

MINUTES

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

February 3, 2020

7:00 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Berman, Campbell, Nibbelin, Kraske, Bigstycyk and Vice Chair Rubinstein.

Absent:

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Bigstycyk

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

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

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Campbell, Nibbelin, Kraske, Bigstycyk and Vice Chair Rubinstein

Noes: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None.

Commissioner Bigstycyk mentioned that their packet had the minutes for the previous minutes.

Planning Director Wehrmeister explained that they were in draft format and they would put them back on the agenda for adoption when staff was through reviewing them.

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 10, 2020:

None

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. Consideration of Draft Local Coastal Land Use Plan (LCLUP) of Local Coastal Program (LCP) and Recommendation to City Council. Recommended CEQA Action: Statutory Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15265.**

Sr. Planner Murdock presented the staff report. Sr. Planner Murdock described staff's proposed changes to various property owner requests identified in the Staff Report. One of the proposed changes was to clarify the coastal residential mixed-use land use designation and Policy LD-I-20 applicable to the Undeveloped San Pedro Avenue Site (also known as the Calson Property), including the type of proposed mixed use which would be allowed. These changes were described in Attachment H of the staff report. Sr. Planner Murdock explained that due to a request from Ms. Calson for further clarification, he and Planning Director Wehrmeister attended a meeting that morning with Sheryl Calson, owner of the Undeveloped San Pedro Avenue Site described in the LCLUP. After the meeting, staff prepared further edits to Attachment H of the staff report to better clarify the City Council's prior guidance for Policy LD-I-20 applicable to the site. Sr. Planner Murdock explained that these further edits proposed by staff had been provided to the Commissioners and were printed and available for the public in the rear of the Council Chambers. Additionally, written comments received after the publication of the agenda package had been provided to the Commissioners and are also available for the public in the rear of the Council Chambers.

Commissioner Bigstyk thanked staff for helping them with the prepared wording of an alternative resolution. He referred to Chapter 3 mentioning of schools in conjunction with usable park space, and he thought the question had been raised at a study session that at various schools their park space was not readily available for public use, pointing out the specific references and he asked if he was mistaken.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that his recollection from the study sessions was that, he was generally correct that many of the public school recreational facilities are not widely available for public use. He understood that there may be some limited instances where there are shared use agreements and the LCLUP and the General Plan encouraged wider use of those agreements where the city can enter into them with the local schools.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought that, by keeping the language in, it might make it more readily available down the road.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they want to make sure there are policies supporting the LCLUP and the General Plan to expand upon those types of agreements whenever possible.

Commissioner Bigstyk referred to a letter they received which addressed the EQ basin, and he thought the equalization basin doesn't occur in the coastal zone and why it was not included and he asked if his thoughts were not accurate.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he was correct, explaining that the EQ basin was an infrastructure constructed by the city and is located outside the coastal zone but is integrated through the sewer collection system with infrastructure that is in the coastal zone, including the Linda Mar pump station, sewer mains and the Calera Creek water recycling plants. He wasn't sure they needed to

expand the analysis to mention the equalization basin and he thought the LCLUP as written was adequate without those changes.

Commissioner Campbell referred to a comment from the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance that discussed inserting some language regarding improvements of the storm water drainage system to Pacifica's streets because of a lot of storm water from outside the coastal area and coming into the park and affecting the coastal zone. He asked if that is being considered by building. He thought it was a good idea to keep it in.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that there were several ways to answer that question. She stated that the policy referenced in Chapter 6 specifically dealing with coastal resiliency and the policies were designed to address any breach of the golf course sea wall or if it is not maintained. She stated that there are other areas of the General Plan that deal with the city and Public Works maintenance and review of the storm water collection system to make sure it is adequate and addressing flows from other areas of Pacifica.

Commissioner Berman echoed appreciation of staff's efforts in creating the staff report which was helpful. She stated that she noticed on Figure 2-3 when looking at Esplanade area, the staff report mentions changing the land use of some of the lots which she supported, but she noticed three other lots along Esplanade that are currently proposed as high density residential but they look vacant. She wondered why those were not proposed to be conservation.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought she was referring to the lots on the 300 block of Esplanade, and he thought other staff members have more updated information but he understood that they still remain in private ownership and to designate them as conservation may not be appropriate at this time as it would deprive them of all development potential. He stated that considering some other land use designation that has development potential is something to discuss but conservation specifically would not be appropriate while in private ownership.

Commissioner Berman asked if the residential/open space/agriculture designation be appropriate.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it would require more analysis by staff to figure out the approximate lot sizes and determine if that would allow them to build even one residence or one dwelling unit. He stated that the open space agriculture is based on more than five acres per dwelling unit and those sites are significantly smaller than five acres each and they could result in a difficult circumstance for a property owner to have economic use of the property.

Commissioner Berman understood, adding that she thought they were privately owned and why the land use had to remain high density residential, but she thought there were other locations throughout the city where they are redesignating owned land. She acknowledged that they weren't designating it as conservation which would not make sense. She wondered if they could find a more appropriate designation if the lots come under separate ownership.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it was a fair point, and he thought if they could visit it a bit later in the hearing, they could attempt to come up with a recommendation that might fit that circumstance.

Commissioner Berman referred to Section 3, Figure 3-4, stating that she noted this when she was walking on the beach by Taco Bell, and stated that it was like the proposed bike network figure

which identifies a Class 1 facility through the Taco Bell parking lot but she didn't think there was one. She stated that there were several bikers who biked over the dirt through the ADA access path and she thought it was an unsafe interaction. She stated that, as the figure proposes class 1 to be upgrade and if a facility is to be upgraded, is there a plan to go through the lot or around it.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought that, at the scale it was created, the people preparing it didn't have the level of familiarity of the break she was talking about which is relatively small linear distance and, if it is reflected in the figure, it wasn't shown because of the scale but he thought they needed to annotate the map to be clear there appears to be a break in the class 1 trail in that location.

Commissioner Berman thought that would be beneficial and an incentive to continue that connection if possible in the future.

Vice Chair Rubinstein opened the Public Hearing.

Mark Steckbart, Pacifica, stated that he had an amendment to discuss and codify what Council has dealt with over the past six months, as it got washed out in the redline discussion several months ago but he thought it was pertinent that there was a clear demonstrated protections for businesses, homes and infrastructure west of Highway 1. He stated that the rest of his comment is to deal with Jeff Guillet's comment. He concluded that existing and nonconforming structures and redevelopment were just words put around a policy that was suicide for Pacifica. He stated that the 1977 date is corrosive, concluding that since then residents have gotten approvals for remodel which he thought were a few 2x4s and one wall, and that falls into the trap. He stated that now they are in a Coastal Commission trap and he felt it was fundamentally unfair as no one warned them. He felt that has to get fixed. He stated that they have 200 signatures on the website submitted as evidence on managed retreat. He stated that the real benefit on manage retreat was shown in November when universally rejected and John Keener got beat because Pacificans don't want managed retreat. He thought they will catch the Lighthouse Hotel, Ingrid B. Lacy Middle School, the new sewer plant, stores at Pedro Point and Manor are in the remodel trap and don't know it. He urged them to abandon the maps. He stated that, if the doctrine was that everything east of shoreline protection stays dry, those maps are redundant and not be considered by any Council writing off a billion dollars' worth of real estate, and public policy will not support. He didn't think Council is buying it.

Richard Harris, San Francisco, stated he was with the San Francisco Public Golf Alliance and submitted a letter to catch up with the moving target of the revised draft and bring them current. He referred to Commissioner Bigstyk's question on the fluvial flooding, stating that the plan deals with both ocean and flooding from the inland. He stated that the two provisions their group has requested are additional language to deal with the issue of flooding coming from inland to the neighborhoods. He stated that a substantial contributor is Pacifica zoned storm water drainage system. He stated that he gave them a map indicating streets and highway that should be dealt with by the added wording proposed and be looked into when the city is dealing with the fluvial flooding. He stated that most of the issues they addressed in prior comments have been resolved to their satisfaction in the current draft, but there are about 6-7 issues that he outlined in today's letter, with some simply drafting points of the applicable law and he thought the coastal act should be cited and linked, and he suggested a way to do that in his comment. He referred to the draft update and adaptation plan provided in the city's goals. He referred to his letter for more information as he ran out of time.

Rob Verloe, Pacifica, appreciated the time put into the updates and he reviewed them extensively, and stated that one thing still unclear to them is the reason the city want to make a land use change in the Pedro Point Calson property from 1980, and they felt it needs to be addressed. He heard about needing more housing and more revenue, and he could only imagine what it is like for them to try and balance them. He stated that, if the change is to provide more residential, he stated the 1980 plan projected that 46,000 people would live in Pacifica in 2000, and his google search shows that 40,000 live here now. He was trying to understand, if housing is a key driver, what the measures they are using to make these decisions. He stated his response to that rational is what he said previously, which is they need to have more quantitative reasons to make changes to the original plan. He felt it sounds that they hedging that has not been provided to the residents in Pedro Point to have context or clarity as to why this makes sense. He drives home and questions why things are changing. He stated that, if they know why, they might work with the change but without that, it appears that the recommendation has come from a vacuum. He understood their considerations and asked that they be more explicit as to why they are making it. He felt it was an easy thing to ask, as he looks at the changes and mention of preserving the nature of the neighborhood. He stated that, based on the new proposals, it seems like a disconnect from the original document and the intent of what they were trying to preserve. He stated that he will ask Council the same thing, which is why they are making the change and what quantitative or empirical research was made to make such decisions.

Suzanne Drake, Pacifica, stated that, in going over the recent changes regarding Local Coastal Plan, managed retreat, sea level rise, etc., her question is definitions. She stated that her house predates Pacifica's records and she thought it could be a historical landmark. She stated that a couple of years ago she made a mistake of putting a new roof on her house which then classified it as a new development. She stated that now, if there is a fire at her house, she cannot rebuild the same as what she had existing but meet the new development classifications. She didn't think that made sense and they need to be clear that they don't screw up people with the terminology. She thought they should be putting a date on it such as saying they will implement new development in five years so that the existing owners can do whatever remodels they want to do for upgrades without the classification of the 1977 landmark. She felt it was important to understand the implications of the unclear terminology. She stated that, while a fire is a normal thing, the fact that a 100-year old house has to change or not be able to be rebuilt, She acknowledged that it is hard work and they are actively debating but they are behind them.

Victor Carmichael, Pacifica, stated that the previous local coastal land use plan should no longer be considered controversial. He stated that all the elements causing grief and anxiety, i.e., managed retreat, cost benefit analysis have been removed and explained and justified. He stated that managed retreat no longer resides in the Local Coastal Plan update and was mentioned as a last resort if circumstances demand it through an amended Local Coastal Plan. He stated that they are with a plan they hope the Coastal Commission will accept but relying on business as usual. He thought, as they assume they can proceed into a serious sea level rise era with a flow of county, state and federal funds to help with sea wall revetment, etc. He referred to a mention of artificial headlands, stating he didn't know if anyone has seen them. He thought he saw them in Barcelona and were very artificial looking and expensive. He stated that the Coastal Commission is responsible for the entire coast, and they know there will never be enough state money to rescue all the vulnerable properties along the entire stretch of the California coast and as we proceed more deeply into the sea level rise era, they knows they need to discourage more building in the at risk zone, which is not like flood planes or barrier islands. He stated that those

properties are still valuable and they can discourage development bureaucratically and making it more difficult by no longer allowing structures that require further armoring or requiring extensive rebuilding of the structures, which accuses them of regulatory overreach. He stated that objectively, development should probably be stopped in the entire coastal zone. He then referred to the redline which shows what will be left under the worst case sea level scenario by 2100 if not enough is done to prevent it with sea walls and revetment. He suggested that they not throw those maps away.

Larry Bothon, Pacifica, stated that Pacifica's coastal zone has been under attack from the Coastal Commission ever since it used managed retreat to disenfranchise everything west of Route 1. He was present to support the protection of the entire coastal zone and everything in it. He stated that the Sharp Park district is the most vulnerable to the attacks and is the working, beating heart of Pacifica and contains an eclectic mix of affordable housing, including mobile homes, apartments, cottages and single family homes, as well as vital businesses and recreational opportunities, such as the pier, golf course, etc. He stated that there aren't many places in California where working people can aspire to live and play by the sea and they think of Newport Beach or La Joya when they think of coastal living but unattainable to most citizens. He stated that Pacifica is blessed with a natural beauty that rivals and even exceeds some of those cities and is accessible at a relatively low cost compared to southern neighbors. He stated that the Coastal Commission's environmental justice policy calls for the protection of existing housing and lower cost recreational opportunities which is in line with goals stated by City Council in March 2018. He stated that all they were asking of the Commission and the city was to acknowledge and enforce its own policies in a place where it is most relevant for us and all the people who come from Northern California to beat the summer heat. He stated that environmental justice is for people and the places where they live, work and play. He stated that the cost of protecting these resources by strengthening our coastal armor in key places is only a fraction of the cost to displace people, businesses and infrastructure and he asked that they act now to do the right thing and preserve these priceless resources by protecting the coastal zone.

Danny Estrella, Pacifica, stated that he is addressing the Calson property issue. He stated that Sr. Planner Murdock gave an update after meeting with Sheryl Calson regarding the clarification of the land use designation for the property. He stated that it sounded like a major shift from commercial residential and now having residential with a detached commercial and sounds like a new definition of residential with an option for commercial. He felt that needed to be clarified, adding that there should be a requirement that any commercial/residential has to have an active commercial unit operating as they already have a commercial/residential unit with a non-operating commercial unit for several years. His request is regarding the process of reviewing the General Plan update and the Local Coastal Plan and requesting the community input with several meetings. He stated that, in spite of the overwhelming opposition to residential in the Calson property with evidence showing that the development of the property was unsuitable, he asked what the driving force that keeps pushing that to residential. He asked if it was only the owners, the Planning Commission, City Council or development industry. He felt there was a bias that seems unfair that, in spite of strong community opposition, they keep coming up to the same situation. He stated that now it is residential with a detached commercial. He asked that they explain what is going on.

Patricia Kremer, Pacifica, stated that Pacifica has become polarized over the topic of managed retreat and she was concerned that this polarization is interfering with the ability to do essential long term planning. She stated that sea level rise is a near certainty but we don't know the

timing of that rise. She stated that, with the geology of our region compared to the East Coast, it was likely that the rise will proceed more slowly but, with the power of seasonal weather patterns such as strong El Nino winters, increased rates of bluff erosion and coastal flooding will challenge Pacifica, and the details vary from one neighborhood to another, but the problems will only become worse in the future. She hoped that Pacifica can submit a Coastal Land Use Plan that will be approved by the Coastal Commission. She thought, to do that, we need to show that we have done serious long-term planning for Pacifica's future and she felt that the current plan does not do this. She stated that coastline armoring and beach nourishment are the dominant actions proposed in the current plan and she didn't think they were not realistic and they have proven shortcomings in how effective they are at maintaining beaches in high energy coastlines such as ours. She was concerned with the frequent reference to beach re-nourishment in the current plan, and thought it was not only fiscally unrealistic but also irresponsible because of giving property owners false hopes. She thought Pacifica could navigate its way through the Coastal Commission's approval process by emphasizing more realistic options for its long term planning. She favored facilitating the option of elevating existing structures by property owners rather than promoting the unrealistically expensive and ineffective approaches of armoring and sand re-nourishment. She thought the straightforward approach of raising structures will buy time indefinitely for a number of our low lying neighborhoods and keeping them viable indefinitely. She stated that, although mentioned in the current plan, it was not emphasized. She felt it should be an essential part of the long term planning for low lying neighborhoods for the next 50-100 years as it can make a big difference towards helping neighborhoods adapt to changing conditions.

Cherie Chan, Pacifica, thanked Commission and staff for all the hard work in preparing the General Plan updated and having to read it all weekend long. She referred to Rob Verloe's comments, stating that they cannot understand why Planning Commission is continuing to ask for a change in the 1980 General Plan. She stated that the designation is commercial with an emphasis on coastal related or visitor serving uses and thought it was the point of the Coastal Commission that they should have access to the coast. She referred to the current General Plan that says the document refers to the Calson lot and states that it was a commercial center and can be rejuvenated and expanded to become an attractive visitor serving destination. She stated that they have done everything they can to work with the Calsons, and they would love to have another golf course and the designated use for the area is commercial with an emphasis on coastal related or visitor serving use which is in place. She stated that it was the existing land use designation when the Calsons bought the property in 1997. She sympathize with those who bought their property prior to the Coastal Act but it existed 20 years ago and the reality of sea level rise continues to be a concern, adding that they only have so much money to not create new problems. She stated that the neighborhood will continue to oppose the zoning change to commercial/residential mixed use. She stated that they were grateful that they created a new land use designation called low intensity visitor serving commercial and it is entirely consistent with the 1980 General Plan. She stated that they were asking that they not make a change that goes against history and the progress we have made.

Aaron Gregory, Pacifica, stated that he owned 184 Paloma Avenue which is in the new amendment to the plan and he thanked staff for taking the time to consider that and thanked the Commission for considering it before it gets voted on later. He stated that he and his wife will be available to answer any questions they have about what they are doing i.e., lifting the house to put another story below it and they will open up a unique business.

Jeff Volosing, Pacifica, stated that he was an advocate for protecting all the Sharp Park area, beaches, homes, businesses, etc. He was against the managed retreat concept and hoped the Commission will take that into consideration.

Allison West, Pacifica, stated that she echoed her neighbors regarding the Calson property. She thought no one on the Commission lives on Pedro Point and they don't totally understand their position. She stated that their decisions pit neighbor against neighbor and property owner against property owner, and she thought it was unfair as they have to look out for their interest. She agreed with what Cherie Chan said that it was a low intensity visitor serving area. She read the amendment and she asked what percentage was commercial and residential. She thought the Calsons were having a 5 x 10 shack that says commercial and then they will have houses the size of the Council Chamber stacked next to each other. She stated that they will come with a plan and staff will feel they have to approve their plan. She stated that pits the other residents against them. She thought they need to look back as the Coastal Commission has given them numerous comments that seem to be ignored. She felt they were entitled to know the percentage of commercial and residential before they start coming up with a plan as she thought it was unfair to them in not knowing why they make the decisions they do and what is the bias against the community to keep it intact. She questioned the size of the units, the wetland survey, etc. She stated that their neighborhood was tired of having the same battle. She stated that she invited Commissioner Berman to have a chat with her and her suggestion was to have everyone together. She stated that she wrote to Commissioner Nibbelin and maybe he didn't get it because she didn't get the courtesy of a reply. She stated that they would like to invite them into their community and walk around and see what they are talking about. She asked that they consider what the neighbors say.

Bob Downing, Pacifica, stated that he was a 61-year-resident of Pacifica. He stated that, for the last three years, he has been president of the Sharp Park Golf Club, and they have done everything they can to save that place. He stated that they were family and they have a lot of "brothers and sisters", as they have over 300 members in the club and employees, and he stated that it generates a lot of money. He felt they speak for everyone and asked that they don't let their family go away as they love that place.

Cheryl Calson, Pacifica, stated that she was present to hear the discussions regarding the new language of the CRM designation. She stated that their property was the only one with that designation. She pointed out that residential without mixed use was permitted as long as there is a component of commercial mixed use on the site. She stated that this has been discussed with the Planning Director and other city leaders by email and she shared it at the meeting earlier. She stated that she didn't know it would be mentioned prior to her speaking. She stated that she also took time looking at all the 2019 meeting and she believed Councilmembers spoke on allowing residential use for their property. She stated that they have continued to ask for greater density as their property was the only one in Pacifica with 3-5 units per gross acre. She stated that even low density is defined as 3-9 per gross acre. She stated that, since the density was decreased from very substantially, 22 units, then up to 15 was the former language, and they were asking for a better compromise.

Cliff Smethurs, Pacifica, stated that he lives in Park Pacifica at the back of the valley and he would love to have ocean front property. He thought they should reject the proposal and plan. He stated that those who live in the "flat lands" pay their taxes every year and keep people employed in Pacifica, and he felt there was no reason to abandon that. He stated that if they just

use common sense and think about it, they would come to the same conclusion and reject the plan.

Vice Chair Rubinstein closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Campbell thought any language that can put in the plan to strengthen the protection of the golf course needs to be put in there, but not just for Commission or Council, but for San Francisco. He stated that he was worried about San Francisco in their zeal for housing. He referred to the new language which was raised by a speaker and he had been thinking about it as well, asking what the ratio was between commercial and residential that would be clear in the plan.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought some of the commenters' desires for that level of specificity are probably unreasonable for a document like the LCP or General Plan. He stated that a lot of the decisions about structure size and maximum floor areas and unit types would most typically be developed in the zoning which implements the General Plan and the LCP designations. He stated that the coastal residential mixed use designation on page 2-7 of the LCLUP does have some parameters, which he thought would begin to shape that conversation. He stated it specifically talks about non-residential development having a floor area ratio up to .5 floor area ratio (FAR). He stated that it wasn't a minimum, but more importantly, the total floor area ratio, including residential and non-residential cannot exceed 1.0 FAR and to the extent that someone is seeking to max out residential floor area, they are quickly going to come up against a requirement for a certain amount of viable commercial space as well. He thought that helps to balance out those considerations. He didn't think that is likely to be the case and the Commission will have another opportunity in shaping the zoning which will follow on adoption of the LCLUP and the General Plan to get a lot more specific in that regard.

Commissioner Campbell stated that his concern was when talking about mixed use, the language stating housing may be clustered and uses may be mixed vertically or horizontally. He thought, if you don't make it vertical, you move away from the mixed use that they are seeking and people are used to and have been approving for years in Pacifica, i.e., commercial on the bottom, usually token, and residential on top. He stated that, at least you have commercial and residential. He stated that, if they do it horizontal, it will just be homes. He worries about what kind of commercial they will get if it was just homes. He stated that one person being unreasonable is another person being arbitrary and capricious and this was so vague as to be falling within that definition of arbitrary and capricious. He stated that he would not sign onto this as written. He felt that it has to be more specific as he was worried that it will be subject to a lot of abuse. He stated that comes from history regarding mixed use which they have had complaints about it being token commercial and a lot of residential in areas and buildings that were supposed to be mixed use. He felt it had so many loopholes and thus he felt they needed to make it more specific.

Commissioner Berman asked if there was incentive to make it horizontally feasible to develop housing such as a request by the owner. She asked if she is correct that the mixed use currently proposed in that area is vertical, with commercial on the bottom and housing on top.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated he didn't know what example to which she was referring.

Commissioner Berman asked about a mixed use development.

Commissioner Campbell asked if she meant the taproom.

Commissioner Berman responded affirmatively.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the site is known as 535 San Pedro Avenue and is a vertical mixed use project. He referred to the inclusion of the horizontal mixed use designation, and he said that, if you look at the mixed use designation as written in this document, they all include the flexibility to have horizontal mixed use development. He stated that it did not come from one individual property owner or a small number of property owner requests but collectively the staff, in dealing with many property owners and potential project applicants, have expressed that the vertical mixed use limitation as written to be above the ground floor in the same building as commercial use was extremely limiting in the types of innovative projects that they can design and in many ways to make the projects fit and feel more appropriate in a part of the neighborhood. He mentioned that, in a highly commercial area, having a vertical mixed use project may be out of character whereas tucking residential units to the rear where they are less visible and parking amenities might be better accommodated would allow an improved site design. To achieve that end, they wrote in the consultation draft in September 2019 the ability to have not only vertical or the traditional mixed use they are accustomed to but horizontal mixed use allowing residential uses in other configurations other than above the ground floor in the same building. He reiterated that it was a staff initiated change to the document that resulted from their dealings with prospective developers and property owners.

Commissioner Berman stated that she supported flexibility in land use designations, but for this site in particular, it was her personal opinion that the vertical mixed use element would be more in character, given the nearby developments. She asked if this was the only Coastal Residential Mixed Use land use proposed or is there another one.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the property immediately adjacent to the east, known as 505 San Pedro Avenue, is also designated CRMU in the LCLUP.

Commissioner Berman stated she would also have the same opinion on that site. She thought that, in the future, this designation could benefit from the horizontal designation. She didn't know if it was possible to specify the language in LD-I-20 to eliminate the option of horizontal for this location in particular. She did understand that, when a development comes along, they will be looking at it in character with its surroundings and that gives them another opportunity to voice their opinion regarding whether it should be vertical or horizontal.

Commissioner Nibbelin wanted to clarify what he heard staff saying about use of the vertical or horizontal for mixed use and whether it was common text in other areas of the city or other jurisdictions. He stated that his understanding that mixed use is typically done vertically and he thought it was probably language that exists in other portions of the General Plan or from other jurisdictions.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought this was a new concept for Pacifica and not language that exists elsewhere except to the extent of separate uses that are not mixed and exist in various configurations throughout the city. He thought this is something where they are trying to innovate and provide flexibility. He stated that they are hearing from potential developers that vertical mixed use projects are not something they think are appropriate for various sites they

discuss. He stated that there was no guarantee that a horizontal mixed use project would be approved or necessarily a permitted use but perhaps a conditional use as the zoning is developed to implement this concept and provide flexibility where a potential applicant demonstrates that it is the preferred design alternative. He stated that foreclosing that possibility by being overly prescriptive in the General Plan and the LCLUP was not the appropriate way from staff's perspective. They think the zoning could further refine this when they get to that phase of the process.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that he wanted to state agreement with that proposition as this was a document that was labor intensive and very difficult to amend. He thought it would be inappropriate for them to be overly prescriptive with this document recognizing that they have tools like zoning and even in the coastal zone that is its own heavy lift. He thought that, in recognizing this is a document intended for long term planning, they ought to afford this kind of flexibility. He stated that, if there was a determination down the road that, with this particular parcel, it was appropriate to limit it to vertical, they could have that conversation around the zoning with some form of an overlay that pertains specifically to this parcel.

Commissioner Campbell agreed in general that allowing them flexibility into the future was a good thing. He thought this parcel was a unique one and he would argue that it was their largest commercial parcel of land zoned for commercial only in the city. He acknowledged that they have a difference of opinion on that, but he felt this was zoned commercial from the beginning and they haven't found out whether that was ever properly repealed which he finds difficult to get around as he feels the reticence to even look at that issue was arbitrary and capricious. He stated that, for them to get rid of their largest commercial property and rezone it basically residential when we are already a bedroom community, long term planning would dictate otherwise. He felt we needed to keep some of the commercial in Pacifica because we know we live and die by property tax, as well as related uses such as schools, etc., and he felt they needed to keep commercial. He stated that this is a unique piece of property. He stated that, if they did adopt this language and say it was horizontal, they are creating an entitlement to homes. He didn't think that was the way to go and they could make a decision that, if you are going to do mixed use commercial, then you do mixed use commercial with residential on top and commercial on the bottom. He hears a lot of deference to the developers and project applicant, but he was not hearing a lot of deference to the community and what they want. He felt they needed to have that, referring to one speaker stating that they overwhelmingly reject this proposal that it should be residential. He asked where this is coming from, as he doesn't understand where the shift in policy came. He felt it would be interesting to know why. He thought the language was too loosely written and they can get more descriptive as to this parcel. He thought there was some ability in the rest of the plan to keep things flexible. He stated that developers are smart people, mentioning that he worked six years for the biggest home developers in the country and they can figure out how to do mixed use commercial on this property vertically.

Vice Chair Rubinstein asked staff how they can proceed with voting on this item with these open questions.

Planning Director Wehrmeister recommended that there be further deliberation on this matter. Because they are talking about a focused policy or two, after they hear some deliberation and get more direction, they can assist them in making a motion if that is where the Commission is going with their recommendation to Council.

Vice Chair Rubinstein asked the Commissioners if they feel prepared to develop a motion around this, given the information available.

Commissioner Nibbelin thought they could, adding that there is more to talk about but he was convinced they can get there. He stated that it doesn't mean they will get four votes for it, but that was another issue.

Commissioner Berman thought it would be tough to continue their entire approval of the LCLUP to Council based on one item. She liked staff's suggestion that they can come to some consensus at the end of their deliberation on this item but in general she was in agreement with the majority of the land use plan, especially in regard to some comments they heard which she would like to mention before they get back to the Pedro Point property. She felt the idea of managed retreat was not applicable now, but she liked that every five years they will revisit any applicable idea. She stated that the new definition of substantial exterior structural modifications on page G-9 in the land use plan identifies exceptions to the redevelopment in the coastal zone, such as natural disaster. She stated that they are able to reconstruct their home within 10% of its footprint. She liked staff's effort with the Coastal Commission to try to propose this.

Vice Chair Rubinstein asked city attorney if there was anything they have to be careful about regarding drafting a motion regarding the Pedro Point property that could affect the plan globally.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano asked if the question was whether they can carve out the Pedro Point property from the motion.

Vice Chair Rubinstein asked if they can carve it out or, if they include it as an item, could it affect other parts of this plan.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano thought that was probably a question better for staff in terms of whether it would have impacts on other portions of the LCLUP.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it depends on the approach the Commission would take. He stated that they have two parts to the discussion of the undeveloped San Pedro Avenue site, first, addressing the coastal residential mixed use land use designation which would have global effect. In practice today as the document is written, it would affect the undeveloped San Pedro Avenue site and the 505 San Pedro Avenue site to the east. He stated that, in the future, Council could seek to apply that designation to other properties and it may have a broader effect than intended today. He thought the more direct and precise way to address the particular undeveloped San Pedro Avenue site is to address policy LD-I-20 which is the policy already in the document, further tailoring the coastal residential mixed use designation to that site specifically. He would probably recommend that they tailor that policy rather than the broader CRMU designation.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that one of the rallying calls from the majority of the speakers was the question of how we got to this point from the original designation in 1980. He thought there was a missing link which they haven't seen yet. He asked if staff could briefly go through that history and tell them about the missing link chunk and why they have that question mark.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought the missing link chunk has to do with some of the zoning that came after the 1980 General Plan amendment, but if they continue with the General Plan and LCP documents, in 1980 it was designated commercial and that also has a mixed use component

that was allowable. She stated that in 1980, the density allowed on the site in the General Plan is much greater than what is proposed now.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought that was his recollection. He stated that it sounded like the lion's share of the last bit of what they are deliberating is horizontal versus vertical, and if it is a major sticking point, he was happy to vote along with getting rid of the horizontal component, although in general, he would favor the flexibility, especially if keeping that flexibility in now means that down the road they could hammer out specifically whether they want it. He stated that, if it is a sticking point, he would be happy to take that horizontal language out to move it along.

Sr. Planner Murdock mentioned further nuance to the discussion the Commission may have. He thought there were two parts to the horizontal mixed use. There is a part that would allow an attached residential use to be attached to a commercial use in a horizontal configuration but in the same building and the further component which they clarified in the exhibit presented to the Commission at this meeting where the horizontal mixed use it taken even further where residential uses could be fully detached from commercial uses. He stated that it would help to get clarity in the extent to which the Commission might be interested in removing or altering the horizontal component, either in its entirety or just that second chunk.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked if he means the detached is the second chunk.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the second chunk was the fully detached residential use.

Commissioner Berman stated that she would be in favor of that. She stated the revised language states residential uses may be constructed, attached to or detached from commercial uses. She thought possibly removing the detached from may help the conversation.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano clarified that Commissioner Berman was reading from policy LD-I-20.

Commissioner Berman confirmed that it was from LD-I-20.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that his own hesitation is about limiting themselves now in ways that may not be helpful or conducive to the best planning and best ideas that may come forward in the future. He stated that he would prefer to defer to staff and the design professionals and developers who may come forward in the future with good ideas, and they want to make sure they have good protection for the public around these sorts of things, but he didn't see the point of being overly prescriptive at this phase. He read Mr. Harris' letter and he had a couple of points for which he wanted some clarification. He stated that Mr. Steckbart had a comment that ran along similar lines. On page 2 of Mr. Harris' letter, he lists maybe five points of a particular concern, one being what he calls a recurrent failure of the post consultation draft to adequately or accurately describe and reference the goals for the draft coastal plan update and adaptation plan adopted by City Council. He thought Mr. Steckbart's proposed amendment raises a similar concern. He was curious about staff's perspective on that. He asked if they believe those notions are specifically stated or adequately reflected in the product.

Assoc. Planner O'Connor stated that those goals were adopted by Council in preparation for the process that they went through with the seal level rise adaptation planning and developed the policies that went into Chapter 6. She stated that those goals are represented in Chapter 6 and

clearly stated. She stated that the policies that made it through to Chapter 6 are representative of meeting those goals as well. She stated that staff feels that those have been representative. She stated that part of Mr. Harris' comments is addressing the environmental justice language in regard to the Coastal Commission's EJ policy. She stated that they added language in response to that policy and prepared actions to improve our environmental justice.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that one of the Commissioners raised appropriately that San Francisco has some interest in the golf course being the owner of it, and he was curious as to whether they heard from the City and County of San Francisco with respect to this latest iteration of document and whether they weighed in on the matter and, if so, what they had to say.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they have not received any public comments from the City and County of San Francisco.

Commissioner Nibbelin referred to one of the public commenters made reference to what she called the 1977 remodel trap. He wanted to be sure he understood with staff as to where they were going with that and what our response is to that legitimate framing of things.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the best he can surmise the concerns of the commenter is that there has been a pervasive fear on the part of some people participating in the vulnerability assessment and adaptation planning that an extreme interpretation of existing development and redevelopment and remodeling would somehow preclude people from making modest routine improvements to their property and triggering the new development status which would cause them to have to demolish their homes or be limited in some way in the use. He stated that they are sensitive to those concerns and they have tried to go out of their way to make it clear that is not the case in this draft document. He thought the most notable examples are the definition they drafted of substantial exterior structural modification on page G-9. He stated that it exempts routine maintenance, explicitly stating removal, replacement or maintenance of nonstructural components such as siding and roofing materials and windows. He stated that was not a type of improvement that is going to trigger new development status. He stated that, even in cases where a substantial exterior structural modification has occurred, the policy language explicitly states that the new portions of the structure must comply and any existing nonconforming portions that are not modified may remain as they are. He stated that they have tried their best to address and tamp down those concerns. He added that, with concerns about the 1977 date they often hear, as they defined existing structure in the document, there were a few different categories but of note it was a structure that was lawfully constructed prior to the certification date of the LCLUP and that would presumably be a date sometime in 2020 or 2021 and that 1977 date or lack of building permit history, etc., was not an issue as the existing structure definition is written and not an issue as the substantial exterior structural modification definition is written. He stated that, in the latter case, the definition is cumulative from the date of certification of the LCLUP.

Commissioner Nibbelin appreciated staff's work in being creative around this and trying to work with the Coastal Commission staff to address these legitimate concerns. He stated his support of what they got is premised on the good work staff has done in addressing that particular point.

Commissioner Campbell thanked Commissioner Nibbelin and staff for addressing that issue. He referred to Commissioner Bigstyk's question about zoning. He stated that he could be wrong, but he asked if at one point the Calson property was zoned from the city's standpoint as commercial recreational.

Sr. Planner Murdock responded affirmatively, stating that it remains in that zoning designation to this day. He stated that, what was not apparent to the casual observer is that the City Council lawfully adopted an ordinance that repurposed the C-R zoning to take on all of the development standards and uses of the C-2 zone which he believes was in 1982. He stated that it was clear from staff's perspective that it was Council's intent at that time to impart C-2 zoning standards on C-R zoned properties which includes mixed use residential.

Commissioner Campbell thought that was a new interpretation of the commercial recreational in 1982 when it was previously just commercial before that. He restated his question, asking if that new interpretation in 1982 by the City Council was legally done and approved by the Coastal Commission.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the City Council lawfully adopted the ordinance. They have less clear information as to whether that zoning change, not an interpretation, was certified by the Coastal Commission and do not have a definitive answer. He stated that staff's position was that it was not material to this conversation in that we are doing a forward looking policy document and the zoning will ultimately reflect and implement what is in this land use plan and they think the focus is best placed on what should the use be and not what it may have been and was it certified and what was applicable today. He stated that Council has the authority to change that in light of the community's needs, desires and wants, as well as applicable legal limitations on the property owner's right to have economic use of the property.

Commissioner Campbell appreciated that point of view but he thought they have set off with a presumption that it was never just commercial back in the study sessions and launched from there with that presumption as opposed to the other presumption that this was a commercial piece of property only at one point and the general consensus was that it should at least be mainly commercial. He stated that brings him back to why this is problematic for him as it skews towards residential which he didn't think was the intent of anyone back in 1980. He thought there were some investor backed expectations, people who own homes in Pedro Point who would be wondering why the sudden shift to residential as opposed to commercial. He clarified that it was not as clear cut as it seems as it has not always been residential. He stated that has been in dispute since the beginning.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought there was nothing about this that seems particularly clear cut to him. He asked at what moment in time, if ever, was this a purely commercial piece of property and at what moment in time did that begin to shift.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he was not sure they have an answer as to when it was ever a commercial only piece of property. He stated that they have information from the 1980 General Plan and LCLUP that it was commercially designated which, as Planning Director Wehrmeister indicated, included mixed use residential development. He believed that the C-R zoning likely predated the 1980 General Plan, the commercial recreation zoning but shortly after adoption of the 1980 LCLUP, Council took that rather significant action to change the zoning standards for C-R zoned sites to have them be C-2 zone sites. He thought to pursue any other line of reasoning is making a legal argument rather than a policy argument. He stated that Pacifica's City Council intended that site to be a C-2 zoned site for all intents and purposes in terms of uses, inclusive of mixed use residential and that is the presumption that staff put forward that some might disagree

with, but staff thinks, from a policy standpoint, City Council decided that mixed use residential and commercial was a permissible use for the site.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he would like to start thinking in terms of looking to the future, but he first wanted to be clear that, prior to 1980, they were definitively saying that there was a moment in time in which it was only commercial and residential was not thought of what it could be used for or are they saying that prior 1980 we are not quite sure.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that his research of the C-R zoning standards as they were prior to 1980, perhaps as far back as Ordinance #2 which he thought was the city's first zoning ordinance, that C-R zoning district did not include mixed use residential. He stated that, to the extent one wants to find a commercial only period in time, perhaps it was when that zoning district was enacted. He did not know the date that the C-R zoning was first applied to this site, but it was in place as of 1980 as best he can tell. He thought one could make a reasonable determination but not a conclusive one.

Commissioner Bigstyk concluded that as of 1980, there is at least wiggle room for interpretation that there could be residential on this property.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought, with the Council's enactment of the ordinance in 1982, redefining uses and development standards for C-R zoned sites to be C-2 standards, that was certainly a point at which that residential use of the site was intended by our local decision makers.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he didn't have any desire to be cavalier with this property, and he thought it was very difficult to deliberate on this piece of property. He didn't live in that neighborhood and he was hesitant as it was hard for him to think in terms of what he thinks it should be when it was not going to directly affect him at least this week. He feels so far is that, when they deliberate as one body between Commission and Council, they seem to try to strike some sort of compromise between what he thinks is clearly the neighborhood's desire for no residential and the owner's desire that what is supposed based on data back to 1982 is that they should be able to use the land in terms of residential as a mixed use. He was as comfortable as he can be with residential being as low as they have currently designated it going forward. He was open to the conversation about whether or not to nix the horizontal, as it was suggested that they should take away that part that is detached horizontal and he was okay with that. He stated that, from his perspective, there was nothing certain but he was willing to go forward based on the accommodations they have been trying to make and this last accommodation. He thinks it will ultimately get hashed out with Council. He stated that he thinks the Council's concern is largely for the property owner and he thought these policies will be going into that venue where there will likely be discussion in terms of what that property owner is going to get to do with it with people who are sympathetic to the plight of someone trying to figure out what to do with their own property. He thought they have taken it about as far as they can.

Commissioner Campbell appreciated that they have hashed this out quite a bit. He stated that his closing remark on this is that they have a history of this property predominantly being considered with a significant commercial aspect to it and to further accommodate the property owner's stated desire at this meeting to get more housing in there than we had agreed to and considering that when they purchased it the site was well known as a mainly commercially designated property, we should skew towards the commercial visitor's center zoning options or at least not create more entitlement for home building than already exists. He felt this accommodates the developer more

than they need to do. He stated that, when he represented home builders, the one thing they loved was certainty because regardless of all the regulations, with certainty they can figure it out. He suggested they give them that and give the community members who have to live next door some sense of what will be built there and will it be a bunch of detached horizontal homes or something that will truly be mixed use commercial which he felt would be a significant concession but he agreed with Commissioner Bigstyk that some Councilmembers are foremost thinking about the owner of the property and a discussion in the future as to whether it would be the community. He felt they should skew toward commercial.

Commissioner Berman referred to many different points from her fellow Commissioners, stating that she agreed with many different points. She thought a more specific definition for this lot and area in particular would be beneficial and she agrees with that. She also agrees with Commissioner Nibbelin that it doesn't quite belong in this land use plan unless staff had a recommendation of a ratio idea that they could add to LD-I-20. She would not be in favor of changing any language of the coastal residential mixed use land use specifically, and for this lot in particular. She was not overly passionate of needing that in this language, but more passionate about removing the detached aspect of LD-I-20 and most passionate about is that they do have to respect that this lot is privately owned and from previous discussion there was no definition of public use to this lot. She is aware that people take their dogs there, use coastal access through there and what is great about staff's development of the LCLUP is that there is incorporation of coastal access and incorporation of wetland rehabilitation. She loves that and it makes her excited for the lot. She was in favor of some type of development in the lot that provides economic benefit to the owner and benefits to the city economically and from a community standpoint. She would like to come to a resolution together and pass along the entirety of the LCLUP to Council, but she didn't know if they will come to a specific diagnosis of the lot at this time.

Vice Chair Rubinstein agrees with a lot of what she has said.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that Commissioner Berman has nailed it and her framing is spot on, notwithstanding his reservations with respect to constraining the language in LD-I-20. He stated he would be amenable to deleting the language that contemplated detached development from commercial uses if that were a way to move things forward, otherwise he would be in favor of moving it forward.

Commissioner Bigstyk referred to the owner's right to decide what to do with the property and they were not just thinking in terms of the owner's rights. He has heard from at least one Councilmember that they were thinking in terms of an affordable housing use that could be an option that would overall benefit the community, but he absolutely favors what seems to be a consensus toward eliminating the detached language and they have something verging on a compromise that can get them forward.

Vice Chair Rubinstein stated that four of them are in agreement on that. He asked for further comment or a motion.

Commissioner Kraske was in favor of moving this forward and removing that detached language from LD-I-20.

Commissioner Campbell was also in agreement with removing that. He thanked Commissioner Berman for making an excellent recommendation.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked if staff could help them have a motion that encompasses everything they have been talking about as there were a few moving pieces.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they need a moment to align the appropriate language and can read it for the Commission's consideration.

Commissioner Bigstyk referred to the idea from Commissioner Campbell of strengthening golf course language which appealed to him, and asked if that was a workable option they are considering at this time or a general comment that it would be good to strengthen that language.

Vice Chair Rubinstein asked if that was directed to staff.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated probably, unless Commissioner Campbell wanted to comment.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he would adopt the language that was specifically requested by the alliance which was about the storm water flows into the course. He thought it would be good to get that notion that they should prevent that storm water flow into the course in as many places as possible. He thought that was a significant issue for the course and for a lot of other things.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if he was advocating for specific language being inserted or satisfied where they are.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he couldn't see the harm in the alliance advocated for inserting it. He stated that he was open to suggestions and didn't want to be unnecessarily difficult.

Vice Chair Rubinstein thought that was a question for staff and legal.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought having the companion policies elsewhere in the General Plan is sufficient. She thought there was a lot of details here to consider as there are endangered species issues on the golf course, historic flow issues, and she suggested leaving it as is and engineering and probably San Francisco engineering would need to put their heads together on how to address this.

Commissioner Bigstyk referred to comment on the equalization (EQ) basin and he wanted to touch on it quickly. He understood that it was not in the coastal zone and why it is not included, but it does mitigate a great amount of water flow into the coastal zone. He asked if there was any reason to bring it up in this document.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it mitigates potential flooding because of the inability of the water recycling plant to accommodate large flows all at once and it is metering it out to the plant. She thought overall it was not impacting the amount of water to the Calera Creek.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked his commissioners if there was consensus of the change to the 184 Paloma Avenue consistent with what they are going for.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they have a suggested amendment. Looking at LD-I-20, they will see in the middle of the paragraph they have vertically or horizontally in red, and the very next sentence is where they are suggesting changes which would be “residential uses shall be constructed attached to commercial uses.”

Vice Chair Rubinstein asked if anyone would like to propose a motion that covers what they went through.

Commissioner Bigstycck stated that he would be happy to make the motion if no one else does.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that it will be the second alternative motion in the packet with the added change to LD-I-20 as read into the record by staff to revise the third sentence of the revised Attachment H provided to the Planning Commission at the meeting to read as follows: “Residential uses shall be constructed attached to commercial uses.”

Commissioner Nibbelin moved that the Planning Commission FINDS adoption of the proposed resolution is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; ADOPTS the resolution included as Attachment A to the staff report to recommend that the City council should adopt a resolution certifying that the Local Coastal Program is intended to be carried out in a manner fully in conformity with the California Coastal Act; INCORPORATES the substantive amendments described in Section 3.B of the staff report into the Post-Consultation Draft LCLUP to be transmitted to the City Council, and further incorporates the land use designation change to Mixed Use Neighborhood requested by the property owner of 184 Paloma Avenue as described in Section 3.C of the staff report, and the amendment staff just shared with Commission to LD-I-20 to delete reference to detached from commercial uses; and INCORPORATES all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Berman seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-1**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Nibbelin, Kraske, Bigstycck
and Vice Chair Rubinstein
Noes: Commissioner Campbell

Vice Chair Rubinstein declared that anyone aggrieved by the action of the Planning Commission has ten (10) calendar days to appeal the decision in writing to the City Council.

Cherie Chan asked if it was 10 calendar days or 10 business days to appeal.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that this was not the time to respond to Public Comment, unless the Chair wanted to acknowledge public at this point.

Vice Chair Rubinstein confirmed that it was 10 calendar days to appeal.

CONSIDERATION:

None

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Bigstycyk thanked Commissioner Berman for bringing them to an equitable solution. He stated that he has had the good fortune to attend the Sharp Park Specific Planning meeting at the Little Brown Church. He stated that it was widely attended and everyone came with wonderful ideas. He stated that Pacifica Jack Cheese was incorporated at the end of the meeting for those who had the wisdom to pursue it. He stated that the community was able to get involved in hashing out what they want their community to be.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister announced that, related to the opportunity to appeal, this recommendation is planned to go to City Council on Monday, February 24, and this is a legislative manner and Council will be acting on this and anyone who would like to provide public comments is welcome to do so. She thanked Commissioner Bigstycyk for mentioning the Sharp Park Specific Plan meeting. She stated that there is more activity coming up but they haven't scheduled it yet and she asked that they stay tuned to Plan Pacifica emails. She stated that Council has tentatively scheduled the Commission and Committee annual reports meeting where they can do it at once, coming in early, and she asked that they put May 11 on their calendar, adding that she will provide updates if that date changes.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Rubinstein moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:53 p.m.; Commissioner Nibbelin seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister