropriate, given the site conditions listed in the General Plan.

Commissioner Cooper thanked him for that very lawyerly answer.

Michael O'Connell, applicant, thought that, at the last meeting, they struggled with how they got from the previous design to this design. He understood the need to go through the exercise, but it was difficult to compare the previous proposal to this one because of the constraints established by the Coastal Commission. He was asking that they focus on the site development permit and the required findings for that and the good parts of the project which they didn't get a chance to discuss at the last hearing. He stated that, for a multi-family project, it only has 13% lot coverage which was unheard of in multi-family projects. He stated that 78% of the site is landscaped, adding that you do not see that in most multi-family projects. He stated that they were dedicating approximately 3,500 square feet to the buffer for the willow, the deed restriction and they have a comprehensive restoration plan where they are removing the invasive ice plant and replacing it with coastal scrub. He stated that it doesn't have green roofs like the previous project, but there was a lot of green elements with the site design. He referred to mention of the scale and mass of the building at the previous meeting, and they looked at the Pacifica design guidelines which acknowledged that multi-family projects were inherently large and there were things they should do to make them visually more appealing, including a variety of materials and heights, roof pitches, and they feel this building articulates pretty well, mentioning some specifics regarding the deck, third floor, etc. He mentioned the various windows, maximizing ocean views. He referred to the different types of materials and mentioned that the units were a third of the size of other multi-family projects recently approved, as well as comparable to other units in the area, such as the Montecito project, adding that their building articulates better. He mentioned that, at the last meeting, he found objections to a few of the conditions and they have worked them out with staff and the fire department. He mentioned reviewing the hydraulic analysis with Public Works, and indicated that the existing city system has the capacity to deal with the additional runoff which was accounted for in the original street design. They were confident that there won't be any major mitigations required, adding that they were taking the water away from the ravine and solving a large problem.

Commissioner Campbell asked him to explain the evolution of the thinking on the wetlands, relative to their purchase of the property.

Mr. O'Connell stated that they were aware of what had happened at the Fish and Bowl. When they did their biology study on the property itself, it came back clean. When the project was appealed to the Coastal Commission, and their biologist came out, they asked them to study other things. He stated that it was easy to study something on the city right-of-way such as the willow, and once they completed the study, they met the criteria for a wetland in that one parameter study and, at that point, the Coastal Commission mentioned a buffer and they started with a 100 foot buffer which was completely undevelopable, went through several iterations and designs based on the different buffers, and their biologist and staff decided 50 feet would be appropriate.

Chair Gordon stated that, as it stands now, the city was saying they have to have at least four units and the Coastal Commission has said they only have a footprint to accommodate a 50-foot buffer.

Mr. O'Connell responded affirmatively.

Chair Gordon concluded that those were their constraints.

Mr. O'Connell responded affirmatively.

Chair Gordon thought it would explain the nature of the building.

Mr. O'Connell stated that it was driven by the 50-foot buffer and they started with the parking and they need most of that space to fit the parking, and it makes sense to utilize the subterranean garage and build on top of that instead of stepping out. He thought they could step out further, but they were trying to keep it within the footprint of the parking.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing.

Victor Carmichael, Pacifica, stated he was surprised and disappointed to find out that the developers are refusing to modify their out of scale apartment building as requested by the Planning Commission in September. He stated that they were hoping for something they might all agree on grudgingly. He felt it was unfortunate that their effort to ward off development in the Fish and Bowl was now being blamed in a way as what one commissioner said was a monstrosity. He stated that there was no reason that the alternative has to be this size. He asked why they purchased this particular lot in the first place. He stated that there are vacant lots all over town that are crying out for apartment buildings to provide badly needed affordable housing. He stated that no one can argue that this project with a previous version will ever contribute to affordable housing. He stated that their objective was to preserve this last remaining green belt from the freeway down to the dunes. He felt this project will serve as a model and a precedent for future development. He stated that it was not their fault that the lot contained a one parameter wetland, the definition the Coastal Commission always uses. He stated that they were concerned about the potential harm to the adjacent wetlands and the ravine. He referred to the concerns over sea level rise, and that the powers that be seem to be satisfied that the head of the ravine is stable, adding that if it every collapses, they will lose a big section of Palmetto Avenue. He stated that the hydrology of the area was a mystery and the city admits that it has no resources to show the underground infrastructure in the area. He stated that the new drainage plan plugs in to the

crossover pipe from the east to west side, mentioning other pipes no one knows about. He felt that, until they get some decent mapping of the infrastructure below Palmetto Avenue, they should put this project on hold.

Project Neighbor, Pacifica, stated that it hasn't rained much the past couple of years and no one has been addressing that with all the concrete, and he asked what happens during the rainy season. His concern was to protect the wetlands.

Chair Gordon closed the Public Hearing.

Dave Blackman, applicant, hoped they take the opportunity to ask him any questions to help solve some of this. He stated that he met with Mr. Carmichael and the condominium association and invited every neighbor within about 1000 feet to talk about this. He respects what Mr. Carmichael is trying to do in protecting the property in private hands. He stated that, when they came to the end, Mr. Carmichael stated that there was only one thing he wanted, no development and he was not trying to make this a better project. He stated that they were trying to do one thing. He referred to the pipe the Bowl has underneath Palmetto and makes the ravine. He stated that it was put in during the depression when they built Highway 56. He stated that they are going to take the water creating the ravine into the city storm drain. He stated that every engineer sees that this project is a huge benefit to stopping that ravine. He was not sure if Mr. Carmichael was confused and if they can have more conversation, but they were dismantling the water going over and creating the ravine, and their project has huge solutions to that. He referred to the scale, and the guidelines say they should be in scale not only with all of Pacifica but the neighborhood. He stated that their building was so much smaller than the condominiums above them and any Lands End building. He stated that, of the entire frontage, they were leaving the majority of it alone because of the arroyo willow. He stated that the willow was not on their property but on Palmetto and was being cut back by the garbage trucks that pass through and created by the water from Highway 1 above. He stated that the Coastal Commission says they have to treat all wetlands, small, bad, dysfunctional, equally. He stated that they begged them to try to get the appellants to drop the appeal and continue on with the project but the appellants wanted one thing only, to destroy the project. They have put their hearts into making the best project they possibly could and he asked them to invite them up if they have any questions, adding that they are in tune with the project and know it inside out.

Commissioner Campbell asked if he was hearing that there was no way to make it smaller or if they entertained any other notions when it looked like 100 or 75 foot buffer.

Mr. Blackman stated that they did many different versions of the project, stating that the Coastal Commission was super involved, and this was the project they drove them to. He stated that it was a big ordeal, and they were dealing with all the parameters of all the neighbors. He stated that they had studies after studies about global warming, the ravine, their doctors of geology meeting with the commission's doctors of geology. He stated that this was a very modest 1150 square foot apartment. He stated that the last time they were there, he was going small and getting pushed to go bigger and was talked out of going smaller. He stated that these were smaller than anything in the neighborhood, including the one Mr. Carmichael lives in.

Commissioner Campbell stated that the way they got here was something he finds hard to buy into, which was the notion that because of an environmental conflict with the Plan. He stated that there was a wetland on the property and, because of that, he needs to push his development in a

certain way, and he needs a parking variance. He agreed that they can do that, but he gets uncomfortable with the notion that, because there was an environmental amenity on the property, it was an action forcing the thing that drives the development plan. He felt that doesn't work with him. He stated that, if you buy property with endangered species habitat on it or property with a sewer easement and it forces you to go up and not out like you wanted to, and it was like a buyer beware. He agrees with the talk that they have the discretion to approve fewer than four units but he hates to buy into that. He was stuck. The project itself didn't seem to be a monstrosity but he was struggling with it and was anxious to hear what the rest of the commissioners say.

Chair Gordon stated that he and Commissioner Campbell were the only ones who didn't speak at the last meeting.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he was at the last meeting and he had a lot to talk about. He reminded them that this was where they had the four units spread on the property and they really liked that layout, but it was not necessarily what he likes but what the public likes and what works for the property. He struggles with this because, overall, it was a lot larger than what he wants to see, but looking at the parameters that they have for the zoning, this was probably the smallest they can go without getting in trouble with having the zoning ordinance and how it was labeled. He likes the bungalow, the spreadout look, but it was not going to happen. The appeal was made, and they were forced into a corner and they came up with something that was probably suitable for this piece of property. He stated that, as much as he would like to see other things on it, he struggles with how they would accomplish that and still make it a viable project. He was waiting for their return as he wanted to see what their comments were as they were not at the long meeting they had discussing all the options and their frustration with it.

Commissioner Baringer agreed, stating that they had an extensive conversation. He didn't have the benefit of the previous application and he wasn't in love with it or a big fan of it. He wasn't sure he would characterize this project as a monstrosity but, in comparison to the other one, it seems to be substantially larger in scale. He also made the comment at the last meeting that, sometimes, when you appeal things, it has an unintended consequence. Maybe, before things are appealed, they should think it through. The consequence of that appeal was that it came back and you applied a new calculus to it and this is what you get. He didn't have that much of a problem with it at the time it was presented. He wasn't comparing it to the grass roof more desirable version because he thought that was academic, as it was no longer a viable option. He felt they have to look at the project in front of them and he thought they did a pretty good job of examining it and discussing it. He mentioned that one issue was that there were four of them and it was going to be a split vote, so they continued it so that hopefully they would have a larger group and get additional dialogue. He thought they were getting that through transitivity. He stated that Commissioner Clifford wasn't present and they can talk about it. He thought they did a good job of working within the confines, and there are a lot of confines concerning this property. He would be willing to move forward and approve it. He asked if they ever worked out the van accessible parking issue that seemed to be a total non sequitur the last time they talked about it or still on the table to be dealt with after the fact.

Assist. Planner O'Connor stated that she addressed it in the staff report. She stated that the building official has still provided the opportunity to the applicants to hire their one CASp inspector and provide evidence of why a van accessible space may not be required, but the CASp inspector who provided feedback to staff's building official have determined that it would be

required. She stated that would be resolved at the issuance of the building permits, but as part of this project, it was the consideration of the minor changes that would occur.

Commissioner Baringer thought it may be a technical requirement as a function of the system, but he felt it didn't pass the test of common sense, which was why he brought it up the last time.

Chair Gordon thought everyone would agree that, in an ideal world, they would have had the small scale individual units, lower in height and lower in visual impact. They don't have that, and he thought this was a unique situation. He stated that the applicants had a small footprint with which to work. They had to put in at least four units. He thought the project was tasteful for a multi-unit building, which doesn't surprise him because he felt their work was visually appealing. He thought the comparison to the recently approved Montecito project was instructive, as it was half as wide, half as large units. He stated that, if they instruct them to go smaller, the units are 1150 square feet and that was on the small side of reasonable, and by going smaller, the units will not be as desirable or workable for a family with a couple of kids. He thought it was a unique situation and he was not concerned about setting a precedent, given all the unique factors going into this particular application. He mentioned that it was 13% lot coverage, 78% landscaping, and thought those were impressive numbers. He was open to what other commissioners are saying.

Commissioner Campbell stated that the project was not something he would object to, but his issue was how they got there. He stated he has gotten complaints where people feel their neighbors have an irregular shape or substandard size lot and they can't build out so have to build up and waive the setbacks for the back fence and you have a 2-3 story high house with no rear setbacks and the neighbors question what happened. He has a hard time buying into that thinking. He stated that he was thinking of what Commissioner Clifford said at the last meeting, that if this had come before them the first time, it would have gotten approved but they saw the Cadillac version first. He stated that he didn't have concerns about the storm water and the pipes and thought that would resolve itself. He thought they have the discretion to approve less than four, and that was his query to the applicant about whether it could be three with each unit being a little bigger, but scaled down further. He thought it gets to the point of nibbling around the edges. He was inclined to approve it.

Chair Gordon stated that, on visiting the area, it was undeveloped and beautiful, but at the same time it was not pristine. If you look above, there was a big condo complex of 2-3 stories and 100 or 200 units. He stated that you have Highway 1 and the area has invasive species all over the place but it was a very special area. He felt they knew that and they would be good stewards for it.

Commissioner Cooper moved that the Planning Commission find the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVE amendment to Site Development Permit PSD-790-14; Variance PV-513-14; and Parking Exception PE-160-15 by adopting the resolution included as Attachment B to the staff report, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A to the resolution; and incorporate all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Baringer seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Campbell, 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.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Cooper stated that Commissioner Clifford was watching or was going to be watching this, and he hoped he was doing well.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he wanted to ask for a study session on the traffic analysis for the quarry. He asked if this was the time to ask.

Planning Dir. Wehrmeister stated that it is the right time in the agenda to ask; however, her response was that the traffic analysis was submitted by the applicant and not prepared by the City's consultants. It was posted along with all other application materials. She stated that it will be reviewed by staff as part of the regular environmental review process which the applicant has not initiated with the city. She stated that the appropriate time for the Commission to discuss would be during review of the EIR for the project if they decide to move forward after November.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he wanted to ask for it now and he will see if he can get some nods. He explained that his reason was that they have the developer who was interested in placing 206 apartment units in the quarry, coming up for a vote in the next elections as Measure W. He was concerned that they have not had a study session on the traffic impacts yet. He wondered if they should. He had a lot of questions about the traffic analysis performed for the morning commute hours in particular. He also had questions about the methodology used by the developer to analyze impacts associated with the commercial aspects of the quarry development but since Measure W only deals with residential components and since there was no development agreement with the city in Measure W that binds the developer to build a commercial hotel component, his question about holding a hearing are limited to the impacts Pacifica's morning commuters might face with the residents emptying out of the quarry onto Highway 1 every morning. He also had a question about the timing of traffic counts, stating that CalTrans guidance provides that the entity that generates a traffic impact analysis described traffic data and how the data was collected. He stated that the quarry analysis lacks some critical specifics, for example, the quarry traffic analysis does not tell them what time the traffic was counted at the key intersections that tie up traffic in Pacifica, Highway 1 intersections at Fassler and Reina del Mar Avenues. He thought it appeared that the quarry analysis relies on data from a single peak hour traffic count conducted in Pacifica on Thursday, June 9, 2016, a normal weekday when public schools were still in session. He felt that was good but the quarry analysis indicates two of the seven intersections studied that day were the ones that they just don't know what time they were studied. He stated that, if you travel northbound out of Pacifica in the morning, then you know the traffic jam occurs at the two intersections, largely related to school related traffic, mainly students being dropped off at Vallemar School. He thought the timing of any analysis should be conducted when the school related impacts are at their peak hour. He stated that it would make a significant difference if the study at Reina del Mar intersection was conducted between the hour of 7:30 and 8:30 as opposed to 8:30 and 9:50 a.m. because much of the traffic is completely over by 8:45. He asked why the data would not be readily available in the quarry analysis. He confirmed with staff that we don't have it and it seems like the hour it was done should be readily available. He was having trouble with other assumptions and would love to hear from the

developer about them for clarification. He was reading the report and he understood that, out of 206 apartments, they are only counting 75 cars as exiting from that development in the a.m. peak hour. He thought a conservative estimate of cars leaving a 200 unit complex might be 2 cars per unit or 400 cars or even 200 cars with one car leaving per family unit, but they have 75 cars. He asked how they get from 400 to 200 to 75. He would like to understand that better. He stated that it appears that the assumption that the quarry was a mixed use development and was going to have so much commercial development that “a certain percentage of residents will opt to bike or walk to these stores instead of driving and, as a result, a percent reduction in total vehicle trips generated is applicable.” He stated that quarry residents will not have to leave the quarry to go to work or school in the a.m. traffic hours, according to this analysis. He stated that he also wanted to understand more is only half the cars leaving the quarry in the morning will exit at Reina del Mar, according to the traffic analysis, which assumes that the other half will exit at Fassler. He stated that the other half of north bound cars are not expected to use the internal roads proposed in the quarry to travel north and exit at the Reina del Mar intersection. Instead, half of the cars will exit further south at Fassler and they are going to choose to experience traffic delays associated with two lights, at Fassler and Reina del Mar, instead of one. He would like to understand that assumption. He stated that the 50-50 split he mentioned was based on a second assumption, that vehicle access along the quarry road and the quarry would only be permitted by residents and hotel employees and guests. He concluded that current Pacifica residents will not be allowed to travel through the quarry to avoid traffic in the morning, and he didn't know how that would be enforced as it wasn't mentioned in the traffic analysis and he would like to understand it better. He stated that traffic analysis generally has a robust discussion of traffic mitigation and they get about four paragraphs on the last page where the developer proposes some light timing, increasing the timing of the lights and better signals at the Reina del Mar and Fassler intersections and restriping some lanes. He stated that it ends with recommendation of the quarry to consider additional traffic mitigation and leaves it at that. He stated that everything he mentioned was connected with a.m. traffic from the quarry, and that was not talking about all the traffic associated with the 200 room hotel which was not at issue with Measure W and these were the reasons that he was proposing a study session on the books, sooner than later. He understood the Planning Director's comments but he would like to get it out there. He cautioned the commissioners that they can't discuss this as it was not agendaized. This was just his comments.

Chair Gordon stated that their comments cannot be substantive in nature like Commissioner Campbell's but can be logistical.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thanked him for his comments and wanted to point out that when the environmental review is completed for this project, the environmental document is completed by the city and they don't necessarily rely on the study prepared by the applicant.

Commissioner Baringer didn't want to have a substantive discussion but he also has a lot of concerns about the traffic study and his question would be, in terms of setting up a working session, where they could have a substantive agendaized discussion, as he understands that staff was planning on retaining a traffic consultant to review the data, plans and come up with their own traffic study. He asked if they can't do that now because it was a budget issue. He asked why they can't take his study, retain our traffic consultant and turn him loose on it now.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the way EIRs and all of the technical analyses that go into an EIR, including a traffic analysis, is that the city hires and manages that process and it is the City's document. The applicant pays for it. They can't move forward with an environmental

document on any project unless the applicant is paying for it as the city does not front the cost for those analyses. She stated that the quarry applicant has not funded the environmental review at this time and the project is still incomplete.

Commissioner Baringer stated that he asked because it was possible that the review of the traffic study only, not the environmental impact report, could trigger major and substantial redesign of the project. He stated that, if you contracted for an entire EIR and a traffic study showed that they had to make substantive changes, then they would have to scrap the parts of the EIR that were in process and adapt the EIR to what changes may be precipitated by a traffic report. He stated that there will be some substantial changes as a result of the traffic study, and he suggested that they start that now and circle back to the full EIR.

Asst. City Attorney Visick stated that it was important to point out that the application for the quarry project is incomplete and the city, as a matter of course, does not process incomplete projects. He stated that the project was effectively at a standstill until they have a complete application.

Commissioner Campbell understood.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he had a question on some of the exceptions that he sees within the packages and how they vary a little from CGI's exceptions. He thought there was a little bit of variance between them. He pointed to the fire flows for the North Coast Water District and he thought, on the last one CGI did, North County was paying for it. They would provide them with the flows and here they were having the applicant pay for it. He wanted to be sure that we were consistent among all our packages.

Chair Gordon assumed that Commissioner Campbell was looking for a study session to discuss the traffic analysis for the quarry project.

Commissioner Campbell agreed that was what he was looking for, and he saw the traffic analysis on the city website that was performed and his thinking was that there was something premature on it to some extent, but it was part of a developing permit application package that has not been finalized.

Asst. City Attorney Visick thought he was correct about this, and if he is not, he was sure someone will speak up. He stated that the materials on the website that they see now do not reflect what was in process of review. They are designed to be transparent about what has been submitted so the public has broad access to everything that the applicant has submitted for that project.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he will take the city's recommendation and wait on the study session as it doesn't sound like it was the time to do it and he will withdraw the request.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister let the Commission know that they were moving forward with their goal of getting on MinuteTraQ so that the agendas will be more easily accessible on line and easier for someone who is trying to find an attachment to one of the very large staff reports on line and will be easier for the Commission to navigate as well. She stated that it will require that

they all bring an iPad or laptop to the meetings. She stated that, if there was any issue with that, they should let her know so that staff can accommodate their needs. She stated that the goal was to have mMinuteTraQ in place by January 2017 and have a training session sometime in December with IT. She thought it was pretty intuitive and it will be a really quick item on one of their December agendas.

Commissioner Cooper asked if it included the large drawings as well.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Chair Gordon asked if they could use a smart phone or does it have to be an iPad or a laptop.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she didn't know about that. She thought she has pulled it up on the website on her smart phone before, and she thought it was doable. She then stated that they were moving forward with their triannual code update, and it will be in front of City Council for a first reading in November. She did not recall if she had made the announcement, but she stated that Holiday Inn pulled their building permit. They have not provided a date for preconstruction meeting or a date when they might break ground.

Commissioner Campbell stated that it was great news. He mentioned the parking signage on Francisco and he didn't want his repetition to dilute the request or interest in it, but he asked if there was any news on that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that there was news, but she didn't have a schedule. She stated that Public Works was amenable to putting some improved signage there.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Cooper moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:51 p.m.; Commissioner Baringer seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister