

## MINUTES

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

June 13, 2023

7:00 p.m.

Chair Hauser called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: Commissioners Devine, Berman, Leal, Godwin, Wright and Chair Hauser  
Absent: Commissioner Ferguson

Chair Hauser stated that Commissioner Devine is participating remotely. She asked her to confirm that she is participating remotely under AB2449 because of a contagious illness preventing her from attending in person.

Commissioner Devine confirmed that.

Chair Hauser stated that she is also required to identify any other individual, 18 years of age or older are present in the room at the remote location from where she is calling and identifying the general relationship she has with any of the individuals physically present in her location.

Commissioner Devine stated that she is alone in her office, but her husband and two children are in another part of the house.

Chair Hauser stated that all votes will be by roll call due to Commissioner Devine's remote participation.

**SALUTE TO FLAG:** Led by Commissioner Godwin

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director Murdock  
Asst. City Attorney Sharma  
Sr. Planner Cervantes  
Asst. Planner Snodgrass  
PW Dep. Director-City Engineer Yip

Chair Hauser invited the public to comment on order of agenda and, seeing no one, asked for approval of order of agenda.

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

Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Devine, Berman, Leal, Godwin, Wright and Chair Hauser  
Noes: None

Chair Hauser stated that they have a process because of conflicts of interest, and asked any commissioner with a conflict of interest to state the conflict for the record.

Commissioner Berman stated she has a financial conflict of interest due to her company's involvement with the project.

Commissioner Leal stated he has a financial conflict of interest due to ownership of real property within the vicinity of this project.

Chair Hauser stated that she has a financial conflict due to her financial interest at City Vendors as the Executive Vice President and partner and there is a nexus between the decisions of the Planning Commission and the income she receives from her employer and, while not a source of income, under the political reform act, her husband is a board member for NCCWD, the applicant, through which he receives compensation.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that Commissioner Ferguson had a locational conflict located within 500 feet of the project location.

Chair Hauser stated that four Planning Commissioners have financial conflicts of interest that prevent them from participating in the public hearing and the conflicts of interest would prevent the commission from having a quorum to act on the proposed project, therefore, it is necessary to elect one commissioner among the four with conflicts of interest to participate so the Commission may have a quorum. One commissioner's participation is legally required under the political reform act. She stated that staff has prepared a slip of paper with the names of commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Hauser and Leal and has placed them in the vessel at the staff table. Staff will mix these slips of paper and randomly select a commissioner to participate in the public hearing.

Sr. Planner Cervantes selected slip of paper with Commissioner Berman's name.

Chair Hauser stated that Commissioner Berman has been selected randomly to participate in tonight's public hearing. She thanked the other commissioners for attending this evening and they can depart Council Chambers so they can proceed with the meeting.

Chair Hauser and Commissioner Leal left the dais. Planning Director Murdock explained that due to the fact that neither Chair Hauser or Vice Chair Leal have been selected to participate in tonight's hearing, the Commission must make a motion to select a chair to lead the remainder of the meeting. He asked them to make a motion to nominate one of the remaining commissioners to serve a chair so they can proceed to the public hearing.

Commissioner Berman moved that Commissioner Wright serves as the chair during this meeting; Commissioner Godwin seconded the motion.

Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **3-0-1**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Devine, Berman, and Godwin.
Noes:	None
Abstain:	Commissioner Wright

Planning Commission Minutes

June 13, 2023

Page 3 of 28

Planning Director Murdock stated he can read the agenda item title while Acting Chair Wright prepares to run the meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 1. PSD-857-22  
CDP-435-22  
UP-130-22  
PE-194-22**

**File No. 2022-0007 – Site Development Permit PSD-857-22, Coastal Development Permit CDP-435-22, Use Permit UP-130-22 and Parking Exception PE-194-22**, for demolition and replacement of portions of the existing North Coast County Water District Headquarters site, and construction of a new two-story administrative building and other site improvements on an approximately 0.8-acre site located at 2400 Francisco Boulevard (APN-016-322-230).

Recommended CEQA Action: North Coast County Water District, acting as lead agency, has determined the project is categorically exempt from CEQA as a Class 1 Exemption, CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) and Class 2 Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction).

Acting Chair Wright asked for directions on the process for him.

Planning Director Murdock stated that staff provided the script with the required steps, and asked if he has it in front of him.

Acting Chair Wright responded affirmatively.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they read Item #1 and the next item, #2, he requests disclosure of any ex parte communication by any participating commissioners.

Acting Chair Wright requested reporting of any ex parte communications by any commissioners. He stated that he spoke with Planning Director Murdock at length as well as Sue Vaterlaus but that is the extent of it.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma concluded that there are no ex parte communications to report, and next is the staff report presentation.

Acting Chair Wright asked for the staff report.

Sr. Planner Cervantes began the staff report.

PW Dep. Director-City Engineer Yip completed the staff report.

Acting Chair Wright asked Commissioner Devine to raise their hand if they have a question.

Planning Director Murdock asked if he had the ability to see her.

Acting Chair Wright responded affirmatively. He had a question for legal counsel, stating as there are only four commissioners voting, he assumes that the potential conflict of interest influencing voting was more important than the fact that the water department

has to have 75% approval to get it to passed as opposed to having five commissioners when they would only need 60%. He asked if that is the overriding principle.

Asst. City Attorney wanted to understand his question correctly.

Acting Chair Wright stated that, if they have five commissioners, to get a majority then need 3 which is 60%. If they have four commissioners, they still need 3 for approval and that is 75%, so it is higher bar for them and he thought it was a little unfair to them and he wondered if the conflict trumps the fairness, which is the way he is reading it. He asked if that is the idea.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that the number of votes needed to make a decision at this night would require a majority of those present and able to vote, and the situation, in order to make sure the item is heard they need a quorum and she doesn't see it as a matter of fairness, as it would be unfair for the matter to not be heard.

Acting Chair Wright understood and he asked if it was staff's opinion that asking for the diagonal parking, the Water Department's concept was that they were going to take away two parking spots by adding the additional driveway and this was an attempt by their architects and staff to replace those and it was actually good will that made them to desire to not impact the community in an adverse way in terms of parking. He stated that it seemed to him that was their attempt based on what he sees.

Sr. Planner Cervantes asked him to rephrase the question.

Acting Chair Wright stated that it seems that they were trying to replace the parking spots that they were taking away and he asked if that was the way staff perceived their request for diagonal parking.

Sr. Planner Cervantes stated that, in the project materials, the applicant never explicitly stated the reason for increasing the on-street parking. It was staff's interpretation that they want to create as much parking on their vicinity as possible and they found diagonal parking as a solution to providing more parking spaces in their vicinity.

Planning Director Murdock added that, as compared to the project conditioned by staff and recommended to the Commission, the project would not result in a net increase in spaces compared to the conditioned proposal from staff, and in any case, it would be a net increase of one space and there are tradeoffs as staff has explained in terms of safety, right of way management, etc. If the Commission were to support the angled parking proposal as further detailed by Dep. Director Yip.

Acting Chair Wright stated that what he is hearing is that both sides are trying to consider the public good, and he was glad to hear that.

Commissioner Godwin had a related question. His recollection from reading the earlier reports is this project requires 30 parking spaces and there were a couple of ways to accommodate those, either provide the 30 parking spaces as off site or off-street parking in the design, pay an in lieu fee for any parking spaces that they are unable to provide in their design so the total of parking spaces and in lieu fee payments total 30 spaces, or another alternative is that they could use parking stackers that are more common in Europe and the east coast and have much fewer parking spaces but accommodate the 30 cars with some mix of service and parking stacking spaces or ask the city for a zoning variance and develop some on street parking which is the option the applicant selected. He asked if that is a correct assessment of where we are at this point.

Planning Director Murdock thought it was largely correct, and they would call what he described as a zoning variance as a parking exception, a specific type of approval that the city can grant when, due to unusual circumstances, an applicant cannot meet the full off street parking requirements of the zoning code. He noted that the applicant has proposed to increase the off-street parking by five spaces from 15 to 20 with their proposal which is a significant improvement proportionally. However, it is still a significant number of spaces short, 10 spaces, from the required off-street parking should be according to the zoning code.

Commissioner Godwin wanted to be sure the problem was framed in his mind correctly.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, clearly there is no allowance in staff's opinion, in the zoning code, to count on-street spaces towards off-street parking requirements as they are separate issues, one a zoning requirement for off-street parking related to a use and the other more generally a convenience factor or, in the coastal zone, a visitor serving component so people can access the coast and park for free on public streets so it is apples and oranges as they are talking about parking numbers between off-street and on-street.

Commissioner Godwin stated that is not part of the solution and just saying they want a zoning variance and diagonal parking, and an unrelated but similar thing, if the city chose to make these angled street parking changes, there would be some reason to argue that the project could be done successfully with fewer off-street parking but, as he said apples and oranges, two different things.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they are apples and oranges from a zoning compliance standpoint.

Commissioner Godwin stated that is what he thought and why this question is interesting.

Planning Director Murdock understood that at some qualitative level, a user of a private development site, such as the Water District project, might use on-street parking and that is understood, but it cannot be counted towards compliance for the off-street parking requirements as that is the critical issue.

Commissioner Godwin thinks he understands the problem.

Commissioner Devine hoped that staff could address the TSPP spot as she didn't hear anything about that. She would like to hear if there are plans from staff on how to address this.

Sr. Planner Cervantes stated that she would see in the staff report that it is referenced as temporary safe street parking in the analysis and the findings for the project and there is a condition of approval that states that the parking space does need to be relocated.

Commissioner Devine understood and asked what the process was for doing that and how realistic is it.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, in the course of reviewing the project, in discussing the mechanics of constructing the project with the Water District, they determined that the project would likely have an impact on the occupants of the space and it wouldn't be possible for them to physically remain there due to some of the construction related components, and with the conditions structured from staff in the draft resolution, the Water District would need to identify an alternative space and propose that to the City Manager to ensure that where ever that alternative space ends up being at the time it is needed is suitable to the city in terms of its form, location and the overall temporary safe parking program requirements and operational components. They don't have an alternative space identified now, and don't know precisely when it will be needed relative to the Water District's construction if the project's approved, but there is a process for the city to review and participate in that relocation decision.

Commissioner Devine asked if that generally needs to be along the boundaries of their parcel.

Planning Director Murdock stated that there is no specific locational requirement relative to the project site or properties boundaries.

Acting Chair Wright wondered if staff could speak to what the Walgreen's experience is with the diagonal parking there so they can have some historical real-life data as it is on pretty much the same street.

Sr. Planner Cervantes stated that staff did look into some other locations throughout the city, including Walgreen's, and the angled parking there, and they were unable to determine the exact time that it was approved. They know the angled parking existed in that general area prior to the Walgreen's being approved at that site. One thing that is quite different from the Walgreen's location and what is being proposed now is that Walgreen's area is a commercial area and it is used for a multitude of different businesses in that area. She knows the engineering team can probably speak more about some of the

safety conflicts that exist at that location now. She stated that is one of the reasons why staff has concerns regarding safety of proposing new angled parking throughout the city.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated, within PW engineering, they receive calls regarding the angled parking along and in front of Walgreen's occasionally. Speaking of the risks with angled parking, it is probably most comparable on Palmetto compared to Francisco in terms of the type of street as this is an arterial. He stated that the draft local roadway safety plan that the city is currently working on is close to ready to be brought to Council for adoption. It identifies several streets in the city as in the high injured network of our streets have a higher risk of collisions and results in serious injuries or fatalities. One of the streets on the high injury network is Palmetto and Palmetto in front of Walgreen's has these angled parking being proposed. In terms of Francisco, it is not currently on the high injury network at the moment.

Acting Chair Wright asked if he happened to know the width of the Walgreens spaces, as he finds them extremely tight and how does it compare to the width of what is being proposed.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated he didn't know that number off the top of his head, but he thought it would be similar.

Acting Chair Wright asked if he was correct regarding a comment he read that a consideration for moving the bus stop would actually offer inclement weather shelter in the new location.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that staff met with Adrienne Carr from the Water District yesterday and SamTrans and looked at available options for relocating a bus stop. One proposed was directly underneath the highway overpass and there is some shelter there. As mentioned in the Water District's letter, this is pending Caltrans approval because anything beneath the highway is Caltrans right-of-way. If they were to relocate there, they would need Caltrans approval for that.

Planning Director Murdock stated, having identified that alternative as recently as yesterday, there are a number of factors that need to be evaluated and, as mentioned in PW Dep. Director Yip's presentation, if the Commission were so inclined to allow the new driveway which would result in a relocation of the bus stop, there would need to be a thoughtful review and approval by the city engineer once those additional factors are more carefully considered.

Acting Chair Wright stated, if they are going to do all those considerations, it sounds like it may be a good idea either way and if they are going to do all the work, there might as well be benefit out of it regardless of the outcome of this meeting. He appreciated the thoroughness on staff's part.



Commissioner Godwin noted reversed angle parking spaces appear to be safer than head in angle parking spaces, and he is asking the City Engineer if any of his opinions would change if he had a back in type reverse angle parking spaces versus a head in space.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated that they did look into a back in angle parking spaces as part of their review to see if back in parking spaces would have better visibility if they were to put bike lanes next to them and it was correct, and they have better visibility when pulling out onto oncoming traffic. He stated that, when you reconfigure with back in parking, you will not be able to get as many parking spaces as you would with the ones backing out, and they would potentially lose a space due to the location of the stop sign and the proximity of the first space, they have some visuals to show that later on. He thought it would be helpful to see a visual as they put some effort in putting some visuals together as they explored this option. He was trying to illustrate the vehicle attempting to back into the first spot. In order to do that, you have to pass the cross walk striping and it is not as straight forward as backing into parallel parking as people tend to know you are right next to a spot and backing into it. In this location, as you pass the crosswalk striping, the vehicles behind you will likely move preventing you from being able to park into that first space. That was a conflict that was brought up in the Fehr & Peers report. He stated that Francisco is an arterial as he mentioned and a lot of traffic, if it starts backing up on the highway, a lot of GPS's will redirect them onto Francisco which they have seen on certain weekends when it gets very busy and this could be a potential congestion conflict. Another issue is the compliance, and backing into parking spaces are relatively new, on a street in San Francisco and you can see that people may park front first, and in this they have reached a yellow line in order to enter this parking space and if this were to happen on Francisco, they will be attempting to back out onto an arterial street. He stated that there could be delineators to prevent that, but it could be hit. There is a maintenance for the short staff services team and overall there is maintenance for future slurry, researches and projects as well.

Acting Chair Wright stated he did not have the visual of Commissioner Devine. He then asked if she had any questions.

Commissioner Devine stated that she had a question regarding the third driveway. She understands that, without some sort of redesign, this would not occur. She understands it is a condition of approval but what would need to happen to ensure, such as a redesign, and asked if someone can clear it up for her.

Sr. Planner Cervantes stated that staff's preference would be a redesign of that driveway area in order to be able to better accommodate the proposed water refill station with two driveways.

Acting Chair Wright asked if there were further questions, and seeing none, he opened up for public comment.

Planning Director Murdock asked if he was opening the public hearing.

Acting Chair Wright responded affirmatively.

Planning Director Murdock stated that he needs to get the applicant situated and take care of some technological adjustments.

Acting Chair Wright saw some cards.

Planning Director Murdock stated they were ready when Dr. Carr was ready.

Adrienne Carr, Ph.D., applicant, asked if she can start first before she introduces her team.

Planning Director Murdock stated that she has ten minutes for the applicant presentation.

Dr. Carr understood including introducing her team.

Planning Director Murdock stated that she will have three minutes for a rebuttal after the general public comment.

Dr. Carr stated she had her team with her, Director Anne De Jarnatt, Vice-President Joshua Cosgrove, Director Ron Ash, Attorney Pat Niaki, President Jack Burgett, architects Amy Watson and Scott Valli, who are all present to answer any questions. They have Nat Levine, traffic engineer on the phone, and Vivien Yu on Zoom and Robin Berrell from Hanson Bridget to answer questions. She thought their Director William Hauser is participating by Zoom and a former board president and director of 28 years, Tom Piccollotti. She then began her presentation.

Acting Chair Wright stated he cannot see Commissioner Devine and asked if he was supposed to.

Planning Director Murdock didn't know if they have the ability to show her during the actual slide presentation but they can bring her up once the presentation is completed.

Dr. Carr continued her presentation, giving details of their background since before the city was incorporated and their goals then and now, explaining that the present facility is aging and undersized and their future plans for their new facility, ensuring water safety for all citizens. She then turned it over to Vice President Cosgrove.

Vice President Cosgrove completed the presentation by explaining that they have a vision and they urge the Commission to approve that vision.

Acting Chair Wright opened public comment.

Chris Redfield, Pacifica, stated he was asking the Commission to approve the resolution conditionally, Nos. 12, 13, 24, temporary safe parking program, and shared his thoughts and concerns on all of them.

John Keener, Pacifica, thanked the Commissioners for serving, and was speaking in favor of the new headquarters, and shared his thoughts and concerns on several conditions.

Christine Fuller, Daly City, stated she was speaking on behalf of her family and friends who live in Pacifica. She is in favor of this development project to move forward, and shared her thoughts on the project.

Tom Piccollotti, Pacifica, stated he was in support of the project as submitted, and shared his thoughts on this project regarding the importance of their goals.

Curt Kiest, Pacifica, stated that he values their recycled water program, and he gave his thoughts on the plus for this expanded facility and requested the deletion of Condition No. 24.

Jack Burgett, Pacifica, thanked everyone for listening and supporting this project which he also supported. He then shared his thoughts as a member of Pacifica on the various aspects of this project.

Asst. Planner Snodgrass introduced the call-in speakers.

Brent Turner, Pacifica, stated he supported the project as designed, and shared his thoughts on several issues.

Steven Poggi, Pacifica, stated he uses the recycle refill station, and he supports this project.

Acting Chair Wright asked if they should give the applicant their three minutes for rebuttal now or after commissioner questions.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they should allow them their three minutes for rebuttal before entering into Commission questions.

Jennifer Barba, Pacifica, stated she was in total support of this project that the water district is trying to push forward, and shared her thoughts on the project.

Acting Chair Wright opened the three-minute rebuttal period for the Applicant.

Vice President Cosgrove thanked them for this opportunity to provide a vision of the water district headquarters. He stated that it is important to reach out to the community which they have done. He was baffled by city staff's response to this process and stated that in his 30-year career in local government, he hasn't seen this happen. One speaker stated that they were being treated like an out of town developer and that is how it feels to him. They represent the city and safety is of the highest importance. He stated that the third driveway is critical to this project. He stated that, as mentioned, the board members have a duty to the residents of Pacifica and their safety and protection was their priority and what they did. They are happy to answer any questions they have. He urged them to approve the vision they have brought forth. He stated that obstructions cost money and the project will get more expensive to the residents if it continues to be delayed.

Planning Director Murdock shared many of the sentiments of the Water District as an applicant as it is an exciting project and an opportunity to modernize their facility which provides a critical service to the community to improve safety for their staff and customers. He stated that it is a significant improvement of the onsite improvements, and it is only limited to the narrow issues in the public right of way where it affects the public where the city has concerns and they expressed

those with their expert analysis and opinion, and they thought there was a reasonable way forward with respect to the bus stop location and driveway, and he has some ideas on that when the Commission wants to explore that. They feel strongly with respect to the angle parking proposal and the overall right of way and considerations that it presents and staff hopes the Commission understands from staff's perspective.

Acting Chair Wright asked if it was appropriate to close public comment at this time.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma responded affirmatively.

Acting Chair Wright closed public comment, and asked if it is time for Commission questions of both applicant and staff.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Devine stated this has been a huge lift on the applicant's part and on staff and she thanked them both for their incredibly thorough material and expertise and their patience. She stated that one thing is troubling her, i.e., their former city engineer, Mr. Bautista, felt that the diagonal parking would be a positive addition and lends the Commission and staff into inconsistent messaging which she believes erodes public trust. She asked applicant if their traffic expert could come up and talk about the positive benefits of the diagonal parking in juxtaposition to what staff has said earlier. She wants to try to understand this from both staff's and applicant's perspective.

Acting Chair Wright asked if it was possible for that person to be heard.

Planning Director Murdock asked their traffic engineer, Nat Levine, to unmute himself and come on camera.

Engineer Levine stated they have done some analysis for the operations of the parking stalls. He thought her question is well intended and he wants to give the district the opportunity to talk about the overall benefit. From the minutiae points they keep saying about safety and parking, he thought it was an interesting situation, where they hear arguments from one side and points they hear other arguments and points from the other side, and it does feel like they are talking past each other instead of together. He stated, as far as safety, the Fehr and Peers study cites a study from the Oregon DOT prepared in 2000, they use data from Nebraska and Midwest cities from 1990 and 1980 and explain that, when there is sufficient parking in an area, you shouldn't be looking to diagonal parking and parallel parking is preferred in those cases for safety. He isn't refuting those issues as there is old data there, but there are safety concerns. However, he doesn't believe there is any conclusion on the aspect of sufficient parking. The Sharp Park Specific Plan that was referenced by staff talks about there is sufficient parking and the Sharp Park Specific Plan only talks about what is called occupancy, and they counted how many cars were on the block and didn't look at what is called capacity and they say they have seven spots and there are two cars in there therefore they have 2 out of 7 and that is a capacity, and they just said there is two cars. It doesn't go into capacity and making the statement that they have sufficient parking. He can't say if it is true or not as they don't have the data and that Specific Plan doesn't go into it. He stated that it goes back to the safety of this claim that staff is making that it is unsafe. He isn't going to argue about what AASHTO comes up with or about how there is bike interaction with cars trying to pull in or out of diagonal stalls, but there is no class 2 or bike lane facility here and

it isn't identified as a bike corridor so they can't get into that detail. He wants to focus on the overall safety about parking occupancy which he thinks is so important to everyone in the community as well as for this project and it is what are they trying to do and how are they impacting either occupancy or capacity and they don't have that capacity data. He will now hand it back to the district to talk more about the overall benefit of the diagonal parking.

Dr. Carr stated that the diagonal parking will benefit the access that their customers have to their headquarters. There is a shortage of parking along Francisco and this will add spaces along Francisco for not only their customers but people who come to their board meetings or other events. They have landscape classes and other community events and will probably host other community events for other city organizations in their new multi-purpose room. She stated that this is something they want to provide for the community as a feature. Parking along Francisco is an arterial street and that is an appropriate place for a larger amount of parking and not on a residential street, and that is again why they moved the entrance to Francisco and took it off Brighton and they think it will benefit by adding attractive landscaping and planting and will make the neighborhood look nicer.

PW Dep. Director Yip wanted to respond to some of the comments.

Acting Chair Wright agreed, but first wanted to make sure Commissioner Devine doesn't have any more questions for the applicant before they proceed to that.

Commissioner Devine is okay.

PW Dep. Director Yip would like to address the claimed mixed messaging that has been provided to the Water District in terms of staff's comments to the project. He stated that the first time the traffic analysis was submitted to study, Sam Bautista was no longer working for the city, and he was here to review that first review. He stated that he was here to complete the items in terms of the angle parking, and as far as he can see in the records, he didn't know if he can determine whether or not Sam Bautista was in support of the project, as he didn't know what the discussions were in terms of the addition of the stop sign and he only knows what our current staff has told him during the fourth review. As far as the first three reviews, they came in three times in 2022 and he reviewed the email that Sam Bautista and Adrienne Carr had some sort of discussion about a stop sign but that was in late 2021. Sam Bautista still approved completeness letters requesting the Applicant remove the angle parking three times after that email. He doesn't believe that engineering division had mixed messaging in terms of approval of the angle parking and he doesn't know what was discussed. He can only say that the stop sign warrants are not there and our traffic consultant could chime in a little bit more about what the primary warrants are and address some of the comments from their traffic engineer.

Traffic Engineer Erin Ferguson referred to the safety discussion around the angled parking and can speak more to the traffic, stop sign and warrants. With the angled parking, in the Fehr and Peers peer review memo, they said the study from Oregon DOT regarding essentially the conclusion that, if there is sufficient parking, introducing angled parking is undesirable as it increases the risk for collisions. Since then, the National Research published by AASHTO in the Highway Safety Manual, which is the manual for industry best practice for understanding what are different roadway characteristics or different roadway design decisions that influence and change the number and the severity of collisions that can happen on a roadway. In that highway safety manual, it also documents that, if you convert on an arterial street, parallel on street

parking to angled parking, then you can see the increase of collisions of about 50-54%. She stated that there are a couple of industry documents, research projects, that have clearly documented moving from parallel parking to angled parking on an arterial increases collisions and it is not something that is trivial.

Acting Chair Wright asked what was the year of that 54% number.

Traffic Engineer Ferguson stated that the manual was published in 2010.

Planning Director Murdock would like to briefly chime in on the reference to the Sharp Park Specific Plan information on parking. There was an assessment of weekday evening occupancy, weekday, midday occupancy and weekend midday occupancy and it was not an in depth parking analysis of the sort that might be done to analyze this issue in extensive detail, but it does relate the available capacity to the percentage of vehicles observed on each segment in a parking lot. As it relates to the Clarendon and Francisco to Brighton and Francisco segment, that is the focus at this time. In the weekday evening occupancy, it indicated 25-50% of capacity used on street parking. In the weekday midday occupancy, it indicated 50-75% utilization and on the weekend midday, it was 25-50% utilization. He stated that, of the available capacity on that street segment on that block, it is finding that the three different periods analyzed relatively low utilization, and certainly not of the 75-100% which is the high end of utilization that is seen in some segments in other parts of Sharp Park. On balance, it is one of the lesser utilized blocks of Sharp Park in terms of capacity of on street parking that is utilized at the periods observed.

Acting Chair Wright asked if Commissioner Devine had any other questions.

Commissioner Devine stated she did not. She appreciated the information.

Acting Chair Wright asked if there were any other questions.

Commissioner Godwin stated he will stay on parking for a little while. To further expand on what he said earlier, there was plenty of room in the NCCWD land to put in parking stackers and park lots of cars, more than 50, and he asked why they didn't consider parking in their final design and not have this issue over the change of zoning.

Acting Chair Wright assumed it was a question for the applicant.

Commissioner Godwin responded affirmatively.

Scott Salge with Nollan and Tam Architects stated he will respond in the spirit of how they are attempting to park the site. The corporation yard has limited space and their proposal includes parking for all the staff on the site and the balance of parking that they propose to be exempted for the project is supporting the multi-purpose room, for board meetings and moments when that space is used, and they will see in the documents that there is a breakdown in parking related to those uses for the building and the dominant need is for staff for being there every day and the balance of parking is hoping that the streets can accommodate the moments where they have public coming to the district. They hope the public comes to the board meetings to further understand the benefits the Water District is providing for the city and its community, and that was how they structured the parking strategy. They wanted to leave the corporation yard as available as possible for them to have the operations safely managed, be able to move vehicles

around, move things out of the way if they need to adjust, and parking stackers do provide more limited access to parts of the site, but those are stands and physical attachment to the ground so it has some limitations and they didn't incorporate it into their project.

Commissioner Godwin stated that, given that off-street parking is safer than street angled parking in all the studies he has read and what he heard from the city at this meeting, he asked why they don't just pay the in-lieu parking fee for the number of spaces they are short for the off street parking.

Dr. Carr stated that they have not said that they would not pay an in-lieu parking fee, although they have an agreement with the city that they share costs as the city is their biggest water customer. The city does not pay a bi-monthly supply and distribution charge that the rest of their customers pay, which is about \$90,000 a year for all the city accounts. She stated that they have a working relationship with the city in all sorts of benefits that they provide to each other. She stated that the city patches some holes for them that are smaller than 100 square feet, they come if they have a leak, if they open up the street, the city will patch that for them as long as smaller than 100 square feet, and they have an existing agreement going back to the 1970s, but when they first applied for this project, they met with Planning Director Murdock in May 2021 and they discussed potential parking exceptions and it could be a charge to the district or it could be recommended as a parking exception. She stated that may be a question for staff if they would recommend a parking exception for this project. She stated that they interacted early with staff and reached out to find out what the city wanted and that was how they designed their project. They also met with engineering in October 2021 when they got their information from Sam Bautista where they presented all the different parts of the project and he liked the diagonal parking as he thought it would add to the neighborhood and he was the one who recommended to them to study a stop sign at that intersection because if they want to have diagonal parking you should probably put a stop sign but do a traffic study and see what the engineer says. That is why they did that study as they hadn't proposed a stop sign before Sam Bautista had suggested it. In their first round after submitting their planning application in March 2022, they got comments and incompleteness determination in April 2022 and they had removed diagonal parking and they were very surprised because when they had talked previously, they had gotten a positive reception from engineering and they requested to meet with them. All they got back is that diagonal parking is unsafe, and they didn't get the list of engineering conditions until PW Dep. Director Yip sent the letter in February. They didn't get the conditions and weren't able to review them from engineering until that time. She stated that they asked engineering about why diagonal parking is unsafe and they said they weren't sure and suggested that they do a traffic study, and they will consider it then. That is why they did the traffic study. They were also told that there was a TFPP parking spot there now so that is an issue, and that was the first time they learned about that parking spot being placed in front of their headquarters. They thought engineering just conveniently said don't put diagonal parking as it would be inconvenient for their TFPP program which they designated that as a spot and it came into being between the October 2021 conversation and the April 2022 letter they received to remove diagonal parking. She thought they would create parking for the neighborhood and they think it's a good feature for the project.

Commissioner Godwin stated, to make sure he understands her lengthy answer, she is okay with the in-lieu fees if they pay them partly in services as well as cash as an alternative to the angled parking or are they not in favor.

Dr. Carr stated that they want the angled parking.

Commissioner Godwin concluded that she is saying they are unwilling to go ahead with the project if they put in a condition as the in-lieu fees instead of the angled parking.

Dr. Carr stated she is not saying that.

Commissioner Godwin stated he needs a clear answer on this, is this an alternative.

Dr. Carr stated she has not considered what the cost is and she does not know the in lieu fees and she doesn't think their angled parking provides enough for the number of spaces that would need to be provided versus the in-lieu fee. She doesn't have a number in front of her and she is not sure if she can make a determination as to whether they should make their ratepayers as it is just going to make their water bill higher if they impose that fee on them. She stated that they are robbing Peter to pay Paul, i.e., robbing the Water District customers to give Pacifica a dollar. She stated that they already pay each other and it isn't very logical.

Commissioner Godwin asked if the project will go ahead without the angled parking or will it stop.

Dr. Carr stated that a decision for the board of directors but they are very in favor of the project with the diagonal parking. She cannot say that's a policy decision or another elected body. She is the General Manager of the agency and they would have to consider it at a public meeting if that were the decision of the Planning Commission.

Planning Director Murdock wanted to clarify that there is no clear basis for the Planning Commission to impose payment of the in-lieu parking fee. It is an option for the applicant to propose that as one of their parking strategies and acceptance of the payment needs to be approved by the City Council. In a hypothetical example, unrelated to the project, he says there is a project in the Sharp Park Specific Plan area that, for whatever reason does not want to provide off street parking, even though they could, that is a text book example of where they may propose as part of their project to pay the in lieu parking fee so they can utilize that space for other purposes besides off-street parking and the city could use that funding to provide and operate off-street parking facilities in some other centralized location. Where the facts support granting a parking exception, that still needs to be granted even with payment so it is not an either/or in terms of parking exception or payment of the in lieu fee and, in any case, the applicant would need to propose payment of the in-lieu fee as part of their project. In his opinion, it is not something that can be imposed on an applicant.

Acting Chair Wright thought that was useful to know, adding that he thought they had some further insights in response to his question and he thought it would be beneficial to help him get more information on his question.

Mr. Cosgrove stated that, as mentioned, the diagonal parking as a board member, he has been at all of their meetings and the board has been clear in their direction that the project must have diagonal as they are trying to maximize parking for their customers that come from all over Pacifica to conduct business or attend meetings, perform their constitutional right to come to a public meeting and their intent was to maximize parking with the diagonal and the board has been clear that they don't have a project without that diagonal parking.



Acting Chair Wright asked him how many parking spots are they actually gaining as a result of the diagonal parking.

Mr. Cosgrove stated he would have to look, he asked his staff how much are they gaining.

Dr. Carr stated that they are gaining two spaces at the bus stop.

Mr. Cosgrove stated that when the bus stop moves they will gain two.

Planning Director Murdock stated, while Commissioner Godwin is preparing his next question, he wanted to remark on the bus stop and the driveway and that particular issue on Clarendon Road. He stated that, not only did staff previously analyze the construction of a new driveway and had potential safety concerns with line of sight while a bus may be at the bus stop and someone is exiting the new driveway, they also had written comment from SamTrans prior to the May 15 public hearing that had been scheduled where they were concerned about construction of the driveway and the impact to their bus stop and operations. He stated that new information as recently as yesterday that SamTrans may in fact be open to relocation of the stop and that is important new information in staff's perspective. As mentioned earlier, they think there may be a way to provide some flexibility for the temporary and permanent relocation that might facilitate construction of the third driveway while also suitably relocating that space and it would have the benefit of them providing two additional on street parking spaces, given the removal of the no parking zone that currently exists at the bus stop. He stated that there is potentially a net positive outcome in terms of on street parking if the bus stop can reasonably be relocated and they have information to suggest that may be possible, given the on sight meeting yesterday with SamTrans.

Acting Chair Wright asked if that would change staff's conditions of approval, such as would that possibly shift their opinion on the diagonal parking or would that not change.

Planning Director Murdock stated staff's concerns on the angle parking are multiple. The fact that, on balance given the overall project, it may not result in a major increase as he thought it was a net increase of one space, that is one concern. On the driving concern of safety, they have no reason to oppose angle parking if it could be safely constructed and allow sufficient management of the overall right-of-way, but whichever way staff looks at it, they don't believe it can be done safely and they think it would be at the expense of multi-modal transportation which the General Plan calls for and they really think they should have a separate conversation about angled parking and the Clarendon bus stop/new driveway are distinct issues with distinct considerations.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated before Commissioner Godwin asks a question, they have spoken a lot about engineering review, and he wanted to point out how engineering division conducts their reviews. They look at projects from an engineering feasibility standpoint and they are engineers. If this project were to come from Public Works, Wastewater treatment, he would have the same comment when they conduct and pull building permits. They are under the same building codes, fire codes, and this is purely an engineering comment. He stated that, if Sam Bautista had seen the traffic analysis from our consultant, he doesn't know what his response would be, but that was the first time he saw it and he is seeing a stop sign being proposed for angled parking and the two other stop signs at this location are the two closest ones next to Clarendon are for the purposes of getting across Highway 1 and they are over 1,000 feet to 2,400 feet away. They are looking for

the best interest of the public as well and he understands there are board meetings and the public who go to their counter and pay bills and pull permits, and the engineering division pulls permits for the sewer and for all encroachment permits and they have two 15-minute parking spaces in front of their office and they are looking for the impacts to all 40,000 residents in Pacifica who will pass by Francisco and have to stop at Brighton now and they are looking for the best interests of the public. In addition to that, they talked a lot about traffic and the safety but also about our bike plan. There will be future bike plans and he agrees with them that Francisco is not on the bike master plan and there will be future bike plans. There are probably bike plans that would not have been there 10 or 20 years ago and there were fewer people biking then. There were no E-bikes back then that would be helping someone to climb our hills but they are here today. He wants to point out that it is in the policy in the General Plan to have multi-modal in our city and the addition of the angled parking is going to prevent that for all future bike lanes because you will not be able to place them behind the angled parking the way it is currently proposed. The bike plan was done before this areas was adopted as a PDA which will open it up to future grants and bike lane grants are the most abundant and easy to get from all the types of grants and they will be able to possibly get a grant to install more bike lanes in the city and build our system to make it easier for people to bike and this also will define our downtown which we want to make it multi-modal and give better access to people in addition to just vehicles.

Commissioner Godwin stated his next question is for the applicant. He stated, given that they vet their reclaim of water customers and there are relatively few of them, he asked if they can partition their parking lot in a way that there is a group of people who can come in and use the reclaimed water tap and there are other employees and other people who can use the entire lot as opposed to creating a third driveway.

Dr. Carr stated that she didn't know if they had a chance to look at their plans closely.

Commissioner Godwin stated he did.

Dr. Carr stated that it is really tight because they have the new solar canopy and they are going to be generating their solar electric over the parking and it is next to their interesting fuel station and it needs to remain where it is and they need to accommodate their new auto shop and a really important feature of this project is the wash rack and they will be able to wash their vehicles in a safe manner so nothing goes into the storm drain that would all go into the sanitary sewer which is now vehicles should be washed. They are going to comply with all the storm water codes. It was developed in the 1960s and now they are going to have all this compliance. There is no other room on the site for a recycled water station but at one of the edges of their property. If they had the one driveway, they would have to come in and here is no room for them to turn around or back out so if they just have one driveway, they would have to have some sort of turnaround for a vehicle and that takes up a lot of room on their property. They have the other driveway that they use in and out for their vehicles all day and they don't think it's a great idea to have a recycled water customer to come in their recycled water driveway and exit out their other driveway and they have where they just had to put things on their site. They have a storm water treatment bas in that will be in that location and they wouldn't be able to have customer drive through that area. She stated that, having a self-sustaining separated from staff and property secured site really makes it function better for the community. They think it can be done safely. When they first met with the city engineering department, they said just put a right turn only sign, and that was the only request that Sam Bautista had for them when they discussed this recycled water drive through and he said that sounded good but make sure that customers aren't turning left onto

Clarendon from there as that would create a hazard. So they made it a one-way signed, right turn only, and that will make it safe for our customers.

Mr. Cosgrove stated that the corporation yard of the Water District, as has been mentioned, is an emergency operation center where emergency vehicles come out of there responding to drinking water leaks, numerous times, on a monthly or weekly basis. He stated that how its designed in there has to be very carefully designed which is what they have done. He stated that moving things around is very difficult for them to do as emergency vehicles are coming out of there. On the parking situation, he wished he could take them all out to the site now, and he can show they what happens where the parking ends up in front of homes because of people who come to conduct this business at the Water District and there is a parking problem there. He has been on the board since 2004 and lives nearby, and there is a parking issue there. All they have to do is go look at it and he can show them.

Planning Director Murdock stated that, whatever the Commission may have interest, they have one mark up of a potential alternative to show that they have tried to think of alternative ways to satisfy the district's desire for a dedicated and recycled water filling location while also avoiding the need for a third driveway. He stated that Dep. Director Yip can speak to that.

Acting Chair Wright would love to hear that but he asked that they adjourn for two minutes.

Acting Chair Wright called a recess then reconvened the meeting. He stated that staff suggested they had potential alternatives.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they needed a moment to bring up a visual. He stated that Dep. Director Yip will walk them through the schematic that shows a concept where the existing driveways remain and no new driveway is constructed and potentially the dedicated off-street recycled water filling station could operate with a pull through for residents in a secured area beyond for the Water District's operations.

Acting Chair Wright asked if it was possible to do a split screen with their original plan so they can see what the difference is between the new proposed plan at the same time or is that done by the shading.

Planning Director Murdock wasn't sure he could do that at this time.

Sr. Planner Cervantes stated that the proposed site plan is the first layer and they can see below and the staff's markings above their proposed site plain.

PW Dep. Director Yip stated it is an alternative design that was discussed with their last slide in response to their letter and potentially they could first move the gate further inward and the whole outer portion of the site is exposed to the public. The previous concerns were if a bus was parked in front of their new driveway, it would cause a line of site issue regardless if someone was turning right or left. if it were to come out too quickly, oncoming cars on Clarendon could hit them and this would prevent that as vehicles can only turn right at the latter part of the site and make a right turn and then, when they exit they will be behind the bus stop. This alternative will not be dependent on the bus stop relocation and any Caltrans approval. The bus stop can remain where it is and it seems like its feasible and can work with the storm water facilities on site. He

believes it can still work and they can still have some water treatment and meet CEQA requirements.

Planning Director Murdock stated, as he mentioned, the initial analysis here was assuming the bus stop remained. With the information they have gleaned from Sam Trans yesterday that they are open to relocating the bus stop, with this alternative proposal, they could actually yield an increase of three on street parking spaces by removal of the bus stop which will be two spaces and removal of the proposed third driveway being a third space. With those modifications, they could achieve the number of on street parking spaces that the district is seeking to increase with the angled parking without introducing those safety concerns that staff has identified on Francisco from the angled parking.

Acting Chair Wright asked if the applicant had a chance to review this plan.

Sr. Planner Cervantes stated that this was done by staff in response to the letter that was sent today.

Dr. Carr stated that they sent the letter on May 15 with the same comments, so they know that they did say the importance of this driveway on their comment letter they submitted on May 15 and they haven't received any response from the city since that date either. She stated that this is a new plan. She knows their trash enclosure is right there. They have to have access for a trash truck and that is one of the biggest things that they need to accommodate in this area and that was one thing that her architect, upon seeing this plan, they have been working on this for a long time. If the direction of traffic were this way, if they had their third driveway, the car could go in that middle driveway and circulate and turn right only out of the driveway and if it just goes in in the new curve cut, that would also achieve the same things and wouldn't have the blockage by the bus. If the red arrow was in the middle curb cut, it would achieve the same thing and also separate out that recycled water drive through as a single feature in their project.

Mr. Salge stated that, in addition, there is a real desire from the district to separate district vehicles going through their gate and vehicles serving the recycled water. They want to separate those two functions and that is why they created the driveway in the first place as they want all the vehicles, trucks, back trucks, large vehicles coming out of that automatic gate for the district to be separate as he thinks that helps safety on that street and doesn't cause a conflict between recycled water users and the district operations through that gate.

Acting Chair Wright asked if he is understanding correctly that, if instead of entering down as they are looking at the screen, the plan is up above the head, and instead of entering on the left, if it was entering in the middle one, that would be an acceptable potential solution for them.

Dr. Carr stated absolutely. She clarified that in the middle driveway. She stated that, in the third driveway they would add, they could enter in the middle driveway and exit out the one on the eastern driveway. They would like to reserve the western driveway for district vehicles in and out because it is their in and out way and they have trucks that need to rapidly respond and go out.

Acting Chair Wright thought that could be a solution as opposed to doing the additional driveway.

Dr. Carr stated that they will need the driveway to go in and they could come out the existing driveway to the east which is already there and they have an existing curb cut there.

Acting Chair Wright stated that they just want to move the red arrow over one driveway.

Dr. Carr agreed, stating that will work for them.

Acting Chair Wright asked if staff has an opinion about that.

Planning Director Murdock stated that would still result in the third driveway and the alternative was attempting to demonstrate the ability to not construct the third driveway and how that recycled water filling station would operate and the incidental benefits of this alternative would be an additional 2-3 on-street parking spaces, depending on they count.

Commissioner Godwin thought the objective here was to have everyone enter at the one point where the automated gate is further in and then the refill water users were leave via the curb cut.

Planning Director Murdock stated that is how the schematic would operate in this scenario.

Commissioner Godwin stated that is the point he was trying to make, that there are alternative ways of laying this out that are workable.

Planning Director Murdock stated that was the purpose. It was illustrative and is not a fully designed alternative concept.

Commissioner Godwin stated that it was just a thought.

Acting Chair Wright does understand the Water District's desire to not comingle the traffic, however, it is how do we serve all these different masters at once to come up with the best compromise. He was glad to see that they are trying to work together with some different ideas and come up with something that will work for everybody.

Commissioner Godwin had another question, i.e., the number of recycled water users at the moment, if he recalls correctly from the study, was about 20, and is that near the correct number.

Dr. Carr stated that they have 68 users but they have about 20 users who use it regularly such as on a weekly basis.

Commissioner Godwin stated that they are increasing the number of hours it would be open three days a week to about six days a week.

Dr. Carr stated that it would be open during Monday through Friday and then on weekends when they have staff at the district. They have staff on duty every single weekend but it depends as some weekends they need to be at their pump stations but when there is staff at the corporation yard, they open up the gate and it would be on a regular schedule because there are certain staff that are assigned different tasks and they have a schedule of when they are working on the weekends.

Commissioner Godwin stated doing some simple math, there are about 20 people using it and, over the new schedule, it will be over 5 or 6 day periods and they are looking at 3-4 people a day, and some come more than once.

Dr. Carr stated that people come more than once and they have heard from some people who use recycled water that their neighbors are reluctant to join the program because there aren't enough hours and she assumed they would have increased usership of the program and that is their desire.

Commissioner Godwin understood it is hard to quantify. Now, if the number of users remain the same they are looking at 4-6 people a day.

Dr. Carr stated that sometimes it can be ten people in a day even now.

Commissioner Godwin stated that is like one an hour, or maybe two an hour, and there is not that much conflict there if they shared a common entrance if that was the choice. It would be a minute or two once in a while.

Acting Chair Wright asked what the total number of hours increased.

Dr. Carr stated it would be six hours a week up to like 36 hours a week.

Acting Chair Wright thought it would six fold.

Dr. Carr agreed six fold and, if not seven.

Commissioner Godwin stated that the city suggested the design concept is not totally out of consideration, it is certainly not a design.

Dr. Carr stated that they would have to make sure the trash truck could make it in and she thinks that would compromise a couple of the parking spots that they had designated inside the fence.

Commissioner Godwin thought there was a lot to be done to turn it from a concept into a design. He wasn't trying to minimize that but there are thoughts that could be placed.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they talked about a number of different alternative and staff has identified a way to try to be supportive of a relocation of the bus stop in light of SamTrans' newly expressed interest in the ability to relocate the space. That would yield two on street parking spaces with removal of the bus stop and they are really talking about an increase of probably one on street space with the removal of the driveway. If they were talking about an alternative design and if it presented a lot of issues that the water District suggests it may, it is a difference of one space but that one space could be valuable to someone wanting to park there. He wanted to hone in on what the delta is between these different alternatives they are discussing.

Commissioner Berman thanked staff and be a third-party consultant for the thorough analysis and review that was completed. Also, the consideration for different alternatives which takes a lot of staff time and professionalism and respect. She is in support of the application in front of them with the addition of staff's conditions of approval that have been thoroughly discussed. Reviewing all of the staff report, the plan, both traffic analyses, she understands the city's concerns and she agrees with them. She also participated in the local roadway safety plan that the

city has been conducting for the past six months. She was a stakeholder for the Planning Commission with the traffic consultant who also provided the third party review for this project. She knows how understanding they are of the safety needs of the city because they spent six months going through it together very thoroughly, and they were very receptive of our stakeholder comments which did include parking concerns throughout Sharp Park especially and, with respect to safe and bicycle use and pedestrian use. She also was very passionate about the bike plan that they developed in the Sharp Park Specific Plan which also took a couple of months of our summer altogether which also had bike improvements that are more current than what is presented in the bicycle and pedestrian plan, not conflicting but, if anything, enhancing the bike and pedestrian improvement at this intersection which is a heavily used intersection and it is tight as there isn't a lot of room there. She is ready to make a motion whenever the chair is ready to hear one.

Acting Chair Wright stated he has a few questions of his own. He asked if she has any other further questions

Commissioner Berman stated she has no questions.

Acting Chair Wright asked Asst. City Attorney Sharma, if she is ready with a motion, does he need to entertain the motion or is he able to continue deliberations and then take motions.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated he may continue.

Acting Chair Wright just wanted to make sure he isn't stepping on any toes. He had a few questions for the applicant in regard to timing of when this project is done. He asked if their contractor was present.

Dr. Carr stated that they don't have a contractor as they have not put the project out to bid due to the fact that they don't have permits.

Acting Chair Wright asked if they will be upgrading their PG&E and where are they in that process.

Dr. Carr stated that they showed up in April and asked them to do the inspection. The inspected when they originally submitted their plans in March 2022 that they would be breaking ground in November 2022, so they are ready to take the project out to bid as soon as they get their permit.

Acting Chair Wright stated that, regarding PG&E, he has four projects in the city and he has been working with them.

Dr. Carr stated that they are ready and they have them on speed dial. They have a lot of projects too.

Acting Chair Wright asked how long it typically takes once they put something out to bid before they select a contractor.

Dr. Carr stated they usually open their bid period for about three weeks to one month.

Acting Chair Wright stated it would be three weeks before they select them.

Dr. Carr stated potentially, as they have all the documents ready to put out to bid and they are pending not just planning permits but they would also have to submit to the building department and get building permits.

Acting Chair Wright asked how long she expected that period to be.

Dr. Carr stated that they have been told by the building department that it is 2-3 weeks for their first review. She stated that they met with the building department as well and met with them first in 2021. They have talked about their project with the building department.

Acting Chair Wright thought he was hearing her say that they would be ready to break ground in about six weeks.

Dr. Carr stated that, if they get their permits at this meeting, she thought they would probably be ready in late August or early September to break ground. She didn't know when the notice to proceed would be, maybe that would be notice to proceed and then breaking ground would be after that.

Acting Chair Wright thought that was the last question on that, and he thought the PG&E time was a little bit optimistic.

Dr. Carr stated that a transformer doesn't have to be done at the first stage of the project. The project is scheduled in December and they had their project breaking ground in April and PG&E was going to install the transformer in September. They had shown up because that was the time when they were going to evaluate the project and that was their schedule. She didn't think the transformer work occurs right at the beginning of the project but about 5-6 months in.

Acting Chair Wright stated, potentially, the parking, you would have about six months for that mobile home to figure out some kind of relocation before it absolutely had to move.

Dr. Carr didn't know that answer. She stated they are having their storage of the materials that are going to be broken down from the building and it is going to be right in that area, adjacent.

Acting Chair Wright asked if on the street.

Dr. Carr stated it is not on the street but in the area adjacent so there will be heavy construction and she wouldn't want to live next to heavy construction site. It might be more kind to relocate occupants prior to the start of construction.

Acting Chair Wright understood she had been collaborating somehow to try to figure out a solution to that. He asked what period of time is needed for that.

Dr. Carr thought the city and district have talked about that it could probably happen soon but that is a question more for the city as they has jurisdiction over this item.

Acting Chair Wright asked if staff has a response to any of those questions.



Planning Director Murdock wanted to indicate that there are two conditions of approval that they would like to read modifications into the record and suggest that they be part of any motion to approve the project, if that is where the Commission is going. They have a third condition that they would suggest modifying, depending on where the Commission is at with respect to the third driveway on Clarendon which relates to condition No. 24.

Acting Chair Wright asked if they are able to break this down into the project minus the conditions and then vote on the conditions individually or does it have to be done all at once to see if there is enough support for each of them before they make a final thing or does it have to be an all or nothing kind of thing.

Planning Director Murdock suggested entertaining more discussion among the Commission about any particular issues that they are trying to read the pulse. They didn't think it was possible to split the project as proposed "from the conditions" as they have analyzed the project and the findings they prepared to support the various permit approvals are incumbent upon the conditions as they have been presented or as they propose to modify them. It is difficult to disentangle them from a complete analysis.

Acting Chair Wright asked if he could inform them as to what their new conditions of approval might entail.

Planning Director Murdock stated that they would suggest that any motion to move forward to approve the project would modify Condition No. 21 to be prior to final inspection, applicant shall grind and overlay existing asphalt with minimum 2-inch AC to the limits of all utility connections or to street center line, whichever is greater across entire property frontage along Francisco Blvd., Clarendon Road, and Brighton Road, all pavement markings and markers shall be replaced in kind by applicant. They would suggest removing condition No. 22 entirely. There is revision to Condition No. 24 which currently prohibits construction of a third driveway. They would propose a different condition entirely to address relocation of the bus stop but he doesn't have a sense where the Commission is on the question of supporting or not the construction of the third driveway. He doesn't know if there is a desire by a majority of the Commission to divert from what the staff has presented.

Acting Chair Wright thought now was a good time for them to deliberate a little more on the thought about the third driveway. He asked Commissioner Berman to enlighten them with her opinion.

Commissioner Berman was in favor with staff's initial recommendation to limit this face of the property to two driveways, and she appreciates Commissioner Godwin's questions regarding the capacity of people using the through driveway that helped her visualize what the use of this area may be, and typically she knows it is often avoided to try to have too many driveways in one close proximity location, especially near an intersection that is heavily used. She was in support of limiting to two driveways which will also add additional on-street parking and she would also like to see the applicant, the city and Caltrans work together on relocated the bus stop which would be subject to the city engineer's approval.

Commissioner Devine was in support of a third driveway as she feels like, if you are more than tripling the amount of hours of the service, most people cannot access because she works and the people using this is going to increase logically speaking. She is absolutely in favor of what

Commissioner Berman suggested in regard to relocating the bus stop as she doesn't necessarily feel like taking away the third driveway is sufficient. She was excited to hear Commissioner Godwin's thoughts.

Commissioner Godwin stated that, on Condition No. 24, he was in favor of a two-driveway solution and not in favor of a third driveway. He thinks it's a good idea to relocate the bus stop away from the driveway so there is less activity at that point and to the extent SamTrans and the city engineer and applicant can all agree on something and he thinks that would be of benefit to the project.

Acting Chair Wright stated to complete the division, he is totally in favor of moving the bus stop and, if everybody can work together on that, he would feel really good about that. As far as the driveways go, he was torn. He understands the desire to not congregate the traffic for a number of reasons, having sequenced a number of jobs himself and understanding the comings and goings. He was appreciative of the fact that they are talking about is a six-fold increase in the number of hours and the opportunity for people to avail themselves of recycled water. This is a big plus and they are setting a good example for a lot of communities in doing this. The best way forward on how to get there, without understanding better, is the two driveway solution at all workable for them.

Mr. Cosgrove stated that he would like to say that this is an emergency operation center and he works in the water industry and he thinks of it very much like a fire station. You don't obstruct a fire truck coming out of the fire station. A water truck coming out to respond to a public health emergency, i.e, a water leak, if you don't have water, it is a serious emergency and they design this so they have the utmost care in their emergency vehicles coming out of that facility and he can't stress that enough as these are emergency vehicles responding to public health emergencies.

Acting Chair Wright stated that, where he comes down on that is that, if it was feasible, he would be in favor of the two driveway solution but what he is hearing from the applicant is that they have pretty decent reasoning on why they would want three driveways and he falls in the three-driveway camp. Additionally, it is a super large lot. If they were all houses and it wasn't the water department, he imagines that they would be talking about more than three driveways for this lot which, for him, is another consideration. He asked if her motion still applies.

Commissioner Berman was happy to still make her motion.

Commissioner Berman moved that the Planning Commission FINDS the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, APPROVES Site Development PSD-857-22, Coastal Development Project CDP-435-22, Use Permit UP-130-22 and Parking Exception PE-194-22 by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A with a modification to Condition 21 and removal of Condition 22 and in Condition No. 24, the applicant, city and Caltrans working together to find alternatives to relocating the bus stop, subject to the City Engineer's approval; and incorporates all maps and testimony in to the record by reference.

Planning Director Murdock asked of the maker of the motion would be willing to slightly revise the motion.

Commissioner Berman agreed.

Planning Director Murdock stated if the motion is to keep Condition No. 24 as it is with respect to prohibiting the third driveway, he would suggest creating a new condition of approval that would go at the end to address the relocation of the bus stop and they have some language to suggest that are modified, suggesting, “applicant shall coordinate with SamTrans to temporarily relocate the Clarendon Road bus stop prior to commencement of construction, permanent relocation of the bus stop after completion of construction shall be subject to written approval of the City Engineer, including review of the proposed new bus stop location and design and any necessary approval by other agencies, including but not limited to Caltrans”.

Commissioner Berman so moved with that additional condition.

Acting Chair Wright asked clarification that the motion does not include the third driveway and does not include diagonal parking.

Commissioner Berman stated her motion does not include the third driveway and does not include the diagonal parking as the diagonal parking relates to Conditions of approval 12 and 13 and those are still in her motion.

Acting Chair Wright asked if there was a second.

Commissioner Godwin seconded the motion.

The motion carried **3-1**.

Ayes: Commissioners Devine, Berman and Godwin,  
Noes: Acting Chair Wright

Acting Chair Wright 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.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Godwin moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:51 p.m.; Commissioner Berman seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Devine, Berman, Godwin and  
Acting Chair Wright  
Noes: None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina  
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

---

Planning Director Murdock