

MINUTES

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

January 21, 2020

7:00 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Berman, Kraske, Bigstycyk and Acting Chair Campbell
Absent: Commissioners Rubinstein, Nibbelin and Clifford

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Berman

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Sr. Planner Murdock
Assoc. Planner O'Connor
Police Chief Steidle
Asst. City Attorney Bazzano

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

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Kraske, Bigstycyk and Acting Chair Campbell
Noes: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: NOVEMBER 4, 2019 and DECEMBER 16, 2019 Commissioner Bigstycyk moved approval of minutes of November 4, 2019 and December 16, 2019; Commissioner Berman seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Kraske, Bigstycyk and Acting Chair Campbell
Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 27, 2019:

Acting Chair Campbell stated that they would not need a liaison.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

- 1. CDP-416-19** **File No. 2019-034 – Emergency Coastal Development Permit CDP-416-19**, filed by applicant, Jason West, for demolition of a projecting concrete patio to the rear of an existing primary structure Located at 1112 Palmetto Avenue (APN 009-291-040).
Recommended CEQA Action: N/A

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it was possible to pass this without a staff report as a consent item. He gave a brief staff report.

Commissioner Bigstycck moved to approve consent.

City Attorney Bazzano asked Acting Chair Campbell if he opened public comment for this item.

Acting Chair Campbell asked if they needed to for consent.

City Attorney Bazzano apologized as she didn't realize it was on consent calendar.

Commissioner Berman seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Kraske, Bigstycck and
 Acting Chair Campbell
Noes: None

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS:

2, 2018-025

File No. 2018-025 – Annual review of a Cannabis Retail Operation located at 2270 Palmetto Avenue (APN 016-182-360).
Recommended CEQA Action: Exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15378.

Sr. Planner Murdock presented the staff report.

Commissioner Bigstyk commented that he wanted to make sure he understood it and asked if there were any calls for service regarding the Phog Center.

Police Chief Steidle stated that they have had zero calls.

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

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that the only possible concern he had was whether there were any issued caused by the Phog Center being there as it was the first approved permit. He concluded that there is no cause for alarm and everything is running smoothly.

Commissioner Bigstyk moved to ADOPT the attached resolution to FIND that the annual review of the cannabis retail operation is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; to FIND that the operation of the cannabis retail operation at 2270 Palmetto Avenue (APN 016-294-570) is in full compliance with the requirements of Article 48 of Chapter 4 of Title 9 of the Pacifica Municipal Code; and to INCORPORATE all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Berman seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Kraske, Bigstyk and
Acting Chair Campbell
Noes: None

compromise. She stated that an affordable housing project was presented to Planning over the summer and the project assessment could possibly have continued if the density were 3-9 units per gross acre. She referred to the RHNA allocation, and the city needs more housing particularly in low income levels. She stated that she included that table on page 3. She stated that recent state legislation requirements are important, SB330.

Jeff Guillet, Pacifica, stated that he has comments on the definitions in the Post-Consultation Draft. He stated that he has problems with a lot of the definitions because they don't define enough what they should be, particularly redevelopment and is defined in Section 30106 of the California Coastal Act which consists of alteration including interior and exterior remodeling and renovations, demolitions or partial demolitions of major structural components and it is considered redevelopment which is new development and if someone did any sort of remodeling, and changes the footprint, added a new window, a new fence, replacing a roof and that would make the structure considered redevelopment. He stated that the new rules would then apply to them. He stated that there needs to be an exclusion due to fire, earthquake or floods so if someone's house burns down and they try to rebuild it, it is not considered redevelopment and subject to new rules to prevent them from building. He stated that there was one section that talks about adopting the maps and figures within the document. He stated that some of the maps were specifically rejected by the city attorney and made a disclaimer on each map saying they cannot be used for any future planning, permitting, etc. He stated, by saying they adopt all the maps within the document, it was negating that and it needs to be removed. He referred to what happens if an existing structure is considered previously permitted and if someone had a permit for something in 1980 and no one can locate the permits anymore and whether it becomes a non-conforming structure.

Sam Casillas, Pacifica, stated that they appreciate all the hard work in trying to juggle so many interests. He stated that Pacifica continues to ignore climate change as the science in regard to flooding and coastal erosion has rezoned in the LCP process which must include a full manager retreat plan. He stated that the Coastal Commission has already stated it was within their jurisdiction and this is what needs to be done. He stated that the state guidelines have directed the cities to realize the state is not natural resources safeguarding California and is continued to be ignored. He stated that the document states that an opportunity to achieve broad environmental benefits is to the use of natural infrastructure solutions to mitigate climate change including the restoration and conservation of natural systems such as wetlands to provide more resilient natural systems and offer protections for climate impacts. He stated that his letter to comments were ignored and mentioned there are four specific areas that have these hazards probably should be amended. He stated that the fish and bowl property is one. He stated that it funnels water through its base causing severe runoff and any development endangers the road and the neighborhood to the north. He stated that the quarry in Rockaway Beach would be ideal for taking flooding pressure off the developed area and storm search on Highway 1. He stated that the Rockaway Headlands was in danger of major bluff erosion and the majority of the property will fall into the sea, but the city has recommended permanent structures including a restaurant. He stated that the Pedro Point wetlands, called the Calson field. He stated that they have been listed in the fish and wildlife federal wetlands inventory which was ignored. They have been illegally ditched by both the city and the property owners without proper Coastal Commission permitting. He stated that there is no up-to-date and verified hydrology report. He stated that he has been providing hydrology information. He referred to a section in the packet where the owner when they mowed the property water has continually been bubbling up. He asked why that isn't being considered. He stated that the property has been zoned commercial recreational,

and according to the Coastal Commission, they should consider conservation when they are looking at that. He stated that the city is not providing any evidence to the contrary that it should be a different density, and including residential. He stated that the Coastal Commission also asked for further detail about the potential hazards and no additional detail is provided. He stated that they are putting it on the potential development while they changed the designation. He stated that they have to address that in the EIR.

Aaron Gregory, Pacifica, stated he and his wife own a Pacifica-based T-shirt company called Cotton Crustacean. He stated that they are hoping to open their flagship storefront in Sharp Park in their home which has been commercially zoned for 60 years and is now set to not be commercially zoned. He stated that they started talking to the city in June 2018, and ran the idea by of what they want to do. They were going to pick up their house for a whole story and build a new story underneath which will be an entire commercial retail store front. He stated that in doing that, the house will be picked up eight feet and moved back allowing for two parking spaces and will get their two vehicles off the street and will be great for the neighborhood. He stated that they are located at 184 Paloma and are directly across the street from Winters Tavern. He stated that there is an apartment building next to them that is set to full commercial and office. He stated that next to Winters they have an empty lot owned by a tow truck company which is set to become a new commercial development. He stated that they are surrounded by commercial properties on all sides except for the west. He stated that they are friends with their neighbors to the west and they are all very excited and help them run their pop up shop at Fog Fest. He stated that he is a scientific illustrator and designs T-shirts with marine animals on them and the store will be a science themed boutique and selling shirts will be the main focus but they will have other art work from local artists, etc. He mentioned a store on Valencia in San Francisco that has beautiful signs with interior design of natural history. He was on the Board of the Pacifica Ocean Discovery Center that they hope to see some day. He stated that this is the micro-version of that and could plant the seed for that future development. They have hired an architect and plans are in and things on the way. They hope it all goes through and they are asking to maintain their commercial zoning which is part of the reason they bought the house in 2013.

Cindy Abbott, Pacifica, stated that she requests that the Planning Commission hold off on passing the Local Coastal Plan draft to City Council. She thought it was ironic in the same meeting an agenda item calling for an emergency approval of demolition for a concrete patio projecting over the ocean and crumbling into the sea was passed and approved. She stated that on January 13, 2020, first 2020 City Council meeting they approved for the 47th time a motion declaring a state of emergency along the coast from Westline Blvd. to the end of Beach Blvd. She stated that they have a problem in Pacifica and it needs to be addressed. She state that the draft Local Coastal Plan does not take a strong stand to do that and they need the longer view to go beyond a draft that focuses on armoring and beach nourishment. She stated that a statement in the responses on page 32 of the staff comments notes that Pacifica's development pattern with significant pre-Coastal Act private development and public infrastructure leaves no other viable near term policy than to focus on protecting and armoring the shoreline. She thought the early development shows exactly why we need to be taking a much longer and stronger view. She stated that we don't want to have the community, Planning Commissioners, Councilmembers or citizens dealing with what we didn't want to deal with at this point in time. She stated that earlier in the day a post went out from Pacifica's government services noting that mitigation investment means spending now to save later. She stated that they need prevent risks from getting worse and protect lives and property from being damaged or lost and educate people to be aware and prepared and work together to build a stronger and more resilient community. She hoped they could do it together

and find the middle ground and they are not trying to put concrete and rocks on the shoreline and destroy our beaches, but looking for a longer term vision which includes managed retreat or at least talking about it and educating the public on what that might mean for Pacifica. She stated that there has been a lot of false information spread about that concept. She looked forward to hearing their conversation as they proceed.

Joanne Gold, Pacifica, stated she is representing the Pedro Point Community Association. She stated that they had submitted a letter commenting on the LCP which she will not repeat, but she stated that, after reading the other comments, this was an opportunity to avoid having this same conversation ten years from now. She stated that the property in the Calson field will be subject to all kinds of sea level rise issues and preventing others from being in the same position as many present residents are now is something she hopes they will address and heed the Coastal Commission's comments. She stated that they can't kick this can down the road further and she mentioned that many commissioners have long term commitments to Pacifica and they don't want to listen to other residents in the future.

Rob Vercoe, Pacifica, stated he moved to Pedro Point after falling in love with Pacifica. He heard comments that got him thinking. He stated that it comes down to legacy and how we preserve the character of neighborhoods by balancing future growth alternatives and initiatives that keep the environment in mind as well as why we like to live here. He stated that he doesn't have the answers but he thought the Commission had a good sense of what that could look like and have taken that into consideration with feedback and comments. He stated that it was unclear to him as to what proposals, other than acronyms, have been thrown around. He stated that he will heed to those in the neighborhood, the city and the property owner to decide what that looks like. He read the documents and thought there were things in them that they need to think about and consider, mentioning land use, traffic, infrastructure and character were very important. He didn't think you need to retreat if you don't make a decision to go somewhere. He thought there were great proposals and a lot to consider but he cautioned them to change the proposals that would change the character of the neighborhood. If they find that the wetland studies are valid, they should adhere to federal and state guidelines, mentioning that in his neighborhood there is water running down the hill all the time and he thought there was a lot to say about the present environment and what they may do that will change or impact it. He thought, after hearing comments, that there was still lack of clarity and he thought it was important to address the issues that affect decisions being made that are important to the neighborhood, legacy and future.

Cherie Chan, Pacifica, stated that she clarified that the preexisting designated land use for the Calson field was commercial with an emphasis on coastal related and/or visitor serving uses. She stated that, when change is mentioned, the neighborhood is so reactionary because that is what they see as well as ill-fated residential homes in a place with known hazards being a problem for the neighborhood. She appreciated the distinction between rules for existing development versus new development as they were all trying to prevent making the problems harder for future generations.

Acting Chair Campbell closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bigstyk referred to property on which the Cotton Crustacean might be setting up a shop, and thought the concern was that because of this document they might not be able to have what they are planning. He asked, if they don't tweak this document, whether it would preclude their business or it would be underway as they would like it to be.

Sr. Planner Murdock referred to packet page 103, stating that they summarized the city staff's assessment of the situation. He stated that the draft they are reviewing would change the land use designation to a residential only designation which would preclude the application that they filed having the potential to be approved in the future. He stated that, without the change, they would not be able to obtain approval of their current proposal. He reiterated that the change was necessary to enable to have their project be approved.

Commissioner Bigstycyk concluded that the change going forward was necessary.

Sr. Planner Murdock clarified that it was the change that they have requested.

Commissioner Bigstycyk understood, and asked if that was the change going through.

Sr. Planner Murdock explained that the recommendation going through was to grant the property owner's request to change the designation from medium density in the current draft to mixed use neighborhood.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it needs to be a part of the motion.

Acting Chair Campbell stated for the record that Commissioner Nibbelin entered the meeting half way through the public comments.

Commissioner Nibbelin apologized for being late but was at a school board meeting he had to attend for work. He referred to Mr Guillet's comment which he thought was making reference to maps that were rejected or upon City Council had made some comments. He asked for some clarification.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought Mr. Guillet was referring to the coastal vulnerability zone maps which are part of the LCLUP in Appendix B. He stated that those maps are important for application of certain policies in the LCLUP, including areas where hazard analysis is required prior to approving development. He thought Mr. Guillet correctly described a process where additional disclaimers and qualifications were added to the maps to ensure that they were used appropriately for the intended purpose of estimating the location of hazard zones in suggesting a site level accuracy and based on valuable models but not a substitute for a site specific engineering and hazard analysis.

Planning Director Wehrmeister added that Mr. Guillet may have keyed in on a separate discussion of maps, diagrams and land use classifications, referring to packet page 130, which is outside of Chapter 6 coastal resiliency chapter where it has the disclaimers. She thought they may need to make sure Chapter 1 paragraph has a proper reference to some of the disclaimers in Chapter 6.

Commissioner Berman stated that, in Section 6 of the Local Coastal Land Use Plan, there is mention of the vulnerability maps, and she asked staff to clarify those for the coastline resiliency will be updated and reviewed per site to identify with the LCP that each site if introduced into a new vulnerability area will be considered.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated, if he understands her question, he took it that she wants confirmation that the maps will periodically be updated to reflect the evolving conditions along the coast line. He stated that, in Policy CR-I-1 on packet page 312, it refers to the update process to reflect the best available science in understanding that as well as other sea level rise related projections and will become better known and understood that the city should periodically update those maps to use best available models and science.

Commissioner Berman asked if it was safe to assume the city will be referencing models that are accurate to the best of technology's ability.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought that was a fair characterization.

Commissioner Berman had more questions but asked if they want to take a linear approach or if there are any comments on the vulnerability maps.

Acting Chair Campbell asked Commissioner Bigstyk if he had any questions.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he had questions but was ready to let Commissioner Berman continue with the present question.

Commissioner Berman understood there was a question of the definition of redevelopment and the consultation draft, page G-9, stating that staff added a definition for substantial improvements. She asked if they could go over that to be sure everyone understands it and be added to the record. She asked what redevelopment definition triggers certain items.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it has been at the heart of the community's concerns as well as many comments from Coastal Commission staff. He asked the team to supplement his response as necessary. He stated that the Coastal Commission has insisted on a definition in the LCLUP of "redevelopment" and they attempted to respond with the definition that captures the range of activity included in that, going beyond that to revise the policy language to remove references in the implementing policies to redevelopment, particularly refer to it by a new term they called "substantial exterior structural modification" (SESM), on packet page 340. He explained that the policy language to implement that language references that specific term as defined and indicates that, if triggered the SESM part of that development needs to comply with all LCLUP policies including hazard analysis. He stated that it was clear that existing portions of the structure, which may be non-conforming with those policies including setbacks may remain as long as they don't make the non-conformity worse, which is staff's attempt to respect existing development and existing property rights while indicating significant changes to the site, SESMs, will trigger a hazard analysis and other LCLUP policy compliance which was the compromise they felt best represented issues raised by Coastal Commission staff and important elements that the community and decision makers have expressed throughout the public process.

Commissioner Berman thought there were exceptions if there is a natural disaster such as a fire, and you are allowed to reconstruct your home within 10% of what it was before.

Sr. Planner Murdock responded affirmatively, clarifying that there are several critical exceptions in the definition of what a substantial exterior structural modification includes. He stated that one exempts structures destroyed as a result of a disaster and are allowed to rebuild as though they

were existing development, as well as other exemptions such as a single family residential exemption which includes the 10% allowance she mentioned.

Planning Director Wehrmeister added that it was important to note that the exemption also includes development on any site which is protected from coastal erosion by an existing permitted shoreline protection structure which attempts to address some of the major concerns from several neighborhoods such as Sharp Park, etc. and any nonstructural maintenance components of the building as they heard concerns to make sure that re-roofing a structure or changing the siding of the structure are also exempt.

Acting Chair Campbell stated, on skipping ahead, he referred to the Calson property, and on page 104 of the staff report it talks about the 1980 local coastal land use plan and mentions commercial up to 22 units per acre and staff is referring to 22 units of residential per acre.

Sr. Planner Murdock responded affirmatively.

Acting Chair Campbell asked if that was the plan approved by the Coastal Commission.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the 1980 certified LCLUP included a commercial land use designation for that undeveloped San Pedro Avenue Calson property site and explained that classification was the city's widely applied commercial designation unlike the draft LCLUP which has a variety of different commercial designations, all commercial development was wrapped into that single designation of commercial and the LCLUP allowed mixed use residential development up to one unit per 2,000 square feet of site area, translating to 21.8 or 22 units per acre of mixed use residential development in the same structure as commercial use above the ground floor. He stated it was very particular in the form of development of mixed use as well as the density maximum allowance of up to one unit per 2,000 square feet or 22 units per acre. He stated that, where some people get hung up, is the zoning applied to the site and he thought there was a discussion to be had about that but it wasn't relevant to the present conversation as they were talking about the underlying land use designations and the zoning which is ultimately applied needs to be consistent with that. He stated that they would be having the conversation in reverse to consider the C-R or Commercial Recreational zoning as opposed to the underlying controlling land use designation which is what they are talking about in this document.

Acting Chair Campbell stated, to understand it, the deepest underlying controlling authority would be the General Plan. He asked if the General Plan had it as commercial and recreational initially with no mention of residential.

Sr. Planner Murdock understood that the General Plan has the same commercial land use designation described in the context of the LCLUP. He stated that the General Plan and the 1980 LCLUP are aligned as one and the same in the sense that the language in the LCLUP is incorporated in the General Plan. He thought that the General Plan and LCLUP are peer documents in the Coastal Zone and all the city's actions need to be consistent with the General Plan but the city's actions also need to be consistent with the LCLUP in the Coastal Zone, and so they are competing and comparable requirements.

Acting Chair Campbell thought there was a lot of difference of opinion on that.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it helps to clarify for any coastal development permit the city issues, Local Coastal Plan compliance is required, adding that, while other non CDP entitlements may require General Plan compliance, to issue the CDP which must accompany any development LCLUP compliance is required. He stated that, in that sense, they were comparable peer level policy documents.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they just found the General Plan map and it is commercial.

Acting Chair Campbell stated that it is commercial.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that his question is regarding the SESM definition and he was thinking about existing structures and what constitutes removal or replacement and the baseline date as they move forward to apply this standard certification. He thought they would be taking a baseline date of the cumulative development as of the date of certification of the document as opposed to the date of the adoption of the Coastal Act. He asked if he had that right.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he did, explaining that the SESM definition on page 340 references the term existing structure which is defined on packet page 335 with the operative date being certification of this LCLUP and measuring any change to the structure or whether it is considered "existing" for purposes of the policies would be the date of certification of this LCLUP. He stated that they would be forward looking in application of these policies and would not retroactively apply them to properties which may have been developed or improved upon without full knowledge of these policies contained in this document.

Acting Chair Campbell stated that this was a lot of material which was thorough and wonderfully put together, but some of the comments received at this time from the Golf Course Alliance and regarding Calson site were interesting. He stated that there was one comment on what he is thinking which was to give them a bit more time to digest this. He thought this was a lot and he would like to take the comments they got at this time and revisit the package with those in mind. He acknowledged that they came in written form but they were extensive. He stated his suggestion was to continue the item for one more meeting so they could dig into it. He was also skeptical that enough people have clued in on this. He acknowledged that they did a wonderful job putting it on the website but the amount of comment was only from a half dozen people and he thought it was amazing considering this is the Local Coastal Land Use Plan. He was worried that there may be a need for one more round of outreach and they could do their part by getting into social media. He reiterated that his suggestion was to continue it for one more meeting.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that he wouldn't mind more time to digest more, although he thought it was adequate so far, and if that was the consensus of the Commission he would be happy to continue. He knew that they had been given a grant to accomplish this in a particular amount of time and he understood that it might have bearing on how quickly how the General Plan gets finished, and then asked staff, if they continue it for a couple of weeks, how detrimental would it be to getting this accomplished in a timely fashion.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that Assoc. Planner O'Connor would be able to answer his question about the grant, but Council had some goals they are trying to meet in terms of

completing the General Plan and the Specific Plan on time and ultimately the goal was to get this to the Coastal Commission as soon as possible to get the time clock running on the time they have to complete the review. She added that they could extend their own time to do that. She didn't think two weeks would have a significant impact on that, but she didn't want to say that there is not a timing consideration as there is.

Assoc. Planner O'Connor referred to the grant they received from the Coastal Commission, stating that they completed their final task under the amended scope of work at the end of last year and that grant has been fulfilled.

Commissioner Bigstyk concluded that the grant was secured but Council is hoping to accomplish this by June at the latest.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they are trying to get this document to the Coastal Commission earlier to start their review in the hope that they will be able to provide the city comments or potentially take this to their Commission while the city continues to work on the General Plan and Specific Plan.

Commissioner Berman referred to Council's plan for the date that the Local Coastal Land Use Plan, General Plan and Sharp Park Specific Plan get finalized, and asked if we know those dates.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it is by the end of June or July.

Commissioner Berman thought the Coastal Commission has at least 90 days to review and respond or approve but they could extend up to a year.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they could.

Commissioner Berman thought time was a good thing to consider, but she personally thought the 2 weeks or 4 weeks if Council pushes back their deadline didn't seem that significant to her in the grand scheme of being held by the Coastal Commission's undetermined schedule for viewing as it may be up to a year. She acknowledged that is a pessimistic outlook but she shares Commissioner Campbell's concerns with making sure that everyone in the public gets to listen to their deliberation, review the document, and provide comments. She mentioned that the majority of the comment period was over the holidays which was difficult for people. She stated that, regarding making changes, she would love to go through the document again. She didn't have any recommendations for major changes. She mentioned one item that was brought up in comment was considering heavier armoring or heavier considerations for coastline protection or considering managed retreat. She liked that staff incorporated language in Section 6, Policy CRI-4, packet page 314 which she thought might have been a previous comment by the Coastal Commission but it provides a timeline of reviewing sea level rise adaptation of five years. She understood that every five years considerations of whether they need to change their approach, look at new technology, etc., to keep people and property safe, and that language makes her feel confident that she wouldn't recommend major changes to this section. She was in support of extending for the community as well as the Commission.

Commissioner Nibbelin hoped to get a sense of what the outreach process has been. Looking at this item, he knew it was a fairly robust effort to ensure that community members were aware of this. He was interested in knowing what was done.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought the bulk of their efforts involved trying to make sure all the relevant information was available to the community and since early 2019, they have been promoting the PlanPacifica.org webpage as the clearing house for information related to this effort regarding the General Plan, LCP and Sharp Park Specific Plan to supplement that place that they hope is familiar to many in the community. He stated that they have also provided announcements when public comments periods were available and when draft documents were available through the Plan Pacifica email list which he thought was sent to over 700 recipients who are interested in the material and will likely want to participate. He stated that they have also continued the effort on social media, Facebook, NextDoor and Connect with Pacifica weekly city email newsletter. He thought they have utilized the channels they have had readily available to make sure there is wide dissemination of the availability of this information.

Commissioner Nibbelin thought it was a good robust work on the part of staff, thus he will agree with his fellow commissioner as he was surprised when he arrived late to find parking so close to building. He thought maybe it was the weather

Acting Chair Campbell thought it was because it was a Tuesday.

Commissioner Nibbelin agreed that might be a factor. He was disinclined with a continuance because he likes to see matters move forward, but he will also acknowledge this was a pretty heavy lift and he will concede that he didn't read every last paper in the binder and he thought it would not be a bad thing to have more time if that is the general direction.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that, within the context of low public attendance, he was disinclined to engage in a conversation as robust as something like those dreaded two words, managed retreat. He stated that, in general, he was disinclined to talk about them because of the amount of consternation they cause in the community. He thought, when delving into a document like this which is not easily digestible in five days as he was appointed to take a thorough look and deliberate as much as capable, some people have admitted being brand new to the process and if he was not on the Commission he might think that he will not take a deep look at it and listen to staff and Commission. He stated that it was daunting no matter from what perspective. He stated that earlier, looking at transfer of development rights and as Commissioner Berman mentioned CR-I-4, he saw it as being a tighter balance than the normal public discourse is in terms of property rights versus figuring out managed retreat. He thought there was a lot of nuance in the document that lends itself towards taking steps toward managed retreat if they decide as a community that they want to do. Right now, he thought holding off on it and figuring how to keep our community secure was the first step and once they figure out that security, then figuring out what steps they can take if that is what the science bears out. He stated that transfer of development rights is something that has not been talked about at this meeting, and he thought was a step in direction of incentivizing those who see it as a more pressing issue for their own properties. He thought the CRI-4 necessitates reassessing things every five years or sooner depending on what is going on. He thought five years was a reasonable amount of time to come to a conclusion and get something done between this moment and when they are coming to that conclusion. He concluded that what he would like to see is something that tells them at some point there will be an opportunity for the public to see that over five years' time these are studies the city has done and what they monitored and the science at which they are looking and the conclusions they have come to, whether at a Council or Planning Commission. He would like to see integrated with CRI-I-4 something that insures that there is an obviously publicly transparent

perspective on the way the city is engaging and reassessing which is what that says. He stated that, if there is consensus to continue this, he would take the time to read more than he has at this time, but he thought the real fighting in the community will be in front of City Council. He hoped that, rather than fighting, a conversation of perspective sharing is what will happen with Council.

Commissioner Kraske was also in agreement with the Commission in continuing the vote to allow more time for digestion and public comment.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that they had a period for written comment that is closed, and he didn't take that their motion was that staff should reopen that period, because it would impose additional work on staff to review and respond. He acknowledged that they might see things that are forwarded to them, but he wouldn't be in favor of the idea of expecting staff to respond to further written comments.

Acting Chair Campbell was in total agreement.

Commissioner Berman asked, given that it will be another item on the forthcoming agenda, whether they will have to accept written comments from the public on the forthcoming agenda.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they will forward any written comments they receive and they will have oral communications as well. She thought what she was hearing is that the expectation that there will be a major rework of the document is not anticipated and they will be keeping their binders and staff will supplement that with any comments they receive and anything they need to address regarding what is in the comments.

Acting Chair Campbell thought that was his perspective and acknowledged Commissioners also agreed with that.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if there was consensus with staff recommending granting the property owner of Cotton Crustacean as a Mixed Use Neighborhood land use designation.

Commissioner Nibbelin thought, if they continue the item, they could include that in the conversation when the item is continued.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he asked now so that when it comes back there will be a motion prepared with that in the motion and they don't have to think about it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it wasn't before them as a separate item. She assumed Commissioner Bigstyk was requesting some deliberation on that at this time.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he was wanted deliberation on that being in the motion later.

Commissioner Nibbelin thought it was that the document be revised to reflect that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister understood.

Commissioner Nibbelin thought the absent Commissioners might have a view on it if the item is continued, and he wasn't opposed to the suggestion, but noted that there may be some benefit to have alternate language available that they could switch rather than making the change.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought it would be helpful to him rather have to do it at the specific time and asked the attorney to help with the wording.

Acting Chair Campbell thought the answer was probably in the report and they need to read it.

Planning Director Wehrmeister added that they would need to continue it to a date certain. She stated that the first meeting in February is February 3.

Commissioner Berman asked if there was availability on that day.

Planning Director Wehrmeister asked if she was referring to the agenda.

Commissioner Berman responded affirmatively.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they do have availability on that meeting agenda.

Commissioner Berman moved that the Planning Commission continue the review, deliberation and consideration of the Local Coastal Land Use Plan post consultation draft to the future Planning Commission meeting scheduled for February 3; Commissioner Nibbelin seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Berman, Nibbelin, Kraske, Bigstycyk and Acting Chair Campbell
Noes:	None

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he acted as Planning Commission liaison to the meeting on January 13 regarding accessory dwelling units and junior accessory dwelling units. He was asked a question to help clarify some confusion about ten-foot setbacks and he did his best, and it worked out in the end and Council went ahead. He stated that on January 22, in the Half Moon Bay library at 6:00 p.m., the county's Planning Commission is going to convene to look at an affordable housing project in Moss Beach called Cypress Point. He stated that, if anyone is interested in affordable housing for the region with a potential to ease housing issues in Pacifica, he thought sending comments now or attending the meeting would be a great way to encourage affordable housing being built in our region.

Commissioner Campbell stated that after three terms and three Council votes, he will not be signing up for a fourth term. He thought his term ends in March along with Commissioner Clifford, and he was letting staff know so they can plan accordingly.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the recruitment has opened for Planning Commission but she did not have the specific due date but it is sometime in early February. She stated that they can check the City Clerk's website and find information if anyone is interested. She stated that on the next Wednesday they have a meeting at the Little Brown Church to discuss the Sharp Park Specific Plan and everyone is welcome. She stated that the start time is 6:30 on January 29.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Nibbelin moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:28 p.m.; Commissioner Bigstyk seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Nibbelin, Kraske, Bigstyk and
Acting Chair Campbell
Noes: None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister