

MINUTES

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

December 5, 2016

7:00 p.m.

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

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

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Campbell

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Assoc. Planner Murdock
Asst. Planner O'Connor

**DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF DECEMBER 12,
2016:**

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they would need a liaison but Commissioner Cooper had volunteered to take the Palmetto apartment appeal.

Chair Gordon assumed she would let them know if he was not able to do that.

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
NOVEMBER 21, 2016** Commissioner Evans moved approval of minutes of
November 21, 2016; Commissioner Clifford seconded
the motion.

Chair Gordon commented that on Item 3 of the minutes, his name was mistakenly left in as opening and closing the public hearing, and should be corrected as he was absent from that meeting.

The motion carried **4-0**.

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

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
NOVEMBER 7, 2016** Commissioner Evans moved approval of minutes of
November 7, 2016; Commissioner Campbell seconded
the motion.

Commissioner Evans asked if that was a quorum.

Chair Gordon stated that Planning Director Wehrmeister had said they had a quorum.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, if four commissioners were present to make a quorum, to pass any item that night, three would have had to vote in favor of the item, and as such, she thought that three of them could act on these minutes if they felt comfortable.

The motion carried **3-0**.

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

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
OCTOBER 17, 2016**

Commissioner Campbell moved approval of minutes of October 17, 2016; Commissioner Baringer seconded the motion.

The motion carried **3-0**.

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

**APPROVAL OF ORDER
OF AGENDA**

Commissioner Evans moved approval of the Order of Agenda; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

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

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. CDP-364-16

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CDP-364-16, filed by Applicant, Carissa Savant, and owner, CRP/PSE Seaside Pacifica Owner LLC, for the renovation of an existing 93-unit mobile home Park commonly known as "Pacific Skies Estates", located at 1300 Palmetto Avenue, Pacifica (APN 009-291-020).

Planning Director Wehrmeister explained that staff needed more time to prepare a technical analysis requested by the Planning Commission. In light of the uncertain timeline for completion of the analysis, staff recommended continuing the public hearing without specifying a date for the future hearing. Staff would provide public notice of the new hearing date once it was determined.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing and, seeing no one, closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Clifford moved to continue Coastal Development Permit CDP-364-16 to a future date uncertain; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Clifford
and Chair Gordon

Noes: None

**2. CDP-374-16
PSD-813-16
PV-517-16**

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CDP-374-16, SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PSD-813-16 AND VARIANCE PV-517-16, filed by applicant, Chris Loeswick, to construct a balcony enclosure for a 154-square foot (sf) balcony located at 2355 Beach Boulevard, Apartment 202 (APN 115-210-050) in Pacifica. A Variance is required as the unit would no longer meet the 150 sf private open space standard per Pacifica Municipal Code Section 9-4.2402(c). Recommended California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption, Section 15301(e).

Asst. Planner O'Connor presented the staff report.

Commissioner Clifford referred to the 30 days to rectify the unpermitted work, and asked if that was a condition whether or not it was approved.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that it was a condition of approval but, if not approved, staff will move forward with code enforcement.

Commissioner Clifford explained his request for clarification as he thought that, while it was a condition of approval, if not approved, it couldn't stand.

Commissioner Evans asked confirmation that, as stated, it was an uninhabitable space.

Asst. Planner O'Connor responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans asked if it would be considered uninhabitable if it was an enclosed deck as previous decks were made.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that the balconies from Building A were enclosed in a way that extended the original living space, whereas this creates a new portion separate from the existing living space. She stated that one option the building official discussed was to remove the original exterior wall between the bedroom and the enclosed balcony to make it one enlarged room. She asked if that answered his question.

Commissioner Evans responded affirmatively, adding that, in the pictures, they were two different configuration condominiums.

Chris Loeswick, applicant, thanked staff for all their hard work, adding that it was an informative process. He stated that this was his first home and apologized for being naïve, adding that it was no excuse. He accepted whatever decision comes from this meeting, adding that his father taught him to accept the consequences of his actions, and he will abide by their decision.

Commissioner Clifford asked if he felt he would be able to finance the remodeling of taking out the existing exterior wall and extending everything to the outside.

Mr. Loeswick stated that he was not prepared to do that at this point, after investing \$5,000 in the construction of it, and \$7,000 in permits.

Commissioner Baringer asked for a clarification. He referred to the wall between bedroom 1 and the porch, and asked if it was totally closed off.

Mr. Loeswick stated that there was a large window.

Commissioner Baringer asked confirmation that he said there was a window.

Mr. Loeswick responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Baringer asked if his suggestion to make it compliant was to entirely remove that wall.

Asst. Planner O'Connor didn't know the exact width that would have to be removed to allow the building official to approve the project, but thought a good portion of the wall would have to be removed.

Commissioner Baringer stated that there was a header over the window and, if they removed the window and made it a cased opening so that bedroom 1 and porch area were all one contiguous space and not divided, he asked if that might satisfy the code requirement.

Asst. Planner O'Connor agreed that something along those lines would probably work.

Commissioner Baringer thought that would be less expensive to do, and he asked the applicant if he would be able to do that.

Mr. Loeswick stated that he would.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing and, seeing no one, closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Clifford asked how wide the window was and whether it showed up on any of the drawings. He explained that he was trying to get a sense of how much was putting an archway where the window was.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that she didn't have that measurement.

Commissioner Clifford asked if the applicant could say how wide the window was.

Mr. Loeswick stated that it was about 5' x 5'.

Commissioner Evans asked staff, if they were to approve the variance with the opening of the window to a passageway, whether that would have to be done within 30 days.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that it was the City's preference that any violations are addressed within 30 days, and whether to make the enclosure compliant with building codes or remove what was necessary to make it compliant, that wasn't their concern. However, she stated that, due to potential safety concerns, the building official was adamant to rectify it as soon as possible.

Commissioner Evans asked, if the applicant was working on the permitting and design immediately, whether that would be part of the process considered within the 30 days.

Asst. Planner O'Connor agreed that it could be one avenue.

Commissioner Baringer stated that, as expressed previously, he would like to help a member of the community and if he would agree to a condition to take the current window out and make it a cased opening from the floor level to the header which would hopefully satisfy the building official as being adequate to create one contiguous space and satisfy the code, he would support this project and move forward.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he was leery in saying they have a five-foot window and they are going to say it was alright for him to do that when the building official may say that it was not sufficient to meet the needs of the codes. He stated that he didn't want the Commission saying it was enough, and force the building official's hand.

Commissioner Baringer thought they could make it subject to that and, assuming there was a problem, they would come back to the Commission and they would have to have another discussion.

Commissioner Clifford agreed they could, adding that something like that was done if you wanted to enlarge the space and they would put a beam across to hold everything up, and put a bigger header in. He stated that, if they left it to the building official to decide how long the opening has to be or how wide it has to be, it wouldn't be that big a job for someone to do. He stated that dressing it off or heading it off might take some time. He stated, if they were to approve it, he would prefer setting it up so the building official decides how wide it has to be. He stated that he may decide it has to be the whole length with a post in the middle to cover the support.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that Assoc. Planner Murdock made a good point that one of the other considerations that needs to be taken into account was the current windows may not be meeting current California Energy Code standards. She stated that it may be beyond just making that opening, and could include removal and reinstallation of the exterior windows as well.

Commissioner Clifford thought that would be up to the applicant to decide if he could actually afford to do what has been approved to do, as he would get a contractor to give him a price to do the work that was approved.

Commissioner Campbell asked if Condition of Approval No. 7 gets them there or do they have to build subject to something.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that Condition No.7 provides the opportunity for the applicant to go home and redesign it and get everything up to code and move forward in that fashion.

Commissioner Campbell concluded that, if they approve it as written with Condition No. 7, then everything has to be up to code, including Title 24 [Energy Code requirements].

Asst. Planner O'Connor responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans referred to Assoc. Planner Murdock's question, and asked if anyone has looked at the existing addition that was up currently.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that the City has not been inside.

Chair Gordon concluded that Condition No. 7 would address the issues raised by Commissioner Clifford in terms of making any approval subject to the building official's discretion or approval.

Asst. Planner O'Connor responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he would move forward with approving it, based on the fact that the City will approve everything necessary.

Commissioner Evans asked, if they approve with Condition No. 7, whether the applicant would comply with whatever may need to be done to make this a legal habitational area.

Mr. Loeswick asked if he was referring to within the 30 days.

Commissioner Evans suggested he work with staff as he didn't know. He thought that, once you start the ball rolling, at least you are working on it, and he would not put a deadline on it. He stated that staff has done that, and he would relay it to staff. He just asked if he would be able to do that.

Mr. Loeswick responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Clifford referred to the 30 days, and if he goes ahead with his drawings and pulls his permit, he asked staff if the 30 days to make the changes would be extended automatically. He stated that you have six months on a permit before the first inspection.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that the 30 days were applying to addressing the current violations, and not the implementation of the project and making it compliant. She stated that they tried to keep them separate. She stated that they wouldn't recommend having anything alter the 30 days, as the condition stated that nothing will be extended based on any appeals or delays to the approval due to the significant safety concerns of the unpermitted living space. She stated Condition No. 1 addressed the current violations and Condition No. 7 allowed for more time with the approved entitlements.

Commissioner Clifford thought she answered it for him and the Commission.

Commissioner Campbell moved that the Planning Commission finds the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVE Variance PV-517-16, Site Development Permit PSD-812-16 and Coastal Development Permit CDP-373-16 by adopting the resolution included as Attachment C 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 **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Clifford
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.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS:

3. CDP-376-16

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CDP-376-16, filed by owner, Joshua Moore, to construct a one-story addition of approximately 661 square feet and attached deck of approximately 250 square feet to the rear of an existing single-family dwelling at 1493 Grand Avenue, Pacifica (APN 023-021-110). Recommended California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) status: Class 1 Categorical Exemption, Section 15301.

Assoc. Planner Murdock presented the staff report.

Joshua Moore, owner, explained the cause of his delays was with his contractor, and he hoped he could now get this done sooner rather than wait another two years. He thanked Assoc. Planner Murdock for his hard work and dedication on this project. He stated that he hoped he could answer any questions.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he had read in the report that there had been issues about the sprinkler system. He asked if that issue has been settled earlier.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that he wouldn't describe it as an issue, simply a point of applying the applicable California Fire Code requirements. He stated that staff didn't want to make it a surprise for the owner, but it hadn't been amplified in the previous report and approval. He stated that there would have been an opportunity to make the owner know the fire sprinkler retrofit for the entire home applied to the project but requests to the owner's engineer were unresponsive. They didn't have an earlier opportunity and they chose to point it out in the report and in conditions of approval.

Commissioner Clifford didn't think it would be an issue for the Commission, but rather the applicant and the building official.

Commissioner Baringer stated that, on looking at the vicinity map, it looked like the house was constructed across two lots. He asked if he was correct to assume the lots were tied together some time ago and they don't have to address that now.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that he had not noticed that the site consisted of two lots. He thought he might be referring to the sewer easement.

Commissioner Baringer reiterated that he was looking at the vicinity map and it looked like the house was constructed across two separate lots. He thought the three houses in a row on the front page of the plans was a technical issue but he thought they should verify that and clean it up at the same time. He stated that, being a title issue, it shouldn't be that big a deal.

Assoc. Planner Murdock stated that he could check to see if the lots had previously been merged. He stated that it wasn't a focus of the review previously. Even if that was the case, he thought it was routine.

Commissioner Baringer agreed that it wouldn't normally be, as they would assume it had been done when the original structure was erected. He added that, if not already done, they can clean it up at this point.

Assoc. Planner Murdock agreed that they could, but added that it wouldn't necessarily be required and would put an additional burden and cost on the applicant.

Commissioner Baringer asked if they would let it ride because it was grandfathered.

Assoc. Planner Murdock didn't understand his question as there was not an issue.

Commissioner Baringer stated that, most of the time when constructing on the top of property lines, the jurisdiction requires that they tie the two lots together and record it before they will issue a permit to build.

Assoc. Planner Murdock understood, adding that he was not aware of a Municipal Code requirement to do that. He stated that there was a function in the city's subdivision standards where substandard lots are merged, and that may have been the case with this lot in the 1980s, when large swaths of the city were subject to changes in state law that triggered the process. He stated that they could look to see if that was done.

Commissioner Baringer stated that he didn't think it was a big deal. He likes the project and would like to do what they can to expedite this.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing and, seeing no one, closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he liked the project and couldn't remember if he was on the Commission when this was originally approved. He stated that it has been approved once before, with no substantial changes and he didn't see any reason to second guess the original Commission that approved it.

Commissioner Clifford moved that the Planning Commission finds the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVE Coastal Development Permit CDP-376-16 by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A; and incorporates all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Clifford,
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.

4. S-117-15

SIGN PERMIT S-117-15, filed by Ruth Bennett of JB Sings, Inc., to construct an approximately four-foot wide and six-foot high, double-sided monument sign containing a total of 30.36 square feet of sign area at 137 Manor Drive, Pacifica (APN 009-141-320). The on-site sign would be located within an island at the front and center of the existing commercial parking lot. Recommended CEQA status: Class 11 Categorical Exemption, Section 15311(a).

Asst. Planner O'Connor presented staff report.

Commissioner Baringer stated that he visited the site and was concerned about a five-foot setback from the sidewalk as it was a monument sign. He stated that, if you pull up to the sidewalk, you will not be able to see oncoming traffic, adding that they appear to have plenty of room to move the sign back if they want to. He asked if they were planning to do two poles and pull up in a car to see if it blocks it and make a determination on site.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that a qualified engineer can do a site analysis to make sure the areas that a motorist would need to make safe maneuvers in the area are clear from any obstructions.

Commissioner Baringer stated that it was typically a 10-foot setback rather than five feet to get it past the front dash of a normal passenger car to see cars coming. He stated that, other than that, it looks fine.

Commissioner Clifford mentioned that the report stated the landscaping will be done at the same time as the sign, but he didn't see landscaping in conditions of approval or Commission's approval of the project.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that it was part of the plans, and the approval of the project would approve the landscaping, referring to L1 which shows the placement and proposed species.

Commissioner Clifford concluded that the landscaping will be happening at the time of the sign going in. He asked if the landscaping was subject to approval of the Planning Director, adding that it wasn't specific about what the landscaping will be, other than drought tolerant and native.

Asst. Planner O'Connor stated that the plan itself detailed the botanical name and species of the exact plants they are proposing to use and a diagram shows the proposed placement of each species.

Commissioner Clifford thought he missed that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the Commission could add a condition stating that the construction drawing submitted shall include a landscape plan in accordance with sheet L1 of the plan submitted.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he would be more comfortable if that was in their approval, if they approve it.

Jeff Bennett, JB Signs, stated that they will be doing the installation of the sign and someone will be doing the brick work and the landscaping when they are done installing the sign. He stated that he had been given a new 20-foot pole sign, still in his shop, as he stated that they have to do it the right way.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing and, seeing no one, closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Campbell thought the project looks good, and he emphasized the need for the study on the visual safety aspect, adding that Ocean Shore School was there and there were a lot of children cutting across the parking lot and a lot of parents moving in and out of that parking lot. He stated that he has been hit by someone coming out of the 7-Eleven who couldn't see and he would like the analysis done for the safety of the children to be taken into consideration.

Commissioner Evans agreed with Commissioner Campbell, adding that he also liked the idea of the lower monument sign. He stated that he lives up the hill from that location and thought it looked better than the old one. He added that it might not blow over. He hoped the engineer would take care of that.

Chair Gordon stated he was also concerned about the five-foot setback and the possibility of someone pulling out and having their ability to see laterally being impaired by the monument sign. He asked confirmation that she stated that an engineering study will be done. He asked how their concern would be addressed.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the engineer will do a site distance analysis to determine if the site distance was adequate for clear vision for anyone making a turn there. She thought it was probable that the engineering division has already done that, but they might like to see an independent civil engineer stamp the design and put it in the file.

Chair Gordon asked if the independent evaluation was in the conditions of approval.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Chair Gordon stated, on checking, that it didn't say anything about it being an independent person, asking if he was missing it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister agreed it doesn't appear to say that.

Chair Gordon asked if they could modify it by stating there will be an independent analysis or was it implied since the applicant will get it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought they will be hiring someone to do that.

Commissioner Clifford asked, if engineering goes out there and cannot find a safe space, whether the applicant will return and put a pole back up. He thought that the pole sign was put up in the first place for line of sight.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, if the designs change so dramatically that it goes from a monument to a pole sign, it would need to come back. She added that, if it needs to move back or over slightly, that would be substantially consistent with this approval.

Commissioner Clifford thought an engineer will be looking at it and determine whether or not it was safe at all, adding that was where he wanted to go.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Chair Gordon asked if they have to reopen the public hearing.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they can vote to reopen the public hearing.

Commissioner Campbell moved to reopen the public hearing; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

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

Mr. Bennett stated that, in other cities, they typically have an outline for the speed limit of the street, the setback of the sign and the distance from the driveway to the sign, and they call it a visibility triangle. He stated that they put that on the drawings to show there is enough setback for that speed limit and it helps with the process. He added that, if Pacifica doesn't have those guidelines, he didn't know how that works. He added that the city normally gives them the guidelines. He suggested that he could come up with Palo Alto's guidelines and show them, but he didn't know if that will satisfy what they need.

Chair Gordon thought those guidelines will come from the independent analysis.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought engineering may have those guidelines, but they want an engineer that is not the City's engineer to put those on a plan and stamp it and say that they have analyzed it and it was a safe place for the sign.

Chair Gordon closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Evans moved that the Planning Commission finds the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVE Sign Permit S-117-15, 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 Clifford stated that he would second it if they had a condition dealing with the landscaping.

Commissioner Evans stated that he had no problem adding that.

Commissioner Clifford stated that the Planning Director had the exact wording of that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the project plans shall include landscaping as shown on Sheet L1 of Attachment C.

Commissioner Evans had no problem with that addition to the motion; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Baringer, Evans, Campbell, Clifford,
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 Clifford wanted to draw the attention of the Commission and public to an article in the Sunday Business Section of the San Francisco Chronicle about new laws to make second units easier. He wasn't going to read it, but the article covers new state laws that they will have to get in line with, or have their own similar laws. He then stated that he was so pleased when reading the minutes to see that CalTrans will be working on the pedestrian over crossing. He stated that he was the one who went to the Council meeting with a 15-pound chunk of concrete that had fallen off of it onto the road, requesting that they fix it. He was pleased that it was going to be redone.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister referred to Commissioner Clifford's comments and stated that she had planned to let the Commission know that there will be several legislative matters before them to make recommendations to the City Council, with one being the accessory dwelling unit ordinance update to comply with state law, as well as implementation of Proposition 64, a complicated issue involving several departments, including police, finance and taxation, in addition to planning, and they will be adopting zoning ordinance standards dealing with marijuana dispensaries.

Commissioner Campbell referred to Prop. 64 implementation, and asked if there will be a period where they haven't adopted an ordinance but it becomes legal to establish one of these facilities and will there be time given in the state proposition for cities to come up to speed.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the proposition requires that any marijuana dispensary not only get a permit from the local jurisdiction, but also from the state. She stated that the state

will not be issuing permits unless the local jurisdiction says it is okay to issue permits. She explained that some jurisdictions have moratoriums in place. She stated that the state will not likely be issuing permits until January 2018.

Commissioner Campbell asked what was going on with the old Denny's site.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that Kimco has an application submitted to tear down the existing building and rebuild a two-unit commercial building, one space is slated to be a restaurant and staff's understanding is that the second space is still available. She stated that they are wrapping up some revisions to their plans and will be ready for a hearing with the Planning Commission relatively soon.

Commissioner Evans stated that he had also heard that the state would not be issuing marijuana dispensary permits until 2018.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, because the public asks a lot of questions of planning commissioners, Chief Steidle was putting together an FAQ for the community and she will make sure the Commission gets the link when available.

Commissioner Evans thought they will need the help.

Commissioner Baringer stated that he has been reading that Half Moon Bay was looking into the retail dispensary part, as well as the actual cultivation part from a land use standpoint, and he hadn't thought about that. He thought that could be a substantial opportunity for the City, given the open area we currently have. He thought it was more complicated than just identifying it as a place you can grow marijuana with security issues, etc., that will come into play. He thought that might be a part of the entitlement process the City could consider as a commercial creation of jobs and land use that was different from what you would normally think of as an agri-business type approach. He then asked if there was any status updates on the house that was moved from the bluffs. He stated that it has all kinds of signs on it but still seems to be there.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the owner was involved in, and qualifies for, a grant to help fund the demolition of the home. She stated that the lot would then be ultimately dedicated to the City to further the coastal trail in the area. She stated that they will have an item in front of them at the next meeting to approve coastal development permits for demolition for, not only that unit, but also the house immediately to the north.

Commissioner Baringer concluded that they have abandoned the venture of moving the house to another lot and relocating it there.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she can't say it was abandoned as she didn't know the outcome of the state grant but it looks likely that they will get it and that process involves demolishing the house.

Commissioner Baringer asked if their timing expired and they have to extend anything. He thought they had a short fuse as he recalled, and he thought the time has passed. He couldn't recall if they gave Planning the opportunity to extend it unilaterally.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she did one extension and they need to come in for their regular CDP. She stated that will be what they will be hearing at the next Planning meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Clifford moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:01 p.m.; Commissioner Baringer seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister