

MINUTES

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

August 2, 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-08-21, 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.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Berman, Domurat, Godwin, Hauser, Leal and Chair Nibbelin
Absent: Commissioner Ferguson

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Domurat

STAFF PRESENT: Dep. Planning Director Murdock
Contract Planner Aggarwal
Asst. City Attorney Rudin

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

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: JULY 6, 2021 JULY 19, 2021 Commissioner Hauser moved approval of the minutes of July 6, 2021 and July 19, 2021; Commissioner Domurat seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF AUGUST 9, 2021:

Chair Nibbelin stated that the agenda includes the Lot 3 Harmony at One appeals and the Text Amendment TA-120-21, and Commissioner Godwin volunteered to step in as the liaison. He asked Dep. Planning Director Murdock if that was accurate.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Chair Nibbelin asked if Commissioner Godwin was still okay with that.

Commissioner Godwin stated that he was happy to be the liaison.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Dep. Planning Director Murdock introduced the speakers.

Mike Vernazza, Pacifica, stated that he wanted to comment on HPD regarding what that means. He stated that HPD designation ordinance cannot be removed without a vote of the people and he wanted to be clear that his comments have nothing to do with the agenda item. He is reaching out regarding the determination of incompleteness from the Hillside Meadows and specifically Linda Mar Woods project. He stated that he would read a portion of the HPD ordinance, stating that the intent was to discourage the development of ridge lines but where a parcel has ridge lines that are the only buildable portion of the property or where it can be demonstrated that the sensitive development of other portions of such a parcel would significantly frustrate the other purposes of this article and some development of ridge lines may be permitted provided most of the ridge line remains undisturbed and such ridge line developed is of low profile with minimal visual impact and utilizes a minimum of grading. He referred to the plans he has reviewed, although not an expert, he thought that Linda Mar Woods is off a full ridge line at the top of the eucalyptus forest and takes up the majority. He thought that, at the very least, we have to keep 51% of that ridge line undisturbed. He knows they can't comment, but he was interested in learning more about creating variances. He stated that having a variance of such properties is a privilege enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under an identical zoning classification. He stated that there is no other example in order to put a variance under part 1 of Section 9-4.3404.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he would stop him at that point.

Cindy Abbott, Pacifica, stated that, after reading the July meeting that was approved by the Planning Commission, she was quite concerned with the push back that is taking place with regard to broadly communicating and clarifying the important preservation district. She stated that they know what the article is, Article 22.5, Chapter 4, Title 9, but she believes the public is looking for and Planning Commission have stated that they are looking for is more information than just pointing them in the direction of that publicly available document. She stated that, as they heard, there are concerns about projects coming up with regard to the HPD. She stated that it has been part of Pacifica's heritage for decades and it seems to be something that they are looking to whittle away at or dramatically being impacted from projects that Harmony at One at Ohlone Point, etc. She wanted to stress how important it is to have the conversation that the

Commissioners asked for at the last meeting. She hopes it continues to be asked for, and staff hopefully will understand that, for transparency and public understanding, this is an important conversation that needs to be had. She hoped the Commissioners and the public, and maybe Councilmembers will continue to request and get back to understand how important this conversation is to the community. She thanked the Commission for considering doing more than just publishing FAQ on Connect with Pacifica as she didn't think that was enough.

Sue Digre, Pacifica, stated that, while they are in a Covid situation and there are all emergency things, it was becoming alarming to her how many times HPD comes up and that there is also a consideration of deforestation in one area and it is very difficult for residents to stay on top of everything. She stated that she has been going through the General Plan as carefully as possible, and she agrees with what everyone else said, and she appreciates the request by Commissioner Hauser to hear more and get to the historical perspective of HPD. She quoted from the General Plan on page 122, regarding the idea that ridge lines should be retained. She stated that the General Plan is extremely important, as well as HPD, and how the General Plan was created with robust involvement of the public and piecemeal planning is not good, and Covid planning is burdensome to the conscience and bothersome.

James Kremer, Pacifica, stated that he was away and had some catching up to do, and was reading the July 6 meeting where Commissioner Hauser suggested that their Hillside Protection District deserves special attention and requested a platform where explanations could benefit city officials and the public. He agreed with that. He referred to Dep. Planning Director Murdock pointing out that the HPD is publicly available to read, but he agreed that getting the facts out would be a good thing. He then stated that, in the July 19 meeting, he reported that the fact sheet was being prepared to dispel any confusion. He stated that, for him, it is not an issue of getting the facts out and dispelling any confusion presumes that there is only one interpretation. He stated that, sometimes, when he reads explanations of complicated subjects, he has lots of questions. He thought that the issue may not be that the public doesn't understand it. He stated that he previously did a study of the ordinance and it is brief, most explicit, with terms that need clarification. He stated that his concern is that some parts that are explicit seem to be considered flexible or at least readily subject to variances by the city. He thought variances were supposed to be rare and justified only under extraordinary circumstances. He is afraid of the piece by piece dismantling of the HPD by these variances. He stated that variances become precedent. He thought our concern should not be the public discussion of HPD might muddle the issue for specific projects. He thought a fact sheet cannot replace an inclusive discussion and it is essential that valid alternative interpretations be heard and considered. He understands why the Planning Department may feel this is undesirable, but he thought it would be good for the public and could lead to improvement of the ordinance. He stated that he has concerns, and he has heard other speakers and it is clear he is not alone, as his concerns are not that the ordinance is not understandable but it is with the city's interpretation. He favors an open discussion, i.e., public working session, where the city's interpretations are not just explained but openly discussed with input from all stakeholders. He stated that they may need expert help with the letter of the law but they aren't qualified to speak on the intent. He asked if there was no chance that the alternative use has merit. He stated that our HPD is vital to the quality of life and the finances of the city. He suggests that no variances of the HPD be approved by the city until concerns over the weakening of this ordinance can be resolved. He thought it was hard to get to the truth, even when they are working together and respect input of those who have different points of view. He thought, if they don't work in the context of mutual respect and trust and working in good faith to get it right, it won't work as well and the outcome will not be good.

Nick Lusson, Pacifica, thanked them for their service to the community. He acknowledged that they have a project on their agenda that has HPD applied to it. He clarified that he was not speaking out against that particular house and project, and would leave it in their capable hands to determine if it is a correct project. He stated that their concern is in the treatment of HPD. He stated that language is imperfect, policies and rules are imperfect and no one in the history of writing an ordinance and rules has ever written an airtight perfect ordinance, adding that this is where lawyers make their living. He stated that it is not in question that HPD has been in effect in Pacifica for decades and has been applied and interpreted in a certain manner and he thought it was incorrect for that policy to be reinterpreted in a different manner without a proper civic process around that discussion and he stated that was what the public are asking for. He asked, if they start granting variances, how they can assure the public that a granting of variance on an HPD project doesn't set a precedent to further undermine HPD in other projects that are in the works and coming up in the future. He stated that they would like to see a proper vetting, and the policy may need updating and some discussion and changes, but they thought it should happen in a community process, not a unilateral process. He stated that they appreciate that some Commissioners have asked for that, and they are hoping to see that before further movement happens on HPD that sets a precedent that weakens this policy that has been important to the community for so long.

Christine Boles, Pacifica, stated that she wanted to echo the comment by previous speakers. She recently heard that several of the commissioners were not aware of the HPD ordinance until recently when an article published in the paper awakened the community and the Commission. She appreciated Commissioners Hauser and Nibbelin asking for a presentation so they can better understand the nuances of the ordinance. She thought it was premature at this meeting to ask them to opine on variance requests before they can make the required findings. She stated that, in her previous correspondence, she disagreed with the Planning Department's analysis of several recently approved projects that she did not think included a proper review of HPD in the staff reports, one being the Harmony @ One lot 3 which exceeded the HPD coverage by a great amount for issues of grading with a lot of discrepancies in the drawings that were not caught by the Planning Department with more paving shown than was included in the sheet with the calculations. She thought they needed to do a better job in understanding the ordinance and in reviewing plans. Trust but verify is a phrase she has come to embrace. She stated that developers are always asking for more and pushing for more, and we have an ordinance that we can measure. She stated that the drawings need to be checked thoroughly and they can be done on a computer, adding that, as they point it out project after project, she hoped that it was a lesson that is being learned and in the future they can rely on and trust the Planning Department to produce a proper staff report for the Commission and the public. She stated that, besides Harmony @ One, 801 Fassler, Harmony @ One lot D had issues of HPD coverage that were not discussed in the staff report. The staff report said it complied, but it did not and was asking for nuance exceptions. She stated because those were not brought to the Commission, they did not know that they should be discussed and reviewed by the Commission. She asked that they listen to the public, look at it themselves, and improve the process to retain the public trust.

Summer Lee, Pacifica, thanked the Commission for their service. She stated that she was not against this particular development that will be discussed at this meeting, but along with the other speakers, she was concerned about how the city has been disregarding the importance of the Hillside Preservation District ordinance. She stated that she moved to Pacifica because of the vision of Pacifica who understood that open hillsides are a valuable resource. She stated that

most jurisdictions do not allow the disturbance of soil on slopes greater than 35% for obvious reasons. She stated that, as others have mentioned, there seems to be a need of a better understanding of the HPD ordinance, its history as well as its spirit, which was to keep Pacifica beautiful and safe. She asked how variances can be granted when underlying ordinance seems to be misunderstood, unevenly applied and in some cases overlooked. She stated that we do not want to be the city that, during this moment of devastating wildfires and droughts, lets standards go, particularly fire standards. She wouldn't repeat the many points already made about the importance of HPD and the need for public input and government transparency, but wanted to add her voice that a proper public process is needed to consider and understand the application of the HPD ordinance.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

**GPA-100-21
RZ-201-18
DP-79-18
SP-169-18
PV-526-18
PE-191-21**

File No. 2018-057 – General Plan Amendment GPA-100-21, Rezoning RZ-201-18, Development Plan DP-79-18, Specific Plan SP-169-18, Variance PV-526-18, and Parking Exception PE-191-21 filed by Matthew and Margaret Murphy, for a General Plan land use designation change to Very Low Density Residential (VLDR), rezoning to the P-D (Planned Development) HPD Hillside Preservation District) zoning districts, authorization for single-family residential use, and construction of a 2,406-square foot (sf) single-family residence with a two-car garage on a 24,149-sf undeveloped parcel, at the eastern terminus of Talbot Avenue (APN 016-270-110) in Pacifica. A variance is required to exceed the allowable coverage within the HPD zoning district and a variance and parking exception are required to deviate from the guest parking requirement within the HPD zoning district. Recommended CEQA Action: Class 3 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15303.

Contract Planner Aggarwal presented the staff report.

Commissioner Godwin asked if the fire risk was considered on this site and, if so, did North County Fire approve it.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that the North County Fire reviewed the plan and reconditioned the project which are included in the conditions of approval part of the project. She stated that there are no trees or large vegetation within the development area. They did look at the fire code plan and approved that as conditioned.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock added that he spent time with the North County Fire Authority, not only discussing their architectural site plan review but also broader considerations about it potentially being in a wild and urban interface and other considerations about the fire service access features and scope of site, etc. He stated that there was nothing out of the ordinary in the fire department's opinion with respect to reviewing this project. They elicited concerns that required special interventions through further conditions of approval and modifications to the project.

Commissioner Godwin asked if the electric power will be underground, from a power pole or what specific connections are going to be provided.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that Engineering requires undergrounding of electric lines from the pole to the development and that is the area where it will be underground.

Commissioner Godwin referred to a request in the report for a darker colored roof to make the roof less visible from the Milagra Ridge trail. He thought, with climate change, etc., the general recommendation is light colored roofs in order to increase the reflectivity of the house and minimize any heating demand. He asked if they thought about that as well.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that they would examine the reflective value of the roof when it comes in prior to building permit issuance of the plan, adding that it was not something they thought of in the review of the plans at the planning entitlement stage, but it is something they should consider which they will in evaluating what the colors would finally be. She stated that there is more question of reflectivity value and there would be choices of colors and to find a balance between it being subdued within the background and there are other concerns that might have to be addressed and will get addressed.

Commissioner Hauser appreciated staff's report as they addressed all of her questions. She did have two additional ones that came up. She wanted to understand how long the PG&E and water utility easement had been recorded on the property.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that there are two easements, one along the western property boundary which is a different easement, and one which is a 50-foot wide easement which runs along the southern border. She was not entirely certain on what the length of that could be, but something that Engineering staff has evaluated.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she saw Mr. Chavarria on his phone and she was sure he has done a thorough title review, and she will reserve her question for the appropriate time, i.e., how long has the easement been in place and how long has the property owner been pursuing this application. She thought it would be helpful to get a sense of a timeline if there have been other applications and how long this has been going on.

Contract Planner Aggarwal stated that this application was first submitted in late 2018 and, since then, there have been some resubmittals and there were incompleteness items to which the applicant had to respond which had to do with the design of the project and how the development would be located on the site. Staff also had questions about whether the development would be conducted in a manner that would not disrupt any of the utility lines on site. She stated information on all that was provided, and the application has been in process since late 2018.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock added that, if he was understanding what was behind her question with respect to the PG&E easement, this lot was created in 1962 or 1963 and that might be a relevant date for the questions she is asking and he thought Mr. Chavarria may be able to elaborate on when the various easements were recorded on the property.

Chair Nibbelin thought Mr. Chavarria will have the opportunity to determine those things during his presentation. He then stated that they could hear from the applicant.

Javier Chavarria, applicant, stated that they will start differently as the property owner wants to make an opening statement and after his finishes, in 5 minutes or so, he will address the project aspects.

Brendan Murphy, owner, introduced his wife, son and daughter, stating that they are the perspective residents of this project. He stated that they would love to move to Pacifica as they find it a wonderful place as they have come here for walks for 30 years, with his father living here for the past 15 years. He would love to have the opportunity for his kids to live on the same street as their grandfather. He commutes long distances and moving here would help him in that way as well as with the collective air. He stated that it has been a long process, approximately three years, and he was not sure what was normal, but it took them two years just to prove the legality

of the lot, after which they received their certificate of compliance. He stated that they have had an additional year of crossing ever "T" and dotting every "I". He felt that the Planning Department has been thorough, and they tried to meet all their demands. He stated that they have been good to work with but it has become exhausting after three years and has cost a lot as well. He stated that they value nature, environment, and they don't want to build a monstrosity that will be an eyesore for everyone. He thought they were presenting a modest house as it is just a family house. He stated that it is a challenging lot with a 50-foot easement running through the middle of what would be an obvious place to build a house, but had them pushed off to the side going down the hill and created a longer driveway and they are running into trouble with Hillside Preservation requirements. He reiterated that they are keeping their house relatively modest, small and narrow to have less impact on the hillside and the environment. He loves Pacifica and would love to move here. He never met his grandfather and it would mean a lot to him for his kids to grow up near their grandfather. They hope to become a part of the community.

Javier Chavarria, applicant, stated that for clarification the recorded date of the easement, PG&E easement was recorded in 1954 and was a complicated scenario. There is a 50-foot street at the top of the property but there is a floating section of the easement that allows PG&E to put the lines where they wanted. He stated that the gas line has a quirky way to go down the hill and doesn't follow a specific pattern because of that condition of the easement. He stated that the lot was also very complicated because, when it was created, there were not specific documents filed and they were done with paper. He stated that, for staff to accept the lot as complete, we have to prepare a certificate of compliance. They did a title search and history dating back to 1920s which demonstrated that the lot was correctly created and the certificate of compliance was issued, and it depicts the location of all the easements. The lot correctly dates from the 1960s and the easements were already recorded before the lot itself was split. He then referred to the design of the home, and as the owner mentioned, the majority of the easement has already been disturbed as gas, electric and water lines are already installed. He stated that the driveway is located on top of that easement. The footprint of the building is less than 2,000 square feet, and it is the new portion of the lot that has been disturbed. He stated that the design of the home, narrow and long, was done on purpose to minimize the disturbance to the hillside. They are missing the opportunity to build on the most buildable area of the lot because of the easement, and they minimized grading, tried to locate the driveway in such a manner that it wouldn't interfere with the gas and electric lines and the other utilities in place. He stated that the location of the home is optimal for the site. He knew staff did a thorough job and it appears they needed different permits, but they are only asking for is an exception of HPD as all the other elements are technicalities. He stated that they are downgrading from low density to very low density because the numbers don't match, adding that it is a technicality not something the designers or owners required. He stated that staff mentioned that the building provides enough parking, two garages, two parking spaces and a long driveway which should be sufficient to cover the practical needs of the home. He felt the building is well located. Regarding fire protection, the Fire Department has evaluated the plans and the 150 feet distance that any point of the building should have from the point where a fire truck is located. He stated that there are exceptions on the building code that allows a little more than 150 feet to the discretion of the fire marshal, i.e., Section 503.1 which grants exceptions when they have a single-family home to have that length of hose a little longer than 150 feet.

Chair Nibbelin asked if there was any remaining time of their ten minutes.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock thought there was a minute and a half remaining.

Chair Nibbelin opened the Public Hearing.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock introduced the speakers.

Clif Lawrence, Pacifica, stated that, after hearing the presentation, he was pointed in a different direction. He referred to the existing housing on Talbot Road of false equivalency, as the topography is entirely different and anyone who looks at a topographical map sees that immediately. He stated that this would be the first house on the really steep sloped side. He stated that the even numbered side of the street was the more appropriate place to build. He then referred to HPD, stating that they heard a recitation of the history of other HPD exceptions that have been brought up before, and he stated that everyone becomes a part of the recital and every time you make an exception, you change the dynamics of the future and he felt that they must take each one seriously because you start with one, then 50 then 100, etc. He was concerned about that and hoped they understand that HPD has made what Pacifica is today and they enjoy that. He asked what we will pass on to those who come after us. He thought that there were real issues with fire safety as the hill is at the end of a hollow and it rises up and any fire that starts at the bottom will race up the hill to this building. He understood the family wants to move there, but he thought they have to understand the difficulties of using this particular site for building. He presumed they knew about HPD and all those things but still decided that this was the direction they want to go into with their hearts. He stated there was a real risk and government is to protect the city and individuals, and they are trying to protect the owner's family and they want an exception to that. He thought they should indemnify the city as they are asking them to do something they don't think is safe.

Mike Vernazza, Pacifica, commented on the variance request and as the neighbors haven't been able to enjoy those privileges as well, as such Section 9-4.3404 makes that variance capability and he didn't see how it would endanger their welfare and the previous speaker may see that differently if they were to potentially start a fire, but it is already a neighborhood. He hoped they could welcome the Murphy family into the community.

Christine Boles, Pacifica, stated that she was a licensed architect and a resident of the Manor District. She stated that she sent them a letter earlier in the day telling them of her concerns of this project in relation to fire safety, geological risk, the Hillside Preservation ordinance and the possible need for additional variances that are not currently noted in the staff report. She added that the lack of adequate analysis for General Plan conformance, particularly in regard to hillsides and the possibility of a public trail that is in the Local Coastal Plan. She hoped they had a chance to read her letters as she didn't have time to address all of them now. She wanted to make sure the issues of public safety are addressed. She heard staff say that the Fire Department added conditions of approval but she did not see them in the staff report that was published. She asked for a page number if it is in the published report and, if added later, she asked that those conditions be read aloud at this meeting. She wants to understand that the Fire Department has allowed for extra hose lengths because she thought the drawings are inaccurate. She stated that there are also implications of planting trees close to the home and on a slope of approximately 100%. She reminded them that, on page 102 of the General Plan, the safety element was ignored on the Vistamar project by the same applicant and the trees appear to be more harmful to overall stability in slopes over 50% and should be avoided. She stated that the area where the trees are being planted is closer to 100% of 1-1 slope. She referred to the HPD variances, and stated that she was appalled that there is no discussion in the staff report as to precedence. She asked how

many variances have been granted over the years since the ordinance was enacted and what were the conditions, mitigation measures required, and were they as excessive as this project where it says that nothing can be built. She indicated that a project of this size to be legally built on this lot on reading the HPD regulations, would have to have a slope closer to 20% and they were talking about a 55% average and closer to 100% at the bottom where the house is sitting. She stated that they know that the latter part of the site is unbuildable. She was concerned about the General Plan's safety element that is so old and they would continue to review projects without proper analysis.

Chair Nibbelin stated that the applicant had a minute and a half reserved to address any issues raised in public comment.

Mr. Chavarria briefly spoke to the issue of the HPD and location of the home, stating that it is a difficult site and the most buildable area is taken by the easement, but it was a property that was zoned already for residential and they understand and completely concur that there are discrepancies in some of the documents, such as the General Plan and zoning plans, but this site is designated for residential and they are doing the best possible way to place a building correctly, minimize the disturbance, and create a safe environment. He stated that the technical report was prepared and it doesn't show any instability in the area. He stated that the building will be set on three piers to the current standards. The drawings are going to be peer reviewed and properly engineered. He stated that the Fire Department has reviewed the plans and the owners and designers will not want to build something that is unsafe and every precaution is taken to comply as close as possible to all the regulations. He asked that they not forget that the buildings are required to be sprinklered as well and the possibilities for a serious catastrophe generated by the building is very unlikely.

Chair Nibbelin closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Hauser stated that this has been an interested project. She stated that HPD is very clear, the calculation is very clear and this is designed with a 20% average slope. She thought, if there was a flat spot on the parcel and the remainder of it was 55%, she could wrap her head around potentially placing a building there, but the house is off the edge of the cliff and, if you go to the cul-de-sac and get out, you are looking down and she doesn't see it. She stated that HPD has been around for 50 years, the easements have been on the site for 70 years and she didn't think the land use has changed. She appreciated that it is just a single-family home, but when you buy a piece of property, you are given disclosures and to some extent, they are an "eyes wide open" that needs to happen and she didn't see it.

Chair Nibbelin stated that one thing that has come up in the staff report and discussed in context of the variance is concern about avoiding confiscatory, a term used in the staff report, which speaks to regulations that might result in inability to make any use of the property and he hoped they could speak a bit more to that.

Assistant City Attorney Rudin stated that the city's HPD ordinance basically sets forth a coverage formula and states that it should be interpreted in a manner that is not going to be confiscatory. While the city code doesn't have any specific definition about what that really means, typically, when the voters are enacting that, they are assumed to enact it in light of the background of relevant law. He stated that one of reasons that language is in there is the concept of regulatory takings. He stated that is basically the concept that land use regulations cannot deny a property

owner all economically beneficial use of their property without some form of compensation by the government. He stated that, with respect to the land use coverage standards, they basically decrease coverage as a set formula down to zero. With respect to having a zero coverage standard, that substantially makes it difficult for a land owner to make economically beneficial use of their property, basically zero coverage standard that says you cannot build anything on top of it. He stated that is one reason why there is the potential for an applicant to apply for a variance. When the voters enacted this particular ordinance, the concept of variance in land use law was well known and had been around for at least a decade at that time and the ordinance didn't modify or eliminate the city's ability to grant a variance on the basis of depriving an owner based on the requirements of variance law, i.e., denying the owner of the same sort of use that would be permitted under the zoning classification that is available to other users. He stated that, with respect to the coverage formula, the idea of all economic benefit doesn't mean that the applicant is entitled to the specific amount of coverage they would like, but to avoid that potential risk of a regulatory taking, there has to be some economically beneficial use available to that land.

Chair Nibbelin wanted to refresh his recollection, asking when the Hillside Preservation District ordinance was adopted.

Mr. Rudin stated that it looks like, based on the notes in the city code, it would have been adopted around 1972. He referred to when Planning staff was looking into this regarding a certificate of compliance issue, and stated that they determined that this lot was created before that ordinance.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Chair Nibbelin concluded that the lot was actually in existence at the time that the ordinance was adopted and they could look at this in the context of the timing. He is very hesitant to deny a project that looks like it is well thought out. He stated that it has been quite a process and he thought the parcel is zoned and the General Plan does contemplate residential use and the zoning contemplates residential use. He believes this is a situation where a variance would be appropriate and he recognizes that there are concerns about issuing a variance but on this project, he seems to be coming down in a different place from his colleagues.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that several members of the public also wanted more information related to previous variances from HPD standards. He stated that, if it was acceptable to Chair Nibbelin, he would like to make a few brief remarks on that point.

Chair Nibbelin stated he could go ahead and comment.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that Mr. Rudin could opine on the issue of precedent in relation to adjudicative land use decisions such as this and the variance in question. He stated that, generally speaking, he understood that these are not precedential from a legal standpoint but he thought they are instructive as to how the city approached similar questions under different or similar circumstances and what the outcome was. He stated that staff was able to identify a total of approximately 11 previous variance applications from standards under the HPD zoning standards and, of those, ten of them were from the HPD coverage standard and two from HPD parking standards. He stated that it is difficult to research that precise issue in some of their planning records. The variances stand from 1977 through 2014 and the type of reports and the level of detail in those reports varies. However, he was able to piece together information about

a handful of those previous variance applications. He stated that, according to their logbook, it looks like seven of them were approved and, of those, he was able to gather information on four of them. With three of those four applications approved, the sites were entitled to zero percent coverage under the HPD coverage regulations. They were approved for coverage in those instances, with two of them undeveloped sites with zero percent allowable coverage and ended up getting, in one case, 14.4% coverage and in another 11.9% coverage. Another was an unusual situation where they needed to do extensive amount of remedial grading to address geotechnical concerns and it was a much larger project with several dozen condominium units and maybe not directly relevant for this type of project. The others were single-family residential projects and one of them was on the site immediately adjacent to and abutting this project, which is 722 Talbot and was approved in the mid-2000s. He stated that site had zero percent allowable coverage with an average slope on that site of 43.3%. He stated that project was approved by the Planning Commission for 11.9% coverage for approximately 7,921 square feet of coverage. He stated that this particular request for a variance for the subject project is not out of line with those previous requests and is in the same range of coverage amount in terms of percentage of site and square footage. He stated that it is actually less proposed coverage than the site that is immediately next door. He hoped that puts in context the fact that variances from the HPD coverage standard are not unprecedented but they come up infrequently and they are not something that they encourage applicants to pursue, as there are very few that they have a record of being considered and approved by the city. He stated that they are a tool as Mr. Rudin explained to provide a safety valve to avoid regulatory takings and to allow economic use of property where this particular zoning standard that was the HPD coverage formula would yield no economic use by virtue of disallowing any coverage on the site. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to share that information.

Commissioner Domurat concurred with Commissioner Hauser's assessment that this is very steep site. He was on site today and you don't want to slip and fall in that area, but if you compare it to other places where a lot of construction has been allowed in Pacifica, i.e., Pedro Point, there are areas there where there is no land whatsoever and homes were completely built out over very steep terrain. He thought, from an engineering side, there is not going to be an issue of constructing the home that has been proposed. He referred to some of the mapping and he thought there seemed to be an unofficial trail that extends from the back of the property up toward Sharp Park Road, and he asked if that was an issue for anyone and something the public has been used to using and he asked if it will become an issue for the property owner in the future.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock he stated that he did locate an informal trail that exists, cutting across the property and going upslope toward Sharp Park Road. He stated that it is a site that could be impacted by this project if the property owner was to privatize all access to the property. He stated that, if the Chair agrees, the owner could speak to their thoughts on their intended use of that trail by the public moving forward. It is identified as a trail opportunity as he recalled in some of the city's planning documents, but to this point, the city has not acquired that right for public access and there is no planning policy in this case to oblige the property owner to provide that as a condition of development of the site.

Mr. Rudin stated he would have some concerns about requiring the property owner to provide that sort of access as conditions of development of the site.

Chair Nibbelin appreciated that input. He then stated that he would ask if Mr. Chavarria or the Murphys had comments on that point.

Mr. Chavarria asked if Mr. Murphy wanted to speak about this.

Mr. Murphy stated that they have no objection as to leaving access to that trail. He stated that it would have to be discussed with the easement holders, PG&E and water department, but they are not in this to ruin people's experience with Pacifica. He stated that he loves trails, and he didn't like them being taken away so they are okay with that.

Vice Chair Berman stated that was the perfect segue into her first set of questions. She referred to the PG&E easement, asking if the easement language allude to specifically what PG&E requires. She thought that, per typical PG&E easements, you can't build a structure on it, can't block access to it, and her take on what appeared to be an unidentified trail was that it would be a PG&E access to the power or gas lines. She asked if Mr. Chavarria could answer her question.

Mr. Chavarria stated that the easement is an exclusive PG&E easement, and when the water company was trying to obtain an easement, there was a lot of discussion between the North Coast County Water District and PG&E to obtain an approval for a water line in place. He stated that the easement is very old, from 1954, and the language is very vague. He stated that basically PG&E has the jurisdiction to do whatever they want whenever they want on that portion of the property. He stated that, if a public access easement were to be proposed, he thought there were two elements of concern, will the property owner carry liability if someone gets hurt on the property and the other one is whether PG&E will allow an official overlay of this easement for public access.

Vice Chair Berman stated that was one of her original concerns in review of the staff report. She stated that the house structure is outside of the easement and she thought the grading as well as the curbs associated with the driveway and one of the flow-through planters are all within the easement and could restrict access to some extent. She stated that, if they were to go into more detail, she does have a concern with the corner of the flow-through planter that is partially in the easement of it and she thought it would have to be relocated and probably should be located further away from that gas line. She stated that there is a concern voiced by the public with the realistic disturbance due to construction. She thought the edge of a building or wall and a curb to a certain extent but constructability wise, there needs to be some over excavation in order to build service facilities. She thought this would be beneficial to discuss at a town hall meeting where they review the Hillside Preservation District's requirements and the tolerance associated with it. She was hoping they could have something like that before another one of these projects came before them. She then asked if there were any renderings of the vantage points specifically. She stated that in past projects, especially hillside projects, the applicant will have some site line renderings available, and she thought that would be advantageous for this location to have an idea of what the site line is going to look like from higher elevation as well as lower elevation and adjacent roads. She asked if those were available.

Mr. Chavarria stated that they did not prepare any renderings from vantage points, just a general rendering of the project.

Vice Chair Berman understood and stated that, as she isn't as artistically minded as some fellow commissioners, she was having a hard time understanding the compatibility of the modern style of the home with the rest of the houses on this road. She stated that the majority of the houses seemed to have craftsman sloped roofs type of homes and a Tuscan style home directly adjacent

which she thought was also out of place. She asked if there was a more illustrative rendering of the home itself with colors, etc.

Mr. Chavarria stated that he didn't have that available now, but they did prepare one and he thought they submitted it initially, but he didn't have it available and was looking for it.

Vice Chair Berman stated that she would like to ask one more question. She referred to the additional parking, and wondered if it would be possible to add just a parallel parking stall at the beginning of the driveway. If you are driving along the cul-de-sac and you are exiting it and beginning to drive up the driveway, is there an opportunity for parallel parking spot to widen the driveway from 12 feet to 20 feet in that location. She stated that it was already disturbed and just degrading, and she thought that could be one variance they could avoid and a parallel parking stall could be placed on the north side of the driveway.

Chair Nibbelin wondered if staff had any thoughts on the feasibility of that suggestion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he had two components, and maybe Contract Planner Aggarwal may have additional points. He stated that, looking at the requirement itself and recognizing that the HPD proposes this requirement in units of ten dwelling units, and to consider this standard at one space for one unit, he thought there was an argument to be made and staff made that argument, that it is a burdensome requirement up to ten times greater than what it ought to be on this particular project, given it is one dwelling unit. He stated that the other point is to consider that it runs at cross purposes with the variance that has been requested for coverage and the fact that no more coverage than needed for the project was requested, according to the applicant. He stated that, to require this, may potentially cause additional coverage under HPD. He stated that the good news is that, in the location she indicated if that is where it ends up, it is already indicated as disturbance, even though it is a planting area, replanted after grading, and this would convert it from a landscaping coverage to a paving coverage. He stated that, as far as feasibility, they haven't evaluated that but perhaps Mr. Chavarria could comment on that.

Mr. Chavarria stated that adding the parking space is possible, but it will require some additional retaining walls in that section because the slope starts moving. He stated that a portion of the work is going to need to be done on the public right-of-way and additional encroachment would be needed from the city. He concluded that it is possible.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock asked him to also comment on a possible four-inch gas line that may be in that area where retaining walls would be required.

Mr. Chavarria stated that, in the way he was imagining now, they have the flow-through planter and he was envisioning the parking spot to the left side of the driveway parallel to that flow-through planter. They would most likely need a retaining wall along the line of the easement and that portion does not interfere with the location of the gas line, as long as they don't go anymore than 20 feet inside the property. They would have to be halfway inside the property and halfway in the right-of-way.

Vice Chair Berman asked if the driveway already proposing a retaining wall along that run.

Mr. Chavarria stated that it proposes a small retaining wall to create a parking area. The driveway itself is not on grade and the reason it is done completed at grade is PG&E doesn't

allow any retaining walls that will impact their access. One of the parking lots is okay because it is only 20 feet and at least 30 feet available for access to the rest of the easement.

Vice Chair Berman asked if she was allowed to share her screen to make sure they are looking at the same location.

Chair Nibbelin asked if that enables them.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively.

Vice Chair Berman asked if they can see her screen.

Chair Nibbelin stated that they can as she started sharing.

Vice Chair Berman stated that the area she is looking at is where her cursor is. She stated that, if it were a parallel parking stall at that point, as the contours run perpendicular and in her opinion, the parking stall would be the same slope as the driveway and is likely a retaining wall would not be necessary.

Mr. Chavarria stated that was feasible.

Vice Chair Berman stated that she didn't believe that retaining walls are allowed in the PG&E easement, and asked if there were currently retaining walls or footings in the PG&E easement proposed.

Mr. Chavarria stated there were not, and the only retaining walls were where she has her cursor and there is a dimension of 18 feet and that is a gravity type retaining wall with no footings and is a very small one of only 18-24 inches tall.

Vice Chair Berman asked staff if that was allowed in the PG&E easement.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated he wasn't sure they have an opinion to offer given that it is not the city's easement at this point in time.

Mr. Rudin stated that he may be able to clarify that, as typically the easement holder has the right to prohibit uses that would interfere with their reasonable use and if the owner had the consent of PG&E for this and has consulted them, there is really no reason for the city to want to prohibit that.

Chair Nibbelin had a clarifying question, i.e., that was supposed to be a planter area in the original proposal, but asked if they are talking about swapping out a plant area for a parking space.

Mr. Chavarria responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Domurat stated that he could be reading the property lines incorrectly, but in that same area they were discussions, the southwest corner of the property seems to encompass the neighbor's driveway and he asked if he was reading it correctly.

Mr. Chavarria stated that he was correct.

Commissioner Domurat asked if that portion of the property has been ceded over to that.

Mr. Chavarria stated that there was an access easement for the neighbor.

Commissioner Domurat concluded that there was nothing that can be done to move the applicant's driveway to encompass a little bit more of that area rather than going toward the downslope side.

Mr. Chavarria stated that they tried that, but they couldn't.

Commissioner Hauser wanted to understand what staff said about the adjacent property, stating that the one where the variance is granted, she asked if staff said the coverage at that site was 11.9%.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that, based on the records he located, the variance granted for 722 Talbot, the property to the south was 11.9% which on that site size was 7,921 square feet. He stated that the staff report didn't have that information at that time, and they took an estimated measurement from an arial photo. It was close but not exactly the same figure.

Commissioner Hauser concluded that the coverage here is proposed as 28% and he is saying that the lot size is different but it about still about the same amount of disturbance in square footage.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock responded affirmatively, stating that the lot to the south at 722 Talbot is much larger than the lot in question with this project.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he didn't see any more hands and asked if wanted to take stock of where they are or see if there is a motion that someone might be willing to make. He stated that he would be interested in making a motion along the lines of that recommended by staff and he would be interested in integrating some of the suggestions that came out from some of the questions they had and recommendation from Commissioner Berman regarding the parking and he would want to make sure he was taking that up correctly in describing where it was at. He thought the first thing was some interest or willingness and maybe it isn't to incorporate it into a condition, i.e., the question about the trail and whether or not there is any way, given the applicant's willingness to entertain continuing public access along that trail. He asked Dep. Planning Director Murdock or Mr. Rudin whether he is correct that there is an uncertainty around that as it sounds like PG&E has a role to play in that and they may not have enough information to do anything further with that now.

Mr. Rudin stated that he would have some concerns about the city imposing a new trail access easement. If the public already had an existing access easement, imposing conditions of approval to preserve that is something reasonable and within the city's powers to do, but they don't know enough about the history of this public use to see if there is an implied public access easement due to the history of it. He thought the issues with respect to PG&E that have already been raised are important to note.

Chair Nibbelin appreciated his comments, and stated he would go back to the issue of parallel parking space and suggested that they add a condition of approval that would require that. He asked Dep. Planning Director Murdock for any suggestions on how they frame that condition.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock thought, at the outset, it would involve Commission making a finding through the motion that is denying the variance and the parking exceptions through the HPD guest parking and, as a consequence of that, requiring through a condition of approval the creation of the required guest parking space in the approximate location to be described subject to further review and approval of the Planning Direct, and he would suggest in that front portion to the north of the proposed driveway.

Chair Nibbelin concluded that the findings are something along the lines of making determining that it is actually feasible to include such a parking space, recognizing that it involves a tradeoff of the respective lot coverage, or just a different kind of coverage, i.e., opting for parking as opposed to planting.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock agreed, adding that he thought it was within the Commission's discretion to balance those factors. He stated that, according to staff's analysis, there is ample extra landscaping that has been provided to comply with the zoning even with the reduction the Commission is considering now and that tradeoff would be from one coverage type to another as they noted under the HPD. With respect to other zoning standards, it would be converting a relatively small percentage of the landscaping coverage to paving to provide that parking space.

Vice Chair Berman thanked Chair Nibbelin for moving forward with the concerns that she and other commissioners voiced. She also mentioned that she agreed with items that Commissioner Hauser mentioned and she asked a lot of the questions she already had and she didn't have a need to ask any additional questions. She stated that this one is a little hard for her to swallow with some major aspects that may be outside of the Commission's control and staff's control she would probably be more inclined to be supportive of the project would be if they had some educational outreach or some townhall meeting or special meeting between Planning Commission and City Council that discussed more Hillside Preservation District aspects as she felt there was a lot of concern throughout the community and the Commission is still wrapping their heads around and becoming experts on each of the requirements and she thought it would be nice to review this after they have that education period. She didn't feel comfortable supporting this project without having the vantage point views and understanding the visual impacts from the ridge, adjacent roads, as this property is on the top of the ridge and, in her opinion, without looking at any site line perspectives, it will stick out like a sore thumb like the property adjacent to it which they can see from a variety of locations and also seeing a rendering of the home itself so she can get a better understanding of its visual aspects as this is a modern home being placed adjacent to not very modern homes. She wanted to voice her thoughts before they made a motion so fellow commissioner understood her standpoint.

Commissioner Hauser agreed with Vice Chair Berman mentioning a potential joint meeting with council. While she hadn't thought of, she thought it could be a really good idea as there is a lot going on. She stated that she thought she had made herself clear that, if they are going to vote on this at this meeting, she would probably not be able to get there. She thought understanding the coverage next door, looking at some of the images that Vice Chair Berman requested and maybe a closer look at the way percentages are awarded for outstanding designs. She thought, putting those together she could get there, but she thought they understood that she was not there now.

Chair Nibbelin asked for input from Commissioner Leal.

Commissioner Leal stated that he was generally in favor of the project and points raised are valid in terms of the challenges with the lot and what their scope of limitations are, but he appreciated Vice Chair Berman's comments, giving the prominence of the location, and what it will look like on the hillside, and he thought it would help him in his final decision. He agreed that a site next to it can be seen in many locations across the city and he had an opinion on that site which he would not share, but seeing renderings of what it will look like on the hillside, given that the intention of HPD was to preserve the hillside and if they can see how the house looks on the hillside, and add additional comments, given that context would be extremely helpful. He thought he could get there at this meeting, but having those renderings with the views would make him more comfortable in continuing the item and bring it back when they have the renderings to make a final decision.

Commissioner Godwin stated that his opinion was quite similar to Commissioner Leal's as he is in general favor of the project but he doesn't want to build an eyesore on top of a ridge that is widely seen and he thought having the renderings before they make a decision would be preferable to having a vote at this meeting.

Commissioner Domurat stated that he kind of feels the same, but they have to put this into perspective as it has been three years with no requirement by the city for them to have to provide those and he thought they owed these people a vote as it has been a long time with a lot of blood, sweat and tears to get to where they are today. He stated that there are some minor concerns and they brought a lot of that up, but he would have no problem doing a vote at this meeting.

Chair Nibbelin stated that Mr. Chavarria had the opportunity to hear a mix of perspectives on all this and he was curious about what it would take to generate some of the renderings in which the Commissioners have expressed an interest.

Mr. Chavarria stated that they can definitely prepare the renderings. He stated that it is a process that will be 2-3 weeks as they will have to locate the proper vantage points, survey them correctly to get the proper camera angle to get to the finish of the building. He stated that they mentioned the sloped roofs and the reason they selected the flat roof was because of the idea to minimize the bulk and appearance. They would be happy to dress up the flat roof that incorporates some live roof and that would minimize a lot of the visual impacts. How the building fits in the area is rather eclectic as there is a number of architectural components and they are confident that they can make the building look very nice. It has a lot of articulations, different breaks of materials and if it incorporated a couple of strips of living roofs, that would probably soften up the appearance of the building. If a rendering is needed, it will take them 2-3 weeks to get ready.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he wouldn't be in favor of continuing the item until after they can have some joint meeting with Council as they don't control whether Council does or doesn't want to have a joint meeting about this matter. He did understand the desire for some perspective and some renderings. He shared generally with Mr. Domurat's articulated view that he would be comfortable with the project as proposed, and it sounds like a coalescent around the possibility of continuing the item for a brief period to afford some opportunity to generate some of the renderings and the additional analysis that Commissioners have spoken to. He wondered if staff could give them some sense of what the calendar looks like in the near future to accommodate

this. He recognized that the matter has gone through a lot and there are some concerns that they want to make sure that they fully address.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that the next opportunity, given the 2-3 week timeline, would be Tuesday, September 7. Should there be any delays that would affect their ability to keep that date, given the agenda preparation timeline they have, he would feel more comfortable with the September 20 date for the Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Nibbelin asked Mr. Chavarria if he would be available on September 20.

Mr. Chavarria asked if he would be available or if they would be able to meet that submittal deadline.

Chair Nibbelin thought both those questions were relevant. He asked if he would be available on the 20th and whether he would be able to meet the submittal deadlines for consideration.

Mr. Chavarria stated that it would be two weeks prior to the meeting.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that would be ideal.

Mr. Chavarria stated that he would be available and they could do that.

Commissioner Leal asked if it was the Commission's discretion to add some opinions as to the site lines that they would like covered, such as directional site lines.

Chair Nibbelin stated that, if they are going to continue the matter, they might as well be as comprehensive as they can about what would be useful to the Commission as they consider the matter. He encouraged him to share whatever he care to offer.

Commissioner Leal stated that, if Sharp Park Road oversees the property, either the McCarthy overlook where the parking is or somewhere along the road, but he thought it was more feasible to do the McCarthy overlook given that people would be parked there and overlooking the ocean from that vantage point. He would say, on Talbot, looking up toward the house from the turnaround would be ideal. He stated that somewhere in the valley or northwest in the East Sharp Park area, Canyon Drive, Carmel Avenue area looking up, it could be at the end of Canyon Drive looking up, given that those residences would be the closest, and a vantage point from the Milagra Ridge Trail, perhaps north of the project site.

Vice Chair Berman agreed with Commissioner Leal as those were the areas she had in mind specifically the Milagra Ridge and the parking outlook off of Sharp Park and Canyon Drive. She mentioned to staff that she personally will not be able to attend that Planning Commission meeting but will be able to attend the next one. She asked that they not make that the decision factor as she did not need to attend.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that it wasn't clear what meeting she was specifically referring to.

Planning Commission Minutes

August 2, 2021

Page 20 of 22

Vice Chair Berman apologized and stated that she will not be able to make either meeting in September. She stated that she will be able to attend the October 4 meeting. She stated that, as long as there is a quorum, she didn't need to be present.

Chair Nibbelin stated that it was up to Mr. Chavarria to consider any other changes to elements of the roof or other possible adjustments and anything he decides that will be useful in that regard, he will incorporate as well as the site limits they are talking about. He stated that, at this point, he would be included to entertain a motion to continue. He also recognized that Vice Chair Berman will be unavailable in September, and he would like to try to do this in September, and he would be willing to make a motion to continue this item to September 20 for various reasons and the various items and information that have been articulated by the Commission.

Commissioner Godwin seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

Noes: None

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Vice Chair Berman asked Dep. Planning Director Murdock if it was possible or within the Commission's purview to request a joint meeting with City Council to review the HPD zoning district.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that it was difficult for him to tell what a majority of the Commission wants on that point, acknowledging that some members have been vocal but the Commission doesn't set the agenda with City Council and he can relay concerns as he has heard and understand them from some Commissioners to the City Manager for his information and allow him to work on that issue and address as he sees appropriate with City Council.

Vice Chair Berman thanked him, adding it was something to consider, and at minimum, it would be great to have a town hall meeting or a webinar as she thought they were all looking for something.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock understood and he thought the key concern he was relaying was that having it at a Planning Commission meeting would be unusual and it presents some potential problems with respect to other projects that are pending with respect to their records. He stands behind the comment and he did not disagree that getting information to the community is important but he thought they need to be careful and thoughtful with the method of delivering that information in whatever conversation might unfold, as well as balancing this issue with a host of other issues that Council has already put on the city's workplan. He also recognized that they have finite time and resources to accomplish all that and that is part of the issue that the City Manager will have to consider when he relays the Commission's feedback on this point.

Mr. Rudin stated that Dep. Planning Director Murdock does raise an important point that, to the extent that there are projects that are still within the potential for appeals or are being appealed, having Council weigh in on those matters in advance of an appeal hearing is potentially problematic for due process reasons and, for that reason, they would not necessarily want to have a public meeting where Councilmembers are asked to opine on their positions on projects in advance of providing those particular appellants if they have an appeal to challenge a project and they have the opportunity to make their case first.

Vice Chair Berman stated that it made sense.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that the main thing he wanted to announce is that the Planning Department has hired a new staff member, Zoe Covello, who is their new Assistant Planner and he looks forward to an opportunity to introduce them to her at an upcoming Planning Commission meeting. He stated that she is coming out of graduate school, the University of Pennsylvania and she brings an interesting background, primarily in research at some prominent institutions and he will give her an opportunity to share her background with the Commission at the perfect time. He stated that they couldn't be happier to have her on board and they look forward to getting her trained and assisting with the interesting and accumulative amount of work they have to do in the Planning Department.

Chair Nibbelin thanked him for that information, and asked if he would repeat her name.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that her name is Zoe Covello.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Leal moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:03 p.m.; Vice Chair Berman seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister