

## MINUTES

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

November 15, 2021

7:00 p.m.

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

Chair Nibbelin explained the conditions for having Planning Commission meetings pursuant to Government Code Section 54953 (as amended by AB 361), to conduct necessary business as an essential governmental function as a teleconference meeting with no meeting location open to the public. 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 Dep. Planning Director Murdock

**STAFF PRESENT:** Dep. Planning Director Murdock  
Asst. City Attorney Bazzano  
PW Dep. Director Bautista

**APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA** Commissioner Hauser moved approval of the Order of Agenda; 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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: OCTOBER 18, 2021 and NOVEMBER 1, 2021** Vice Chair Berman moved approval of the minutes of October 18, 2021 and November 1, 2021.

Commissioner Hauser asked if she could vote since she wasn't present for the November 1, 2021 meeting.

Chair Nibbelin stated that she was able to vote on both.

Commissioner Hauser 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 NOVEMBER 22,  
2021:**

Chair Nibbelin stated that they didn't need a liaison for the Council meeting.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock confirmed that he was correct.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

None.

**CONSENT ITEMS:**

None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**PSD-855-21  
UP-129-21  
CDP-432-21  
HPP-7-21  
PE-192-21**

**File No. 2021-023 – Site Development Permit PSD-855-21, Use Permit UP-129-21, Coastal Development Permit CDP-432-21, Historic Preservation Permit HPP-7-21 and Parking Exception PE-192-21**, filed by the City of Pacifica to renovate the existing City Hall and Planning, Parks, Beaches and Recreation (P&P) Buildings, to demolish the Police Annex Building, and to construct other site improvements to the City of Pacifica Civic Center at 170 Santa Maria Avenue and 1800-1810 Francisco Boulevard (APN 016-042-310). Recommended CEQA Action: Class 1 and Class 4 Categorical Exemptions, CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 and 15304.

Vice Chair Berman stated that she was going to recuse herself from this item as she was employed by the Civil Engineering firm that is the civil engineer on the project.

Chair Nibbelin asked Asst. City Attorney whether she should leave the meeting or follow some other protocol.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that she would ask that Vice Chair Berman mute her microphone and turn off her video, and then join again at the end of the meeting if she desired.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock presented the staff report.

Commissioner Domurat asked if any consideration was given to electric vehicle (EV) charging stations on site for possible future city vehicle charging and any consideration to alternative energy, solar panels, and the city can demonstrate some potential of that to the community.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that both of those points were discussed and analyzed by Planning with development city staff serving as applicant. He stated that, regarding solar panels, building code requires that the P+P building be made solar ready and that will be the case as the flat roof is potentially suitable for future installation of solar panels but are not part of the project at this time. Regarding electrical vehicle EV charging stations, he stated that the zoning code requires that the project installs two or possibly three EV charging stations to charge multiple vehicles and they are proposed on the western portion of the parking lot area.

Commissioner Hauser wanted to understand how trash is collected as it looks like it's on a walking path rather than a vehicular path.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that the project is trying to make the site more aesthetically pleasing with improved landscaping and pedestrian paths and the elimination of the vehicular driveway on the northwestern portion of the property where the trash service could have been provided before, the project would include a trash enclosure located closer to the northwest property line. He stated that there is currently two rolling dumpsters and some small residential sized recycling containers. He stated that all of them are rolled out on trash day but he thought the applicant could explain more as to how the trash service would be, moving forward.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she downloaded the plans many times but they were so big they kept crashing her Adobe and she thought she missed it, and she wanted to understand what makes the pocket park a pocket park.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock didn't think there was a definition for a pocket park but a term commonly used to describe very small park spaces that don't have significant recreational facilities but tucked in within existing constraints in developed areas to help improve the amount of park spaces available. He thought there was a desire to try to create some small but enjoyable walking paths through the area that could potentially include a small centralized turf area that would allow people to sit down, have a picnic, read a book, etc., and would be more recreative than pedestrian oriented or a walking path. He thought those components made it more aligned with the pocket park function.

Commissioner Hauser stated that she didn't see the graphic so she thought it wasn't like a seating area, but a turf area and walking path.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that most of the area would be described as pocket park has paths and a turf area along the central portion of that and there is proposed to be more integrated with the architecture of the P+P building but some stepped up seating and would provide some additional park like functionality to the space.

Chair stated that they have gotten a sense of the applicant's perspective from staff but they technically have an applicant and the ordinary process is to afford the applicant an opportunity to present the project. He asked if there was a specific designated individual to speak for the applicant.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he thought Dep. PW Director and City Engineer Sam Bautista would be starting the presentation and be joined by a consultant.

PW Dep. Director Bautista stated that he is the project manager for the Civic Center Campus facilities project. He stated that there are exciting things happening and they now have the opportunity to showcase them. He stated that the city hired Group Four architects and the team of Dawn Merkes, Carolyn Carlberg, Gary Ching, and Cozy Hannula along with the subconsultant, Marco Esposito of SWA Group. He stated that they have done an amazing job in coordinating with city staff, addressing residents and Council concerns and designing a Civic Center Campus that will enhance the Sharp Park neighborhood. He stated that the renovation of the existing building will provide city employees with updated and efficient working spaces while the upgraded site will attract residents and visitors to an inviting destination. He then introduced architect, Carolyn Carlberg of Group Four who will go over the work plan schedule, design and next steps of the project.

Carolyn Carlberg, applicant, then made her presentation of the project, mentioning all the meetings they had with staff and residents, then explained the process.

Chair Nibbelin opened the Public Hearing.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock introduced the speakers.

Christine Boles, Pacifica, stated that she sent a letter to staff regarding her concerns about parking issues, mentioning some of her specific concerns and suggestion that they include a parking variance as part of the application.

Richard Stevens, Pacifica, referred to the existing Cyprus tree and expressed his thoughts on how they worked around the tree, as well as questioning how the curbs will be marked.

Chair Nibbelin closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Hauser appreciated the detailed presentation. She thought the project was super cool and loved all the specifics. She referred to the corner of Santa Maria and Francisco, and she thought a lot of people who come to City Hall and Planning are coming from Highway 1 and driving south and they have cool signage throughout the project but nothing specifically on that side and she thought it would help with identification and recognition of the facilities. She wondered if that was a possibility.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated he would comment and the applicant may add on. He stated that they discussed the potential locations for signage and he thought the applicant preferred to minimize the draw to that corner of the building and not confuse the correct location to access the buildings and it was a conscious decision to downplay some of the landmark status other than to give it a strong presence architecturally. He thought there may be some additional ways to achieve what she desires, and asked if the applicant wants to add on to that.

Chair Nibbelin asked if Ms. Carlberg or PW Dep Director Bautista wanted to speak to that.

Ms. Carlberg agreed with Dep. Planning Director Murdock that they looked at signage on that corner but wanted to make sure that everyone knew that both the vehicular and P+P building entrances were on Francisco and City Hall was located on the southeast corner. She stated that the big sign for the Pacifica Civic Center is on the east corner of the building.

Commissioner Hauser thought it was cool that they were providing spaces in the pocket park area and she thought a bench would be a great idea as they will tend to use the space more if they know it is for them and she thought that would be important. She then referred to solar, stating that it is expensive but on a new building in this environment she thought it was important to have some opportunity for the solar either now or in the near future. She asked clarification about the public comment on the tree, as she thought it was planned and she thought it would be great to confirm that.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock thought applicants could discuss further the evaluation of existing trees on site and the efforts to retain them as well as how the design would allow for that.

PW Dep. Director Bautista stated that Marco Esposito is a panelist and he could address that question.

Marco Esposito stated that the large Cyprus on Salada is maintained and there is parking on both sides of the one-way street. Because of the enormous size of the tree trunk, they would be taking out the parking lane for a short distance on the side of the Cyprus. He stated, as mentioned by the public, the drive would shift from the east side to the west side and he thought it worked

nicely and there is less pavement against the tree with a bigger distance around the tree trunk with planting and there is connectivity of the Salada sidewalk for the first time in a while.

Commissioner Hauser appreciated that and she commended the design team as it is a great project and she loved that there is a lot of softscape. She stated that, when making a motion and supporting the project, she will be supporting it.

Commissioner Leal mentioned the tree on Salada, and then stated that the ballot drop off box on the northwest corner is currently there and it will remain in its current position or will the County be taking it back.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that the City Clerk was engaging with them on how to retain that as it is a well-utilized drop off location, but he didn't have an answer or if the applicant team does, but the City Clerk is looking at options to retain it on site and be convenient and identifiable, and needs to work with San Mateo County to reach a mutually acceptable location.

Commissioner Leal stated that it was a drive up and drop off box and its current location will work at Manor but he thought a walk up ballot box would also be good, as they will have additional parking on Santa Maria. He referred to public art, and whether there was any public art planned for the pocket park or any plans for public art.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that there were no requirements in the zoning regulations for public art installation, but the city frequently looks for opportunities to incorporate public art and beautification opportunities. He stated that the staff liaison, PW Dep. Director Bautista, is regularly in attendance at the Beautification Advisory Committee and he may be able to speak to what opportunities may look like.

PW Dep. Director Bautista stated, with public art, the BAC looks at the murals but there was no opportunity at this point for this project. However, he said that, if there are pieces that are donated to the city, they could definitely look for places to put them especially if they want them at the Civic Center following the upgrading and redeveloping and there might be spaces to put art or sculptures.

Commissioner Leal recalled a previous project with concrete animals added on Beach Blvd., and that seemed like a potential use of space for the pocket park. He echoed the comment on solar, as he understood not having solar panels as part of the project, but he thought they were investing significantly in the area and to have solar included would be nice. He then mentioned the tree on Salada, and stated that the tree has essentially eliminated people being able to walk safely on the sidewalk. He thought the numbers pan out and seem to work for the driveway width as well as spaces for the EV vehicles, and it concerns him in terms of the future growth of the tree and digging up that driveway. He referred to talk of a fence in the packet, and he wasn't sure if that was temporary or a permanent structure around the tree and asked for clarification.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that there are a number of references in the staff report to tree exclusion fencing during the construction phase of the project, but he was not aware of any permanent fencing proposed.

Commissioner Leal stated that, on packet page 122, it mentioned protect in place with tree protection fencing and he wasn't clear if that was a typical construction temporary fencing or permanent so that cars don't drive into that with its proximity to the driveway.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that permanent fencing is not a component of the project to his knowledge and the fencing referenced are construction phase of tree protection to ensure the tree is not damaged by equipment and other construction activities.

Commissioner Leal stated that he has concerns with its proximity to the driveway and it is already existing damage to the infrastructure where it is, and he didn't know if they can shed a light on whether they anticipate this tree to damage the new driveway further because he thought the driveway was very close to the EV charging parking spaces and to get through the driveway, cars will be driving behind the bumpers or front end of vehicles parked in that lane. He thought any egress from that tree into the driveway will push cars further. While that is his only concern, he did see a need to protect the tree as it is the largest tree on the site and there will be another tree that will be removed in that area.

Commissioner Domurat stated that, to support the idea of the public art, maybe another area to that would be student art where there could be a dedicated space where students from local schools can display some of their creativity. It does display their creativity but also brings the younger members of our community to the City Hall area to see what government is about and enjoy that space and display their artwork. He thought it could be a rotational thing with different schools, and a good use of some space in one of the parks.

Commissioner Hauser stated, on hearing Commissioner Domurat's comment, she thought it was a schoolhouse connection of the historic building, and it is such a cool idea. She thought there could also be some school public art on the bench.

Chair Nibbelin hoped staff can take those suggestions back to appropriate individuals to integrate them going forward. He agreed with comments raised by other commissioners and he thought it was an interesting sort of a project and he thought that harmonizing the new elements with the historical elements was well-conceived and not trying to match it but trying to compliment it. He thought it was well conceived and was in favor of the project. He was a little concerned about the vehicular aspects as it is a tight area, and acknowledges that they have to deal with that fact. He thought the concerns expressed were well taken but they will have to be careful and patient. He thought, what they are proposing, is to code but perhaps not optimal but they sometimes have to adjust to less than optimal circumstances. He was open to anyone inclined to make a motion.

Commissioner Hauser moved that the Planning Commission FINDS the Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVES Site Development Permit PSD-855-21, Use Permit UP-129-21, Coastal Development Permit CDP-432-21, Historic Preservation Permit HPP-7-21 and Parking Exception PE-192-21 by adopting the resolution included as Attachment A to the staff report, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A to the resolution; and incorporates all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Godwin seconded the motion.

Dep. Planning Director Murdock took a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **5-0-1**.

Planning Commission Minutes

November 15, 2021

Page 8 of 10

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

Chair Nibbelin invited Vice Chair Berman back to the meeting.



**CONSIDERATION:**

None

**COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:**

Vice Chair Berman wished all our veterans a happy Veteran's Day, adding that she thought it includes Chair Nibbelin.

Chair Nibbelin stated that it did, adding that it applied to Dep. Planning Director Murdock as well.

Vice Chair Berman thanked them for their service. She also thanked staff for all the work they have been putting in to the Hillside Prevention District information, mentioning pamphlets going out to the public.

Commissioner Hauser echoed Vice Chair Berman's wish of happy Veteran's Day, and she stated that, in light of all state laws, she has been noting cities adopting objective standards and she hoped Pacifica's objective standards are coming soon.

Chair Nibbelin thanked her for her Veteran's Day greeting.

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

Dep. Planning Director Murdock stated that he didn't have anything but responded to Commissioner Hauser's remarks about objective standards. He stated that it was staff's intention to incorporate that through the robust comprehensive zoning update that will follow adoption of the General Plan. They thought that was the best time to have the detailed discussions that will need to occur related to adopting as many objective standards as they can to achieve the community's objectives. He thought a new planning paradigm in California with a lot less reliance on discretion on the part of decision making bodies like the Planning Commission and the Legislature forcing communities to adopt what their objective and goals are in ways that applicants can know and understand as they formulate their applications to make the processes simpler and faster with greater certainty in the outcomes, particularly for housing productions. He stated that they will do their best and deliver for the community. He stated that will follow up early to middle of next year after the General Plan is adopted.

Chair Nibbelin thanked him for that information. He had a question for the city attorney, stating that there is a blurb that they have in the bottom of the agenda that speaks to anybody who might be aggrieved by the action of the Planning Commission. He asked if there was a requirement to read that after a matter has been approved or deemed a matter of public record.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that she was not aware of a requirement that it be read out loud, but most agendas include it as a way to provide notice to the public that of their appeal rights. She stated that he was excellent at alerting the public to that opportunity at the end of the meeting and she thought he will do it again today.

Chair Nibbelin stated that he would note that anyone aggrieved by the action of the Planning Commission has ten (10) calendar days to appeal the decision in writing to the City Council. If the action they took is challenged in court, issues which may be raised are limited to those raised at the public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the city at or prior to the Public Hearing.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business for discussion, Chair Nibbelin moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:12 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 Vice Chair Berman  
Noes: None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina  
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

---

Planning Director Wehrmeister