

MINUTES

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

January 19, 2021

7:00 p.m.

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

Chair Nibbelin explained the conditions for having Planning Commission meetings pursuant to the provisions of the Governor's executive order, N-25-20 and N-29-20, which suspends certain requirements of the Brown Act and pursuant to the orders of the Health Officer of San Mateo County, to conduct necessary business as an essential governmental function with no public attendance allowed. He also gave information on how to present public comments participating by Zoom or phone.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser, Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Absent: None

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Vice Chair Berman

STAFF PRESENT: Dep. Planning Director Murdock

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA Vice Chair Berman moved approval of the Order of Agenda; Commissioner Leal seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser, Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Noes: None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
NOVEMBER 2, 2020
NOVEMBER 16, 2020** Commissioner Hauser moved approval of the minutes of November 2, 2020 and November 16, 2020; Commissioner Ferguson seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser, Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 25, 2021:

Chair Nibbelin asked Dep. Planning Director Murdock if he was correct that no liaison was required for the meeting.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

- 1. CDP-424-20** **File No. 2002-019 – Emergency Coastal Development Permit CDP-424-20**, filed by applicant City of Pacifica, for demolition of a portion of the Beach Boulevard promenade and repair of voids in the Beach Boulevard seawall immediately north of the Pacifica Pier.
Recommended CEQA Action: N/A.

Chair Nibbelin asked for the standard protocol.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that no staff report was required, but it requires public comment and a motion and vote by the commission. He stated that he was happy to provide a brief explanation of the item, which they typically ask for even though it was not necessary on the consent calendar.

Chair Nibbelin asked if, in deference to practice, they can hear from him on it.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that they probably know that, during storm season, the Beach Blvd. seawall has in the past experienced voids that sometimes result in failures of the wall and it happened again in December. He stated that PW staff noted the void that resulted in a portion of the wall allowing water to intrude and wash out some of the backfill, mentioning what was done and planning to be done by the end of January.

There were no comments.

Commissioner Hauser stated she would move to approve the consent calendar, and asked the Dep. Planning Director Murdock if she needed to use the terminology for the action or just simply to approve the consent calendar.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that either was fine.

Chair Nibbelin stated that they had a motion to approve and he asked if they had a second.

Vice Chair Berman seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

Planning Commission Minutes

January 19, 2021

Page 3 of 13

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser,
Leal and Chair Nibbelin

Noes: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

**2. Amend
CAP-8-18**

File No. 2020-020 – Amendment to Cannabis Activity Permit CAP-8-18 to modify requirements of Resolution No. 2019-031 of the Planning Commission of the City of Pacifica related to the timing requirements for the first-floor storefront window modifications (Condition of Approval No. 9) and payment of outstanding and applicable processing fees relating to the CAP (Condition of Approval No. 18) in relation to an existing cannabis retail operation approved in 2019 for retail sale of adult use and medicinal cannabis at 450 Dondee Way, Suite 2 (APN 022-021-640) in Pacifica.
Recommended CEQA Action: N/A.

Chair Nibbelin stated that the recommended action was to continue this to the Planning Commission meeting of February 16, 2021. He asked staff if there was anything else to be said other than what he has already read into the record.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock didn't think anything else was necessary as it was just requesting continuance due to non-availability of the applicant for the amendment and they were planning to reschedule it to February 16.

Chair Nibbelin thought they were hoping to entertain the motion to continue.

Chair Nibbelin opened the Public Hearing.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that there was one public comment.

Henry Barragan, Pacifica, stated that he was supporting the continuance regarding this amendment. He stated that he was the store manager of Rockaway Enterprise, and d.b.a. is Coastside Dispensary. He was ardent about this issue as there have been many moving parts to the first floor store front window modification that the city has enforced. He stated that this enforcement not only required the business to spend \$60,000-\$75,000 extra on this modification alone, but the store opening was pushed back a year. He stated that, as an employee and father, it has been hard with this postponement to make his monthly bills with the store opening being postponed and was a struggle to be fully employed. He stated that luckily the owners have granted him the opportunity of managing other projects otherwise his livelihood would have been devastated through this pandemic and abnormal times we are in. He stated that a lot of energy and capital has gone into their project and they were ambivalent about someone else not having to go through the proper steps they have.

Chair Nibbelin closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Ferguson moved to continue the item to the Planning Commission meeting of February 16, 2021; Commissioner Leal seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser,
Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Noes: None

3. TUP-1-20

File No. 2020-13 – Temporary Use Permit TUP-1-20,
Filed by Iglesia Ni Cristo to operate a church when a tent erected
beneath an existing covered arena structure for a period not to exceed
six months at 650 Cape Breton Drive (APN 018-170-060 & 022-
320-200) in Pacifica. Recommended CEQA Action: N/A.

Chair Nibbelin asked if there was anything additional to add at this time.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that there was not.

Chair Nibbelin stated that they were looking at a motion to continue the item to Commission meeting of February 16, 2021. He stated that there were a lot of people present with respect to this item and asked that comments be focused on the issue of the continuance request.

Chair Nibbelin opened the Public Hearing.

Chair Nibbelin asked commissioners, if they end up with a significant number of speakers but will be having a substantive conversation about it on February 16, if they want to look at whether three minutes is more time than they need.

Vice Chair Berman agreed, as the topic the community will be discussing was the continuance and they will be further discussing on February 16, that a shorter time frame for public comment.

Commissioner Hauser concurred with them on that matter.

Chair Nibbelin thought two minutes would be appropriate for the comments.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock acknowledge the two-minute period for public comments and then introduced the speakers.

Evelyn Taverna, Pacifica, stated that she lives within a few blocks of the proposed church site. She will be brief because of the continuance. She stated that at the Open Space and Parkland Advisory Committee meeting where the church representative presented the plan, she had four issues of concern. On traffic and parking, she thought their estimates were way off. She stated that they were up against a very high fire area in the area and there is only one way in and out in that location. She thought it would impact that area for people to be able to evacuate. She stated that the other issue was noise and sanitation depending on the number attending the church. She stated that their plan was open air where the corral is now, and she stated that noise transfers readily in that area. She asserted that her main concern was traffic and evacuation issues and she hoped that they strongly look at that.

Karen Poiani, Pacifica, appreciated the chance to speak. She asked why the agenda item was being delayed until the February meeting.

Chair Nibbelin stated that this was not a question and answer period but her comments are noted.

Mary Ann Waterman, Pacifica, stated that she owns the property directly attached to the corral. She stated that her grandchildren live there and run in the street. She asked why they dismissed her question about being continued. She also asked where this came from to be at this site which

is not a commercial site but open residentially zoned site. She stated that there will be traffic, noise and littering. She stated that they are the furthest street from the police and fire in all of Pacifica and they are going to bring in hundreds of more people into their tiny street. She stated that she has many questions and two minutes is not enough time, i.e., traffic, zoning, why they entertained this idea, and bringing outsiders into the back of the valley with one way in and one way out. She again asked why it was continued and why they dismissed Ms. Poiani's question.

Michael Casey, Pacifica, stated that he has lived on Cape Breton for almost 50 years, which is normally a tranquil and peaceful area. He stated that they have a lot of people living at home due to the pandemic and economic situation and the preexisting fact that kids are graduating from college and they should be talking about the ever increasing number of people and cars before the church proposal. He stated that this was new to him. He thought there might have been one article in the paper, but he was present because someone unknown put a flyer on his porch. He stated that there was some talk about houses only within 500 feet of the corral would be considered or email or informed on the dialogue. He asked about being 600 feet away, stating that it was an arbitrary limitation. He agreed with Ms. Waterman on every point she made. He asked who they are, what they are all about and where are they headquartered and what is their philosophy and approach to the community. He asked if they have written a paper to the neighborhood to comment on why the neighborhood should welcome them. He was not against churches, but he didn't think they needed another church for all the reasons mentioned. He thought there was a lot that the community needs to be told about who they are and why they are doing this.

Lucy Shepperd, Pacifica, stated that she shares a fence with the corral and have several young children as well as other young kids and dogs, and they enjoy the neighborhood being quiet and they love the corral which she thought was a good addition to the community. She asked why they weren't told that this lot was even up for sale. She stated that a lot of them are on NextDoor and they have seen the commotion this has caused, and she doesn't know why it is even being entertained at this time. She stated that she checked on this church and they have a shady past. She thought it would bring more crime to our neighborhood and she didn't know why it was an option. She agreed with everyone.

Jewel Walli, Pacifica, agreed with the last speaker and she felt that they were bamboozled in this as they never heard the land was for sale. She didn't hear anything about it until she read about it on NextDoor. She thought, if they knew the land was for sale, they could have possibly had the Pacifica Land Trust buy this land and they could have continued to use it as park space. She was not on the street and the traffic will probably not affect her, but it will increase traffic. She stated that her children ride their bikes on Oddstad and there will be wear and tear on the road. She stated that they are small streets and she thought the traffic was already terrible. She stated that there were only two exits from the valley. She stated that, during the Paradise fires, she and her husband had suitcases packed as they were afraid that their community would have to evacuate quickly. She stated that they are going to be having more homes in the back of the valley with the Oddstad homes by the Pacifica School District at the Oddstad School site which will also increase the traffic, and she would like to see more transparency on what is happening before any decisions are made, especially with a church that meets five times a week and is not a quiet Sunday event.

Lori Yap, Pacifica, stated that she lives on Cape Breton. She understands the continuance and is fine with that, but she thought it would be helpful if they would explain how the process works as a lot of them are new to this and it was hard to find out about it and got the word out with the flyers when they heard that only those within 500 feet were going to be informed. She stated that those who are new to this need the process explained to them to have their voices heard.

Lauri C. Pacifica, stated that she lives in the back of the valley and she asked that Planning Commission consider contacting everyone that is within 500 feet of the bordering land that the church has purchased without the permit and would include Glacier, Cape Breton, Big Bend and St. Lawrence, and not just 500 feet from the entrance but those that border the land owned. She also seconded the opinion that the numbers given at the Open Space Committee did seem to be low and there were a lot of questions asked. She was curious that even though more than 20 people expressed concerns about the potential plan and this entity decided to go ahead with the purchase, knowing that they didn't have the permit they wanted.

Sheri Stoddard, Pacifica, stated that she was calling from Maui, Hawaii where she lives, but she grew up on Cape Breton Drive and her retired mother still lives there and her brother lives with her and helps to take care of her. She stated that the streets are very narrow and she worried about her mother getting in a car accident with the cul-de-sac at the end for turning around. She hopes they are doing there are doing their homework regarding the hills as they have slid before with mudslides. She stated that this church has 7,000 locations throughout the world in 151 countries. With all the churches in Pacifica, she didn't know how they bought the property without any neighbors knowing. She referred to the amount of anxiety everyone is going through and thought about hearing church bells five times a week in a quiet, peaceful, calm area with wild animals and she can't see a huge mega church. She stated that it was heartbreaking and she was concerned about it. She understood that it was continued to February 16 and she looks forward to hearing about it and questioned whether it can be prevented.

Cleo Borac, Pacifica, stated that she is Jewel's neighbor and not in the immediate proximity of the site on Cape Breton. She stated that her daughter took horseback riding lessons and she has done a little bit of homework and looked at the papers filed, especially the traffic report as she thought everyone was worried about evacuation in case of fire. She stated that they are comparing the traffic and the church said it was going to be very low such as 40 cars per day, which she thought was hard to believe. She stated that they compare it to a stable in San Juan Capistrano. She asked why the person doing the report went to San Juan Capistrano to look for a stable that has comparable traffic. She stated that the stable, Sycamore Trails, was with no less than eight arenas and about ten round pens and she was counting 22 instructors. She stated that it was a huge stable with an enormous amount of business in Orange County where there was a lot of interest in horseback riding. She stated that the conclusion of the traffic report was that the church was going to have less than the horseback riding facility would have. She disagreed with that and she thought they should look at why the traffic report was compared to San Juan Capistrano. She asked why they couldn't find something closer that was more similar in size.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock asked those dialing in to give their names for the records.

Chair Nibbelin also asked that the speakers focus on public comment that pertains to the request to continue as this will be continued and discussed at length at the February 16 Commission meeting.

Toni Sills, Pacifica, stated that she lived on Cape Breton and wanted to be sure Planning Commission takes into account that it will impact more than just 500 feet from the stable as there are other areas that will be impacted by traffic, noise, additional crimes that might come because of the mega church. She thought the boundaries set need to be reset, refocused and revisited. She thought narrowing the scope doesn't give them a good idea of the impact it has in Park Pacifica. She stated that there will be continued conversations at the next meeting, but she also thought there needs to be someone who can take a look at their streets, seeing how narrow they are and understanding what they live in to assess whether this is the right decision to allow the mega church to come. She stated that others have made this comment, but she stated that they have two parked cars on both sides and they cannot pass two vehicles as four cars cannot be in the lane. She stated that the infrastructure has not been made to fit that level of vehicle driving in and out of the facility.

John Schultz, Pacifica, stated that he has lived on Cape Breton for over 45 years and raised his children. He is also outraged like his neighbors who have stressed their concerns. He stated that, with little research, they can discover that the INC church, a non-traditional religious sect, has mega cathedrals throughout the world and we don't one in Pacifica. He stated that INC plans to have services six days a week with hundreds of vehicles up and down the street. He stated that they currently occupy Serramonte Del Rey which is Jefferson Union High School District building and there are hundreds of cars there every day having services. He would like to speak again in February to bring more concentration to this issue.

Erin Macias, Pacifica, stated that she was stunned because she was not expecting any conversation on this topic as she expected it to be continued to the next meeting. She stated that she has started a petition to have the Planning Commission, City Council and staff take a hard look at the historical use of this property. She stated that she was fortunate to spend 4 ½ hours on this today at the Pacifica Historical Society reviewing the documents associated with this parcel and she pointed out that chain of title is broken. She stated that, without question, until they have a clear picture of the use of the property, it was ridiculous that they would consider any temporary use permit and it warrants extensive discussion and investigation by the city and the new owner. She stated that the historical use of the property was something that is critical to the environment and culture of Pacifica until the eviction of the current leaseholder at the stables. She would like to see it continued and keep an open mind to a variety of issues that result from this temporary use permit.

Isabel Christensen, Pacifica, stated that she lives in St. Lawrence Court and she was the original owner of her home. She was very upset about never being notified that the stables are going to be sold to this mega church. She stated that, like everyone who talked about the traffic and having services six days a week, she was sure they will be having weddings, funerals, fundraisers, etc., which will bring in so many people and so many cars. She stated that the traffic is unbelievable from 50 years ago. She was also concerned with the stables and people going up the trails behind her house. She referred to past mudslides, stating we have had lots of mud slides since then. She still has drainage problems, and she asked if the church will be responsible for the drainage, upkeep of the mountain and trails. She stated that it doesn't make sense to have a mega church in a small community on a cul-de-sac.

Rebecca, Pacifica, felt this was a very inappropriate setting for a mega church due to the traffic and she thought it would not work. She stated that they need to be where they have better ingress and egress access. She stated that she lives on Oddstad in a townhome and they have enough

traffic and parked cars already, and with that kind of traffic going up and down the road, it will be a mess. She did not see that it would work unless the city is going to widen streets and give them a better way to get in and out. She thought it was not quite right and she felt it was something that got thrown at them. She stated that it was not the right setting for a mega church and they need to find somewhere else with better and wider streets.

Neil Hayak, Pacifica, stated that he has lived on Cape Breton for ten years. He doesn't have much to add. He was also surprised by this and it was because someone left a flyer on his door that he became aware. He stated that his main concerns were the noise and traffic it will generate. He stated that he and his wife are looking to start a family and they have concerns for what it will mean in the future. He stated that he sees many kids playing on Cape Breton. He stated that they haven't talked about the impact on property value. While he wasn't planning on moving, this church coming certainly may change that decision. He was surprised by it and does not support it.

Zalmon Morris, Pacifica, stated that he is studying city planning as his major and did a lot of research on environmental reports. He stated that he has some serious concerns about changing the use of this property. He stated that the environmental information form included with the application is wildly incomplete. He stated that there were a number of areas, i.e., Section 34, where they are required to address historic and cultural benefits and it was not mentioned, as well as no mention made to the noise level that would increase with cars that the site will make, and no mention in Section 23, no mention has been made to the wildlife that may be affected. He stated that there are mountain lions and people have seen mountain lions on the premises. He stated that mountain lions are a protected animal and are being constrained in the Santa Cruz Mountains and the mountains behind Pacifica. He stated that, if we change this land use and increase the number of people this could interfere with mountain lion habitat and he thought, under CEQA, they are required to make the applicant get a report that examines any type of CEQA violation. He stated that he wasn't against it and welcome them to owning the property, but he does think they have a responsibility to make sure that the application is complete and make sure they are taking the environmental factors into consideration.

Charlotte Allen, Pacifica, understood that they will be continuing this item to next month. She appreciated that, and as a proud Pacifican, she wanted to draw attention to the number of people who have attended and wanted to speak just on postponing the topic, let alone over 5,000 signatures on the petition that is circulating. She stated that the amazing points that have rightfully been brought up such as the history, culture, traffic and the life safety that this imposes. She hoped that the reason they are postponing this to next month is because they also understand the ramification of all the issues that have been brought up at this time. She hoped that everyone who wants to speak at next month's meeting, which she assumes will be a lot of voices, will have the opportunity to be heard.

Chair Nibbelin closed the Public Hearing. He then referred to his comment about the public comments not being a question and answer format. He stated that it was very common that questions are raised in the public comments to staff and commissioners and are eventually addressed in the context of their deliberations. He asked if he was being heard properly.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he was getting some distortion.

Chair Nibbelin stated that it was not uncommon to get questions in the context of public comment that they ultimately discuss in deliberations with staff but it is not common that they enter into a back and forth in the course of public comment. He stated that there were questions raised in regard to why the matter was continued. He thought staff may have the opportunity to speak on why the continuance request was made and to address other matters that came up. He asked Dep. Planning Director Murdock to address the reason why this item was continued.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he would like to touch on that point and why this application is even being considered as he thought that was an important fundamental point. He stated that it was being continued because the approval of a temporary use permit, such as the one that Iglesia Ni Cristo has requested to operate a temporary church, required the city to make certain findings, either to approve or deny the application. He stated that the proposal was relatively simple, but as many members of the community have expressed, there are a number of complexities to it in that the indirect impacts from traffic, noise, etc., require an appropriate analysis in relation to the findings the city needs to make if they were to approve the permit. He added that the site has some complexity in the way it is configured with respect to the city's zoning map and the site has split zoning. It was partial, in that a minority share of the site is zoned residential and the majority of the site in question for this application is zoned Commercial Recreation or C-R. Over the entirety of the site in question is the Hillside Preservation District, HPD overlay, and in analyzing this application, the city is required to consider the appropriate uses and policies as they apply to the underlying zoning districts. He stated that, even though it was a temporary use permit, it is more complex than typical temporary use permits and they found that they needed additional time to analyze all the relevant factors to make an informed recommendation to the Planning Commission. Regarding why this is being considered, he stated that Pacifica's Municipal Code has an assortment of uses and types of development for which people may apply for different types of permits. He stated that the temporary use permit is a type of permit that property owners can seek or their authorized agents can pursue on a piece of property with property owner authorization. He stated that, in this case, the city was not in a position to reject this or other applications without giving them fair consideration and assuring that they meet the application requirements in terms of minimum informational requirements and that is the due process right of this particular applicant and the city is fairly applying their right to apply under the Pacifica Municipal Code and ultimately to have a public hearing before the Planning Commission on this matter.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she supported staff's recommendation for a continuance on this matter, and she also appreciated the community input that they have gotten thus far. She stated that it was obvious that there are a lot of community concerns surrounding this project. She stated that they have gotten emails on the continuance and she understood it was a big deal. She referred to what a couple of community members asked, i.e., that since it was probably being continued, if there are future notices, can they potentially go out to 1,000 feet from the property boundaries as it was a big property and there are clearly a lot of people who are concerned. She referred to a few questions on the sale, and she stated, when the staff report is provided, it would be helpful to understand if this is a public sale or just a private sale.

Vice Chair Berman referred to some of Commissioner Hauser's and community members' questions, and asked Dep. Planning Director Murdock if he can explain the notification process in general for an item similar to this.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that state law requires for public hearings such as this, i.e., use permits, development applications, that the city provide a mailed public notice to property owners within 300 feet of the parcel or lot in question where the activity or development is proposed. He stated that Pacifica has expanded well beyond that minimum requirement to 500 feet around the parcel or lot in question. He stated that, while it seems like nearly a doubling, it was actually more than that in terms of the number of property owners receiving the notice with that increase in the radius. He stated that the city has expanded that property owner notification requirement to an occupant notification requirement. He stated that they utilized the San Mateo County assessor database for information on occupants in addition to property owners. He stated that they go well beyond the minimum requirements of state law in terms of providing mail notification. He stated that, for those who may live beyond the 500 foot radius that the city uses for noticing, they can send a message to publiccomment@ci.pacifica.ca.us in order to share their thoughts on the project. He stated that, if they do that in the case of this temporary use permit, they have assembled an extensive list of email addresses as well for persons who may not receive the direct notification from the city via US mail and they can assure those who have expressed interest in this application will receive notification of upcoming hearings. He stated that they have gone beyond the minimum legal requirements in this case by posting the project information on the city's website and interested members of the community can review the plan and explanatory information submitted by the applicant so they can ensure that those materials are transparently available to the community, especially under the current Covid-19 restrictions. He stated that they go well beyond the requirements of state law by expanding those requirements by a local procedure and he feels confident that those interested in being notified can contact the city to express their interest and ensure that they receive the notice. He referred to the boundaries of this site and stated that it was an extensive site. They have expanded the notification beyond the Assessor parcel to reflect the actual underlying lot. He stated that it is bigger than just the corral site. He stated that, per the city's procedures and requirements of law for notification, they were strictly applying the minimum notification boundary of the underlying legal lot. He didn't believe that they will expand that beyond the lot in question where the activity is proposed.

Vice Chair Berman thanked him for the thorough explanation and the effort in notifying the community.

Chair Nibbelin asked if there were any comments or anyone wanting to make a motion.

Commissioner Godwin moved to continue the item to the Planning Commission meeting of February 16, 2021; Commissioner Ferguson seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser, Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Noes:	None

Chair Nibbelin thanked everyone for all the public participation and input in that matter.

CONSIDERATION:

None

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

None

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he wanted to make sure the Commission and community know that on the following Thursday the Association of Bay Area Government executive board will consider the draft regional housing needs allocation. He stated that it was an extensive, statistical, analytical and public input process that yields at the end of the process each local jurisdiction's determined housing development requirements over the eight-year planning period. He stated that, for the Bay Area, the eight-year planning cycle begins in 2023 and the work has already been underway for some time to conduct that statistical analysis. He stated that, once the executive board from ABAG takes action, presumably Thursday, they will send the draft methodology for calculating the regional housing needs allocation to the state Housing and Community Development Department. He stated that they will take some time to review the Bay Area's methodology and will likely provide comment in the spring of 2021. He stated that, at that time, once the draft methodology has been endorsed, ABAG will release the draft allocation to individual jurisdictions, such as Pacifica and other cities and counties in the Bay Area, followed by an appeal period in the summer of 2021. He stated that, following the completion of that process, the final allocation is expected to be released in late 2021. He stated that, based on the current draft methodology, the estimated allocation for Pacifica over the eight-year planning period is approximately 1,900 housing units and it would take a drastic change in the methodology for that number to dramatically increase or decrease, but staff will track that very carefully and keep Commission, City Council and community informed.

He referred to the Planning Commission recruitment process, stating that the city was currently recruiting for two positions on Planning Commission. The first is a partial term expiring in March 2023 that opened up due to former Commissioner and now Councilmember Bigstyeck's election to City Council and the other term expires in March 2025 and is currently held by Chair Nibbelin. He stated that they hope he reapplies and for anyone interested in the partial or full term, the deadline to apply is noon on February 5. He stated that they can find more information on the application process and form on the commission and committee page on the city's website or by contacting the City Clerk.

Chair Nibbelin stated that they were now ready to adjourn.

Vice Chair Berman stated that she had a quick question for Dep. Planning Director Murdock. She referred to City Council drafting a letter to submit to ABAG regarding the RHNA allocation for Pacifica and she asked if they got a response to that letter.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he was not aware of a direct response. He thought all the public comments have been packaged up for the executive board's consideration in the

agenda materials for the Thursday meeting, but he will follow up on that point to be sure after this meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Vice Chair Berman moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:05 p.m.; Commissioner Hauser seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Berman, Ferguson, Godwin, Hauser, Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Noes:	None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister