

MINUTES

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

June 1, 2015

7:00 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Vaterlaus, Cooper, Gordon, Brown,
Evans and Chair Campbell
Absent: Commissioner Nibbelin

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Gordon

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Assist. Planner Farbstein
Public Works Director Ocampo
Acting Senior Civil Engineer Donguines

**APPROVAL OF ORDER
OF AGENDA** Commissioner Brown moved approval of the Order
of Agenda; Commissioner Cooper seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Vaterlaus, Cooper, Gordon, Brown,
Evans and Chair Campbell
Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JUNE 8, 2015:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that there was no need for a liaison for the June 4 meeting, but the Harmony Lot 2 call-up was on the agenda June 8th and they may want a liaison for that meeting.

Chair Campbell stated that he would be the liaison.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Ralph Sizemore, Pacifica, stated he was speaking on Dave and Lou's gas station site being considered for a 7-Eleven. He felt that putting that on the corner of the highway would only contribute to more trash, crime, etc. He mentioned that not even the police want any 24-hour business. He pointed out that Dave used to police the area, pick up trash, etc., and he didn't think they would have that with chain stores where the employees just come in and out and don't care about the environment, adding that you also have to consider the residents in the surrounding area.

Chris Redfield, Pacifica, referred to the 7-Eleven proposal in Linda Mar and thanked the Nanini's for being excellent neighbors for many decades, stating that they will be missed. He couldn't believe that any public official would consider putting a convenience store in that location. He

also didn't see any reason to take business away from the businesses in the Linda Mar shopping center. He stated that alcohol was a major youth problem in Pacifica and he didn't think the police would endorse additional access to alcohol in Linda Mar. He pointed out that this sends the wrong message about Pacifica, as smoking, cheap alcohol, etc., were a large portion of their sales. He urged the city to tell 7-Eleven to look elsewhere.

Dan Stegink, Pacifica, also referred to the 7-Eleven proposal and passed out some material then pointed out that old documents are proof that the current 7-Eleven stores were not meant to be 24 hours, were not meant to have gasoline pumps, were not meant to use signage without receiving approval, and were not meant to change the landscaping as approved with original permit, all of which were to remain in effect for the life of the permit. He read specific wording from those old documents as proof of the specific decisions where they denied those requests. He then mentioned that he was directly adjacent to the property, and pointed out how the proposed size and expected operating conditions would directly impact his property and asked that they not be fooled by being given a pretty picture and are told that is the way of the future.

Virgil Morse, Pacifica, also referred to the 7-Eleven proposal and stated that he complimented Dave on what he has done on that property. He felt this was a radical change from the current business, and didn't think they would be as conscientious as Dave was. He felt they should find a better fit. He was concerned about the litter and 24-hour operation. He felt it was very close to residences.

Betty Duran, Pacifica, stated that she was at the previous Planning Commission meeting. She stated that the process of dismantling the Chevron on Hickey has begun. She was concerned because an appeal was filed regarding the proposed, confirming that because she filed it. She mentioned that, upon looking at previous projects, notices were mailed to at least 28-33 and once as many as 108, but in their case, it was mailed to 9 property owners. She stated that many of the neighbors are feeling abandoned. She stated that something went very wrong and she was perplexed. She was upset, and felt that the residents involved in the process, and in particular the people of Fairmont, deserve better. She felt that the battle should not be decided in favor of those with the most resources. She stated that the project was going forward even though there is an appeal in place. She concluded that the owners have no regard for the nearby neighbors and people most affected will not give up and will not go away. She stated that this will continue to be an issue for the city and those residing within the neighborhood and the city.

Loreen Cuneo, Pacifica, stated that she was a Fairmont homeowner and was speaking regarding where the Chevron gas station was. She stated that she was at the last meeting, and commented that one Commissioner stated that he would not want a 7-Eleven near him, yet he voted for it. She asked if it was because they weren't near them or being bothered in their space. She was upset with staff as well as the Fairmont Association. She questioned how they would like having them near their homes, adding that 7-Eleven was not a good neighbor.

Pauline Gonzalez, Pacifica, stated that she lives on Arguello and was against 7-Eleven as it would generate a crime atmosphere. She stated that they had a gunpoint situation at McDonald's where they robbed everyone, and was one of her main concerns regarding this project. She stated that there are 3 generations living in her home and they were against the 7-Eleven convenience store. She stated that they also have the QuikStop which was successful and she didn't think they need another convenience store.

Chair Campbell asked if the 7-Eleven store that was going to replace Dave & Lou's was going to come before the Commission.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it has not been agendized yet but will be coming before the Commission. She reported that the 7-Eleven project in Fairmont mentioned by the public was appealed and will be heard by the City Council. She stated that she might be able to get a meeting date on the agenda the following morning and there will be more information for them after that.

Commissioner Brown asked if there was a notification planned to address the concern raised that only 9 people were notified about the previous agenda item.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the requirement was to notify property owners within 300 feet of a project. She stated that she can find out if there was a mistake and, if so, they can make sure that is corrected before the City Council hearing. She added that, starting today, they were implementing the Planning Commission's direction to notify residents within 100 feet of projects. She stated that this would be consistent with the coastal zone process and they will now have one process throughout the city and nearby residents will now be notified.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. **Special UP-45-15 MM-162-15** **SPECIAL USE PERMIT, UP-045-15, AND MINOR MODIFICATION, MM-162-15, filed by Virgil D. Capetti, applicant, on behalf of Missionaries of Charity, owner, to convert duplex into an institution of a charitable nature associated with the adjacent nursing home and increase the second story by an addition of 800 square feet within the rear set back at 164 Milagra Drive (APN 009-253-090). Recommended California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) status: Categorical Exemption.**

Asst. Planner Farbstein presented the staff report.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the ADA access changes from an R2 to a charitable use.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that accessibility issues are being addressed with the building permit plan check.

Commissioner Evans asked if the R2 zoning was not an issue by the changing from a duplex to a multiuse.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that a special use was allowed in any zoning district in any general plan designation. She added that certain types of uses are would be considered an institution of a charitable nature.

Virgil D. Capetti, applicant, stated that the project was to remove an existing kitchen. He stated that when they bought the property in 1997, it was a duplex and now it was being utilized as the residential home of the Missionaries of Charity who are providing services at the other building they own, and they only sleep in this building. He stated that granting the special use permit will not convert it to an institution. It already is being used as a residential only for the Missionaries of Charity as they work in caring for the sick in their facility called the Gift of Love. He stated that Sr. Maria Conception wants to speak before the Commissioners as well as Sr. Sammitte.

Sr. Maria Conception, stated that the Gift of Love is run free of charge. They only need this project to extend the home space of the sisters. She stated that there were 12 of them in the building. With a duplex, she stated that there are many spaces that they cannot use, such as the garage cannot be used for sleeping. She stated that the only possible thing is to have a second floor above the prayer room they use.

Commissioner Nibbelin arrived.

Chair Campbell opened the Public Hearing.

Mark Nicodemus, Pacifica, stated that they live at the property south of this development. He stated that it was a two-story building, and the attachment at the rear was where they want to add the second story. He referred to her mention of the privacy reason. He stated that the rear of this property was adjacent to the side of their property and their windows look out onto the area. He stated that they have been there for 30 years. He stated that, if this extension is added, three of

the new windows will look into their windows. He stated that, at this point, there were no windows facing their property at all, and their question was whether the windows could be smaller or developed in a different fashion.

Isabel Mathews, Pacifica, stated that they understood that they need to have more space and is not an issue. Their issue was that they would be looking at them. She stated that the present window faces the street now, and the proposed building's present window is lower but with the development it would be higher and the windows will be looking directly at each other. She stated that it was hard to tell how large the windows are going to be, and asked if they could be placed on the other side.

Mr. Nicodemus added that their only concern was having the same privacy as the sisters. He didn't know what they have to have for the bedroom windows, but he asked that they address privacy for both buildings.

Commissioner Cooper asked what side of the building he was referring to.

Mr. Nicodemus stated that it was the south side. They look directly at the south side of their building. At this point, there are no windows they see from the south side. He stated that there were two windows that were below grade, and they didn't even see them because of the wall.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he saw two windows added, along with the bathroom window.

Mr. Nicodemus stated that was five on the south side and they look directly at them.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he was counting the panes as windows. He stated that there were two windows but five panes of glass. He was making sure he got the elevations right.

Vice Chair Gordon closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Capetti duly noted this and they will take due consideration of the concern of the neighbor, and they will change them into high windows so there won't be an issue at all.

Commissioner Cooper asked how high they would make the windows.

Mr. Capetti stated that they will be placed so they are not within eyesight. There will not be any windows looking down to the property, although the property of the neighbor is higher than the Missionaries of Charity property but they will take that into consideration and will continue to be good neighbors with them.

Commissioner Cooper commended the charity for the services that they do. He considered it great for the community and they provide a valuable service to people. He thought being a good neighbor is speaking with those who live next to them and raising the windows to an elevation or putting fritted glass into the panes which certainly take care of any of the view. He proposed that they put the windows at a higher elevation, possibly five feet and have a smaller window with no direct view into the neighbor's lot.

Chair Campbell asked if they were talking about clerestory windows.

Commissioner Cooper thought it could be clerestory windows or a fritted glass pattern so they are opaque. You get light through but it doesn't allow the visual portion.

Commissioner Vaterlaus asked staff if it affects the fire code, ingress and egress, if they raise the window height.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that she did speak with the neighbors earlier and she was able to contact CSG. They had started a plan check on the project and she talked to the plan checker that was most familiar with the project. He said, because there are windows on the other sides of the proposed bedroom, one facing the street and one on the back side and they were fine in terms of the emergency egress.

Commissioner Gordon referred to possibly considering making the windows smaller, and asked if there were requirements in terms of size. He asked if it was a bedroom.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that the two windows in question are both bedrooms and the smaller one that doesn't seem to be an issue is to a bathroom. She again stated that, as far as the CSG plan checker familiar with the building codes for this project said, it could be a wall, and she asked that and got clarification. He said it does not need to have any windows on that side.

Commissioner Gordon thought it was in the process of being worked out, and he was open to the compromises being proposed.

Commissioner Cooper asked if it made sense to have them work with the neighbor and get concurrence and buyoff prior to approving the project or put a condition of approval. He asked if they could do that for a third party.

Planning Director Wehrmeister didn't see it as an issue as they seem to be able to work things out so well. She didn't recommend that type of condition. She would prefer to have something more definitive in the condition, but maybe flexible enough that staff can make administrative approval when they come in with the final building permit.

Commissioner Gordon asked if there was a way that they could create another condition which would put this issue in their discretion in terms of being approved to make sure everyone is happy.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought there was, and she would think about it and craft a condition.

Commissioner Cooper stated that they could put a height restriction, stating clerestory windows, elevation 5.6 feet above with fritted glass or to the approval of the Planning Director as a condition and they can come up with some sort of solution.

Commissioner Evans thanked the two neighbors for working this out and talking about it before they come before them. He felt it would make everybody being happy.

Chair Campbell also thought it was nice to see neighbors voluntarily working things out. He thought Commissioner Cooper's idea was a good one. He was willing to entertain a motion with something like that in it.

Commissioner Cooper moved that the Planning Commission find that the project is exempt from CEQA; **APPROVE** Special Use Permit UP-045-15 and Minor Modification MM-162-15 by **ADOPTING** the attached resolutions for the proposed conversion of the duplex into an institutional use of charitable nature to assist the residential care facility next door and a second story addition within the rear setback at 164 Milagra Drive, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A; and incorporate all maps and testimony into the record by reference, including an additional condition that states: the windows facing the south side shall be 5.6 feet or above with fritted glass or at the height and restrictions upon approval of the Planning Director; Commissioner Gordon seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0.

Ayes: Commissioners Vaterlaus, Cooper, Gordon, Brown,
Nibbelin, Evans and Chair Campbell
Noes: None

Chair Campbell 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.

**2. UP-034-14 INTERPRETATION OF PLANNING COMMISSION
PSD-787-14 CONDITION OF APPROVAL #18 OF RESOLUTION 897, filed
PV-511-14 by Michelle and David Garcia, owners, for new single family
residence at 650 Corona Drive (APN 022-210-080).**

Commissioner Vaterlaus stated that she has to recuse herself as she has a parcel for sale which is adjacent to this project.

Asst. Planner Farbstein presented the first part of the staff report.

Acting Snr. Civil Engineer Donguines completed the staff report.

Commissioner Cooper asked if a sidewalk was a flexible item for staff.

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that was the issue because if they follow the Complete Streets Policy which was the emphasis now to provide a safe and alternate form of getting one place to the other which includes providing access for pedestrians as well as bicyclists.

Commissioner Cooper asked if they were not talking curb and gutter but talking the sidewalk.

Public Works Director Ocampo agreed, adding that the sidewalk has to be higher than the pavement itself for the protection of the pedestrians.

Commissioner Brown asked clarification that the first 110 feet after the hammerhead that they were talking about.

Public Works Director Ocampo responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Gordon assumed they were recommending a width of 26 feet for the street, consistent with HPD and asked what they were thinking in terms of the appropriateness of a sidewalk.

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that there was an existing sidewalk that was extended by the development of 674 Corona Drive. He stated that it is not 6 feet wide but 4.5 feet wide and was consistent with the overall community there.

Commissioner Gordon understood that the primary factor in deciding whether a sidewalk was appropriate was safety for pedestrians.

Public Works Director Ocampo agreed that it was safety and they encouraged them to walk rather than using their cars.

Commissioner Gordon thought the corresponding issue was that it would be a lightly trafficked area, heavily trafficked area or moderately trafficked area in terms of cars. He asked if that made sense.

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that it was one of the considerations which was why staff was asking direction from the Planning Commission as to whether they would like to require the sidewalks to be extended or not.

Commissioner Gordon asked if the street would be a dead end once it was extended, and serving a maximum of three parcels.

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that it was correct unless subdivisions are done with the existing parcels because the parcels are big.

Chair Campbell stated that he was not at the meeting where this was first discussed, and then asked, if the paper street were taken to its logical conclusion or to the maximum that it could be taken, where does it ultimately end?

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that it ends where it is shown on the map they have.

Commissioner Gordon stated that he was confused and asked what was meant in saying it ends.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it ends at the Garcia property and does not extend to serve more properties.

Commissioner Gordon asked, if it was continued, if there was a possibility that it would eventually be built out and connected to a larger street or is this as far as it is going to go.

Planning Director Wehrmeister replied that, given the current parcel configuration, this was as far as the street goes. She stated that, if there was a future subdivision to subdivide the Garcia or other lands, it would have to go through the Garcia land and that would require a discretionary approval where the city would condition the roadway section and make it a standard section if it was going to serve more lots.

Chair Campbell assumed it was basically a cul-de-sac at the end. He knew they had the cul-de-sac issue before, such as fire trucks turning around, etc. He asked if that was an issue.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the hammerhead on the plans was going to remain there, and the fire department has determined that they are able to use that turnaround for the Garcia residence.

Commissioner Cooper thought it came before them last year, and this was the area where they had an issue with fire access and the width of the drive, adding that they talked about the improvements in the area before.

Commissioner Nibbelin was wondering about the process of coming and asking the Commission for interpretive guidance with respect to matters that have already been before them, asking if it was a standard process. He wondered where it was that they defer to staff's interpretation of the actions taken, and why it was coming back in this instance as opposed to just standing on the work that staff has done.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought that part of the reason this is back before the Planning Commission was that the condition could have been clearer, and specifically stated what the section requirement was going to be. It referred to standards, and the standards now are conflicting which was why staff needs direction.

Commissioner Nibellin stated that, in working for government for a long time, he thought it was not uncommon that they have to reconcile conflicting standards. He thought it was unusual to go back and ask the decision maker to reinterpret. He thought staff's interpretation was entitled to some significant deference. He was just curious about the process and whether it was done frequently.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that some of the standards in conflict specifically state that the Planning Commission may make an exception and they want to know if the Planning Commission made that exception the record is unclear.

Commissioner Nibellin was interested to know if anyone was thinking along those lines.

Commissioner Cooper stated that his recollection was asking the specific question of upgrading the street to city standards and he thought that was what they agreed to.

Commissioner Gordon referred to the comment that they wanted to see if the Commission was going to make an exception, and he asked what exception.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that there was the subdivision section which states that the Planning Commission can determine that because of specific reasons, topography, etc., that it would be justifiable to construct a street section that may still be safe but may be less than what would normally be required on a flat surface. That was the area where they want clarification.

Commissioner Gordon asked for clarification that she meant that they needed to confirm if they were intending to make an exception to the required 26-foot width as required by the HPD.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she was looking at Section 10-1.903, streets and thoroughfares minimum standards, in the middle of the citation, and she read the clarification that the Commission can make for justifying a lesser standard.

Commissioner Gordon stated he was confused regarding a section of the staff report that refers to "due to conflicting sections of the Municipal Code," and he asked what sections were conflicting as opposed to just being vague.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it was the one she just mentioned, and the HPD section which says that the street sections shall be 26-feet wide plus the sidewalk.

Commissioner Gordon then concluded that 10-1.903 stated that Commission could make an exception on the 26-foot requirement, and another section in HPD stated that it shall be 26-feet, and were on the table for them.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Chair Campbell concluded that the city was saying Section 10-1.903 applies even in HPD where HPD says 26-feet, but this section would give them the authority to move below 26 feet in HPD.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that he was hitting the nail on the head and therein lies the problem. They try to avoid these types of internal inconsistencies within a document, but that was what they have.

Commissioner Evans stated that they say there is an existing sidewalk, and he asked if it was on the side with the houses, and it stops at the end of the house at 674 Corona Drive.

Public Works Director Ocampo clarified by the hammerhead.

Commissioner Evans referred to the 110 and 360 properties on the other side of the street, and assumed those were the two properties that would use the road as access.

Public Works Director Ocampo said it may, in the future.

Commissioner Evans referred to the square area with an angle on one side, and asked if that was the city property in the extension of the road, just past the hammerhead.

Public Works Director Ocampo responded affirmatively.

Asst. Civil Engineer Donguines stated that the angled line was the end of the right-of-way.

Commissioner Cooper asked if there was only one sidewalk on one side of the street on the map between 690 and 674 Corona Drive.

Acting Snr. Civil Engineer Donguines responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Cooper asked, if there was any development on the opposite side of the street, there would be a sidewalk required per the building code.

Acting Snr. Civil Engineer Donguines stated that, at that time, they will require a sidewalk for that side.

Commissioner Brown asked two questions, i.e., if they were okay with 20 feet versus 26 feet and did they feel a sidewalk was required or were they willing to allow an exception for that. He stated that he was in the meeting a year ago, and he understood that they approved the roadway consistent with the general standards for the roadway, and he didn't remember it being 20 feet. He was not comfortable with going less than 26 feet. He asked, with respect to the sidewalk, what adding that extra six feet now would do in terms of retaining walls, etc. He knew they approved retaining walls for this access and he didn't remember them being on the right of way, but did remember them on the driveway. He also asked confirmation that, if APN 110 and 360 are developed, they would require a sidewalk.

Acting Snr. Civil Engineer Donguines responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Brown asked, if the probable traffic looks more probable, then is a sidewalk required. He stated that he was leaning toward not requiring one at this point.

Chair Campbell thought they might want to hear from the applicant, but, if there are more questions for staff, he didn't want to cut anyone off.

Commissioner Cooper asked, if the Commission were to go with the standard, would they go with the standard of PMC 9-4.2258 with a 26 foot wide street.

Asst. Civil Engineer Donguines stated that they were recommending the 26-foot wide street.

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that he can share a photo of the existing street as it is now.

Commissioner Gordon asked, if HPD says the street has to be 26-feet wide, and applicant is seeking a narrower street, whether they need to request a variance.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, under the HPD section, there was no section that says that exceptions can be made, so what they are requesting is a narrower section under 10-1.903.

Commissioner Gordon concluded that they have no discretion to vary from HPD.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they would need to get a variance. She added that, if the Planning Commission would like, there is an ability under the other section to make an exception.

Commissioner Gordon asked if both sections were from the Municipal Code.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Gordon concluded that they were on equal standing and one does not trump the other.

Michelle Garcia, owner, stated that, basically, when they were before them a year ago and had this discussion, they discussed in great length, and they had reached agreements, then when they submitted their encroachment permit application, there were all kinds of things, like sidewalks, drains, etc., and their first issue was that they never got a list of city standards and she does not know what they are, but there was a considerable difference in terms of manpower, money, etc., and they questioned it which was why they were where they are now. Through research and other means, they felt they had agreed on 20 feet. She made reference to what they would have to do to comply with 26 feet, such as cutting down a tree on the neighbor's yard and adding huge retaining walls. She stated that in the previous discussion, taking into account Hillside Preservation, they were trying to avoid that, as well as keeping the environment nice. They actually bought the property because it was hillside preservation and they don't want to fill it with cement, adding that the people at 674 Corona Drive don't want it filled with cement either. They were asking them if they can allow for less width of the street, adding that it goes to nowhere, just to her driveway and no one will ride a bike or walk down without coming to a dead end and have to turn around and walk away. She stated that it was like a bridge to nowhere. She stated that they weren't saying they don't want to improve the city right-of-way. They do and were not trying to not do their part, but they don't feel that the crazy city standards apply to them and wasn't approved. She mentioned that they didn't have this discussion with Engineering at the first meeting and have them give their reasons. She stated that they were asking the Planning Commission to allow them less width to the city right-of-way and no sidewalk because one isn't required. If people walk down there, they will go to their driveway and not be able to go any further. She stated that Dave Blackman may have more information on that.

Dave Blackman asked if they wanted him to talk as a clarification applicant.

Chair Campbell stated that they have 10 minutes and split it up anyway they want.

Ms. Garcia stated that, at the end of the day, they were trying to keep that city right-of-way looking as beautiful as it does now, with wild life, etc. She stated that she can drive her car down with both doors open and she will still have a ton of room on the side, but if they put a 26-foot wide road and add sidewalk, it was not 26 feet because the sidewalk has to be 4 feet, and you were looking at 30 feet just to drive her car down the road, going in and out of her home. They were asking the Planning Commission to make the exception this time because all the cement and destruction to the surrounding environment really is unnecessary.

Dave Blackman stated that when they were there a year ago, they had a specific plan of 20 feet and it sounds unquestionably that the decision of how wide the pavement was going to be was up to the Planning Commission. He believes that was what everyone was agreeing to. He stated that he is expressing his frustration with a whole year of a lot of planning and engineering staff time and he didn't understand why it was still a question. He stated that he has built a lot of homes in the town where they only built 20 feet of pavement because that was what the fire department asked. He stated that he built two commissioners' homes that only have 20 feet and homes in Pedro Point that have less than 20 feet. He stated that they watched Harmony @1 build a 20-foot driveway for the lower lot and the retaining walls are huge. He stated that they were not in a much steeper area. If they try to go 26 feet and sidewalks, they are going to see huge walls and they will lose the cypress tree, and he asked for what. He believes the Commission has the power to make the decision, adding that he thought they already made the decision. He watched the video, laughing at how long they talked about this. He stated that they defined the driveway as specifically from the hammerhead to the garage door and they talked and all agreed at 20 feet and the fire department was happy and signed off, stating it was more than enough. He mentioned that, if another development comes forward, it was required by law that they do their share, and it was not up to Michelle Garcia to prepare for them. He stated that, if they need more width at that time, then it would be on them. He then mentioned the Complete Street thing was put in by Arnold Schwarzenegger and the concept was to make all streets work for all types of modes. He stated that it was based on global warming and the need for people to be able to walk and ride their bikes. He stated that, if they think this 20 feet would prohibit Michelle Garcia from riding her bike or walking out of there, that was madness. He mentioned other competing interests, such as Hillside Preservation and the C3 regulations, and he stated that he didn't know why they were back there when they all agreed on 20 feet. He stated that they want clarification. He stated that no one has come up with a logical reason for why they want more than 20 feet. He stated that the walls will be huge, and he didn't know if they were asking them to come back with the wall designs for the new idea. They came with a very specific plan a year ago, and Engineering took six months to look through the plans in detail. He stated that he was frustrated, not with anyone specifically, but the process was disgusting.

David Garcia, owner, stated that he has been in construction for 30 years and the crazy part is that he has been a superintendent on the 49er stadium, Apple, Twitter projects and he did not recall seeing something so out of control. He stated that they had problems on big jobs, but he felt they have to hold people specifically to what they can and can't charge people and following some kind of a rule. He stated that, when they came in, they should have been present telling them what they need, but they weren't even at the meeting and to come here now, the past year has been a nightmare, with constant dragging it around. He built a house in Millbrae from the part they were until he was building, and this has been a year and it was insanity. He added that it wasn't that he didn't know construction and have an idea of how it's supposed to work. He has

an idea, and he has done it for years, and they have to get some kind of control for the next person. He stated that everyone should be present when someone comes in to build a house like this, adding that there was still a lot of property left in Pacifica.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the retaining walls they talked about which he thought were next to their house further up the driveway and were the reason that the fire department wanted to get around the guest parking spaces. He asked if that was their recollection.

Ms. Garcia stated that, when they were discussing it, fire department wanted to make sure they could get up there and there were parking spaces that planning wanted to ensure that they would be there. She stated that, with 20 feet, and they parked two cars, the fire truck could get by.

Commissioner Cooper thought they just got rid of the guest spaces.

Ms. Garcia stated that they kept them.

Commissioner Cooper assumed they just moved them over.

Ms. Garcia showed them how they arranged the parking to allow the fire truck to get by. They will still be there.

Mr. Garcia referred to the picture where they could see the roadway, mentioning the damage to some of the areas in that one spot. He loved more parking but looking at how much damage it did made it a look a little off. He pointed out the cypress tree in the picture and stated that was where the sidewalk would go and eliminate the giant cypress tree which was on the right-of-way.

Ms. Garcia stated that it was partially on the neighbor's yard.

Mr. Garcia reiterated that it was the sidewalk location. He referred to the two properties and stated that, if they build a 15-foot wall to achieve that width, they will have to cut the wall out to get to their property.

Ms. Garcia stated that the property was above them and, if they put any kind of wall, those walls have to come down. They will have to pay money to put up walls and would literally block the entrance for anyone who comes in.

Mr. Garcia stated that the cutting they have done has hampered the sale of the end property.

Ms. Garcia stated that the lady from the Planning Commission was showing the property and they said they have to make it so they can get up there.

Mr. Garcia stated that they have only prepared the ground. They can see it because he sees it every day but they are trying to take his picture, which is to give them the idea of what the street looks like now.

Commissioner Gordon apologized to the applicant. He stated that this sounds like a project where they have an opportunity to look at what happened and to learn from it. He stated that they want to have a process where they are not left pulling their hair out. He asked staff what the compelling reason was to make the width 26 feet instead of 20 feet.

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that the 20-foot clearance was what the fire department asked. He stated that you cannot park because the fire department requires that the width is 20 feet clearance. He stated that, if you look at the standard lane width for a road, it varies from 12 feet in each direction and is about 24 already, and there is no room for pedestrian to use. He stated that the driveway was 20 feet wide for a two-car garage but for a street it could not be because you can't park.

Commissioner Gordon asked if the fire department signed off on the 20-foot width already.

Public Works Director Ocampo said it was 20-foot clear, meaning that you can't park within the 20 feet.

Commissioner Gordon concluded that, if the road was going to be 20 feet wide, there would need to be signage saying you can't park there.

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that would have to be the case.

Chair Campbell asked the applicant if they understood that fact, that with 20 feet, there was no parking on either side.

Ms. Garcia asked who would park in that city right-of-way. She stated that they would not be parking there and they wouldn't have people park there. They would have them park on their driveway. She stated that, if you were to be there and you get to the end of Corona, there is the road that takes you in there, but who would ever park there. She didn't understand how anyone would park there. They would have to go in and try and turn around. She understood what he was saying, but she would find it hard to believe that someone would park at the bottom of her driveway.

Chair Campbell asked if Dave could answer his question. He was confused as to why fire signed off on a 20-foot width as long as nobody parks on the sides.

Dave Blackman asked the Planning Director if the fire department signed off on the existing plans which do not have the no parking signs.

Planning Director Wehrmeister responded affirmatively.

Dave Blackman reiterated that they signed off without no parking signs. They are okay and with 12 feet they can get a truck by. He understood what Van Ocampo was saying but they signed off specifically on the plan that the Commission approved and they were not requiring the no parking. He stated that may be fine if they want to go back to the fire department and add that. He reiterated that they approved the plan that the Commission approved which did not require no parking signs. That was his understanding and the Planning Director just confirmed.

Chair Campbell asked staff if that was accurate.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that, to her knowledge, the fire department has not requested no parking within the right-of-way area. She did not specifically ask them that question, but that was not something they indicated.

Chair Campbell asked if they had the plans, looked at it, but it came up.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they had a meeting with the fire chief about this project, and yes they did see the plans.

Commissioner Evans stated that he did remember the 20 feet when they voted on it after long discussions. He stated that they approved something a year ago, it is on record, the fire department got the approval on it, and he felt like they were asking the customer to pay more money for something they already bought. He commented that if an item in the store has two price tags on it, the store always gives you the lower price. He felt the sidewalk is needed, and if needed, the additional properties will be required to put one in, and he asked why they are putting one on the other side. He didn't believe it was necessary or should require more than what they approved a year ago. He apologized for the confusion, and he didn't think they should put these people through any more pain than they already have had. He felt it was kind of ridiculous because they already approved it, and he didn't think they should have to redo or whatever the question is for getting more money.

Commissioner Brown gave them kudos for going back to the tape. He imagines the tape is more accurate than his memory. He agreed with Commissioner Evans. He thinks that 20 feet was what was on the plan and was approved, and he would like to move on and not revisit it and what they approved before should stand.

Commissioner Nibellin agreed that, if 20 feet was what was approved before, they should move forward with that. He didn't fault staff for their efforts to try to reconcile what was ambiguous and they will try to do better in the future to make sure they don't have ambiguous conditions included in the actions they take. He thought the best thing was to go ahead and confirm what they did before and go with 20 feet. He didn't see a need for a sidewalk at this point and he didn't see a need for 26 feet of width at this point.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he didn't agree with his fellow commissioners. He remembered this area as a public right-of-way and the question as to whether this was going to be built per standards and it was an area where it was not just that parcel. If the other parcels are developed, they will be stuck with the cost. They are the first parcel to develop in the area and it was not fair to the neighbors that they don't have a place to park if someone throws a party as it is a public right away. He was in disagreement with what is happening in the San Pedro where there is no street improvements, no guidelines, and the streets ramble through the neighborhood. He didn't think, from the standpoint of Pacifica, that they should allow this type of thing to happen. He didn't think there was a necessity for a side walk, but he thinks there is a necessity for the road extension in this area. He thought it was possibly 100 feet and it would service all the parcels within that area, and he didn't think they should compromise the standards for one person and not for the next. He stated that this will come up again on the other two parcel developments.

Commissioner Gordon disagreed with Commissioner Evans on his characterization of the meeting. He stated that he looked at the whole meeting today and he realized that it would be very easy for them to say that was what they decided and they have to stick to it. He stated that, if you look at the hearing and deliberations, 90% of the conversation was about the requested variance for parking spaces. He stated that the conversation was about parking and the discussion about 20 feet was about the driveway. He stated that it was not cut and dry as what they

discussed and it was all done. He stated that, if you look at the tape, it was very ambiguous. He agreed that the plans they submitted listed 20 feet as the width of the street. To the extent they approve the plans as submitted, it was a fair argument, but the approval in the resolution says that the project was approved per the plans as submitted subject to the standards of the city. He felt the fact that it was 20 feet in the plans does not answer the question. He wanted to be honest and it was not as simple as that. He stated that it was up to them what they want to decide. He didn't think their hands were tied by a prior decision, because that decision did not happen. He stated that he has strong feelings about sidewalks. He stated that he lives in an area that has inadequate sidewalks in Vallemar. He stated that there is a ton of people walking around, and it was not safe. He stated that he felt strongly that they should build sidewalks for new construction. At the same time, this was an area where you have to think about what kind of traffic will be on the road. He felt you did have to balance between the extent you want to preserve the natural aspect versus the extent you want to pave it over with a sidewalk. He stated that another option was to put in something like crushed granite, but that does involve destroying the area. He was on the fence in terms of the sidewalk. He thought there were good arguments both ways, and he was leaning toward not requiring the sidewalk because of how much that area is going to be developed. He thought, in the most developed case scenario, you still only have a couple of parcels and it was not going to be very heavily trafficked and he was okay with no sidewalks. In terms of the width of the road, this was a situation where you can find an exception based on circumstances, such as it won't be very heavily trafficked and that was why he asked why they felt they should go 26 feet instead of 20 feet. He didn't know where he was. He stated that his big point was that they haven't decided anything, and he stated that in the prior discussion, they really never talked about this issue. He stated that, procedurally, they didn't have a chance to jump in and he values the feedback and they can get around it by asking a question and they can respond. He asked Dave Blackman what was on his mind.

Dave Blackman stated that he would love to read "modifications of the requirements for subdivisions." He stated that they were talking about street improvements and it says that the Planning Commission may make modifications that they feel are reasonably necessary or expedient. He stated that it gives them so much latitude. They can make this modification and it serves one home. He stated that, if they are asking if it was fair for the other two people, it was not fair for this applicant to do 100% of the improvements. When they come forward and something else is needed, they can take care of it at that point.

Ms. Garcia stated that she didn't know if they got the conditions for approval for 674 Corona Drive back in 1999, but they were actually required to complete that city right-of-way but they didn't. She was advised by Engineering that the reason they didn't have to was because they had to make more improvements to the actual street that their house was on and their conditions of approval, signed by the Planning Commission, never had to be completed. She stated that she wasn't saying that she didn't want to complete but someone else was supposed to complete it and they didn't and she was being asked to complete it. She didn't have a problem completing but she would appreciate it they could find some medium ground to where it was more conducive for them, considering that back in 1999, it was signed by Planning conditions of approval that they were supposed to complete the city right-of-way. She submitted that with her submission to them.

Chair Campbell stated that, if this were a paper street that looped around to a busy street eventually, he would require the full 30 feet all across with sidewalks on both sides, and like Commissioner Gordon, the no sidewalks really bothers him in some instances, because in his

neighborhood, they have had some developers not put the sidewalks in on blind corners and he didn't get why they didn't put sidewalks on them. In this situation, it seems this is a unique circumstance where it is going to cul-de-sac in and he isn't seeing a ton of through traffic and not seeing concerns for the sidewalk. He sees that the next property owners will probably have to put a sidewalk in but would have had to do that anyway. He referred to a couple instances in his neighborhood where there were no sidewalks and they had an incident where an emergency vehicle could not get through and someone may have passed away and he was really sensitive to this issue. He stated that the city put in a sign that said no parking within 10 feet of the center line of the roadway. It has generally worked as cars don't park on either side for a length of time, but there needs to be a little code enforcement but generally it works. He wondered if there would be any option like that where a sign could be posted with no parking on one side, not both sides necessarily, to ensure that an emergency vehicle can get through there. He didn't want a tragedy on his head, and he asked if there was a way to do that and asked the applicant if she was amenable to that.

Mr. Garcia thought it could be red on both sides. He stated that most of the fire truck area at the end of the street is all red.

Dave Blackman thought he was just asking about signage. He agreed that it was common in Pedro Point and in Vallemar where he lives near him. He stated that the fire department would like to have 10-12 feet to get by and why they are okay with the 20 feet. They have conversations and it has gone in different directions but they were okay with this. He thought the extra signage seemed like a fine solution.

Commissioner Nibellin commended Commissioner Gordon on his recollection of the meeting, and it got him to thinking more about his perspective. He referred to the possibility of someone developing the parcels currently undeveloped. He asked if there was a process or something in the law that would allow for charging back a contribution to later developers who benefit from the same infrastructure or is it a question of first in bears the cost.

Mr. Garcia thought that sometimes, in the context of sewer improvements, there are processes where they can come by and collect from people who might come in later with respect to some things that are put in.

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that there were assessment districts where the property owners band together but there is a process in doing so. They start with an engineering study, come up with the estimate and there should be consensus among the property owners before they add this.

Mr. Garcia stated that was only in the context of a district that formed pursuant to the government code of streets and highways wherever it was done.

Commissioner Cooper hears the applicant and knows the cost associated with doing infrastructure. He asked if the Commissioners would entertain performing half the infrastructure within this development and leave the other parcel numbers to do the rest of the development.

Commissioner Nibellin asked him to clarify what he meant.

Commissioner Cooper stated that there was 110 feet of improvements that need to be made, according to the map, and rather than the applicant taking the full burden of improving this, he suggested that they take half of it and continue with their regular driveway for the remaining half.

Commissioner Gordon stated he was confused.

Mr. Garcia asked if he meant 26 feet for half of it and 20 feet for the other.

Commissioner Cooper clarified that 26 feet wide, full improvements, curb to curb with sidewalk and then approve the driveway for the remaining portion.

Chair Campbell stated that, before they entertain comments on that, one thing that he did appreciate was the HPD arguments made where narrow streets and less infrastructure and not taking out that big tree would be something that would fall in line with the HPD.

Commissioner Brown stated that there was a lot of good conversation going on, and he went back to the comments made that it was a Hillside Preservation District, and there would possibly be issues with the retaining wall for the two undeveloped lots, and he was inclined to leaving it at 20 feet, but he did think there should be no parking allowed on either side of the street. On thinking through what was probably going to happen with development, but it wasn't a connecting street, he didn't see a lot of traffic coming through and he was in favor of keeping it at 20 feet with no sidewalk. He thought the next homeowners that come in and purchase the lots will have to do their share.

Commissioner Evans agreed that they should stick with the 20 feet. He gave his reasons before. He thought, as far as shares go, if they are doing 20 feet, and they wanted 26, they have gone over their share already. He stated that, if the other two developments come in, they will have to put in sidewalks and curbs, they can add the other feet. This owner was already doing 20 feet, and he didn't understand making them go further.

Mr. Garcia thought the cut for the roadway cuts into the hill instead of down the hill to be less obtrusive, otherwise, if they were to move down the hill, they would be looking at a giant wall. He stated that the cut will hinder the entrances to those other properties as well, and the wall will get higher. If they can envision that, it was what he sees each day, and it is a tough climb the way it is as grade is down at road level.

Chair Campbell stated that, if they were going to go with 20 feet, with the signage that the applicant seems prepared to agree to, and he really did appreciate the city's arguments, and he completely understands where they are coming from on this. He knows it is not an easy call as judged by the length of the meeting, but going with 20 feet and signage, he asked how they would structure a motion on that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister recommended that the motion be structured to reference the subdivision section that does give them the ability to make the exception and then reference some of the things that have come up in the discussion, such as topography, the existing tree, not wanting to create a lot of retaining walls.

Commissioner Cooper reminded the Commissioners that they can't simply add six feet onto a roadway that was not built to city standards. They would have to take the whole roadway out and put curb and gutter in and it was not as easy as putting another six feet on a road.

Commissioner Gordon appreciated Commissioner Cooper's comments and points of view, but the discussion is always deeper when you have different points of view. He stated that when thinking about the decisions to be made on this project, they have to think about precedents that are going to be set for other projects. From a planning perspective, they have to think about what width of the road makes sense for this project. If they say it is Hillside Preservation District, but are not going to follow HPD requirements, they have to be clear about why they are going to be varying from it. He thought there were good reasonable arguments and would probably be furthering the interests of the HPD by going against the 26 foot width and will be saving a tree, etc., and in this case, smaller seems to be a very good idea. He stated that he lives close to the area that Commissioner Campbell was talking about where someone died. Now, there is now no parking signage in that area. He felt it was for their safety. He stated that the idea of not doing 26 foot width was unsettling to him because he has seen that it can have very serious consequences. He shared Commissioner Campbell's unsettling feelings with approving a road that was narrower, but fire signed off on it and signage could address that issue.

Mr. Garcia asked how long the road went up or was it multiple houses up the street.

Commissioner Gordon stated that it was eight or nine blocks long.

Mr. Garcia stated that they got held way down the hill. He stated that the difference was that it was only about 90 feet.

Commissioner Gordon stated that, given the fact that HPD would be served by going with the smaller road, he was in favor of 20 foot width and, given that there is very little through traffic on this road, he was also in favor of no sidewalks. He thought he was coming down with Commissioner Brown's position and maybe some others too.

Mr. Garcia assumed that the signage would be until another person upgrades the other properties.

Commissioner Gordon stated that there has to be signage.

Chair Campbell thought, even if someone comes in and puts in a sidewalk, the signage may survive. He thought it would be case dependent when they get to that point and see how it works out.

Ms. Garcia stated that it doesn't matter to them.

Chair Campbell appreciated the applicant's flexibility.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that he was in the camp just recently articulated with respect to the 20 feet and no need for sidewalks for the reasons already expressed, but he did think that staff's position on this was a reasonable one. He thought there was ambiguity and they appropriately addressed the ambiguity so by in expressing his present view, he did not want to suggest that staff's position on this was unreasonable. He thought they were reading things in a reasonable and appropriate way.

Chair Campbell agreed with that point wholeheartedly.

Commissioner Cooper agreed that there was thoughtful reasoning behind requiring this. He reminded them that this is city property, not private property and he would hate for something terrible to happen because there was only a 20 foot driveway and it doesn't meet city code.

Chair Campbell appreciated that comment as well, and he hopes they have some comfort in the fact that the fire department gave a thorough review of this before they signed off.

Chair Campbell moved that, pursuant to the Planning Commission's discretionary authority under Pacifica Municipal Code Section 10-1.903, pertaining streets and thoroughfares, provides them the discretion to deviate from the HPD requirements of a 32-25 foot wide street, the Planning Commission interprets Condition No. 18 of Resolution 897 to require a public right-of-way of 20 feet in light of a number of factors, including the HPD goals of a narrower street, less land disturbance, lower retaining walls, maintenance of a cypress tree in the right-of-way and most importantly the fact that the paper street does not continue past this APN parcel number, and also conditioned upon the placement of signage discussed similar to signage that exists in Vallemar District of Pacifica, and also understanding that no sidewalks will be necessary on this portion of the public right-of-way.

Public Works Director Ocampo clarified that this required 20 feet of pavement base of curb to base of curb, basically a curb on both sides but no sidewalk.

Commissioner Brown would agree with that, but he thought, if there are developments in the other two parcels, he wouldn't want to state the no sidewalk requirements as being forever after.

Chair Campbell agreed which was why he wasn't going to mention it.

Commissioner Nibellin stated that, with respect to this project specifically, the sidewalks wouldn't be required if they just limited the no sidewalks to the particular project under consideration.

Chair Campbell agreed that the no sidewalk condition was limited to this specific item under consideration.

Public Works Director Ocampo wanted that clarified because, in the previous statement, it gave the impression that it was for this particular section, but in the future it could be required.

Chair Campbell stated that to be absolutely clear, yes. He stated that he was going to entertain one quick comment from the applicant.

Dave Blackman stated that they got in trouble before by not being clear with each other. He stated that they were planning on putting a retaining wall on the uphill, and he just heard for the first time that they were talking about curb on the uphill wall and he didn't know what that means and needs some clarity. He stated that he also understood that the signage would be similar to the ones in Vallemar on Berendos and that would be in just the public right-of-way.

Chair Campbell stated that it was just what they were talking about tonight, just the public right-of-way.

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that the need for curb and gutter, particularly the gutter is to make sure that the drainage is controlled. With regard to the other question about the signs that are germane on Pedro Point and at Vallemar was specifically adopted by the Council for those particular areas. For this particular one, they were looking at no parking, whereas the other mentioned said no parking within 10 to 6 feet from the centerline of the street. For this particular case, it is going to be a requirement for signs to be installed to state that there will be no parking, particularly on both sides of the street.

Chair Campbell stated that the parking signs in the Vallemar District had the practical effect of knocking out parking on both sides of the street anyway and that was his intent of no parking.

Dave Blackman stated that the applicants were fine with no parking on both sides, and that was what he was hearing from them, but he was still a little unclear why they were putting a curb on the uphill side as the plans show all the water going to the west side of the street. He was hoping to get clarity but if they don't want to put this to rest, they will hope for the best. He didn't understand why they were doing curbs. He didn't even know what a curb looks like next to a retaining wall. He wants some clarity but, if they can't do it, they will try to walk away and see how it works.

Chair Campbell understood but he thought they were getting into an engineering issue and he didn't think they were equipped to deal with that now, and they were going to cross their fingers on that and hopefully it will work out.

Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

Commissioner Nibbelin referred to the no parking signs, and he asked if that really required Council to adopt an ordinance, and were they requiring the Council to adopt an ordinance. He asked if they have that power.

Public Works Director Ocampo stated that it was up to the city engineer.

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

| | |
|----------|--|
| Ayes: | Commissioners Vaterlaus, Cooper, Nibbelin and Gordon |
| Noes: | Commissioner Cooper |
| Abstain: | Commissioner Vaterlaus |

Chair Campbell asked if this could be subject to appeal.

Planning Director Wehrmeister thought it could be subject to appeal.

Chair Campbell 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.

CONSIDERATION:

3. Determination that the Calera parkway Project, part of the 2015-2020 Capital Improvements Program is Consistent with the General Plan (continued from May 18, 2015).

Continued to meeting of June 15, 2015.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Cooper congratulated Chair Campbell on being Chair.

Chair Campbell thanked them all for a thrilling first meeting. He also thanked the previous Chair Brown and Vice Chair Gordon for all the work they did over the last year.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the state has adopted emergency guidelines for water regulations for brand new homes that they will be implementing which includes requiring a water budget, encouraging great water systems, any irrigation systems need to have a moisture sensor, etc. She stated that staff will be attending the Coastal Futures Conditions Conference in Pacifica later in the month. She stated that there was also a Healthy Planning Webinar on June 11 and if anyone is interested, she can forward that link to them. She stated that they were working with consultants on the next steps in the process of the General Plan update and she expects to have a report for them and the Council soon.

Chair Campbell understood that there was a new store going into the Fresh and Easy store. He asked if they were going to be seeing that come before the Commission.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they were checking on the approval process, but it was very likely that it won't be coming to them because it was a grocery store replacement which is like for like. They are making sure they are following the correct process.

Chair Campbell stated that he would like to agendaize one portion, which was the signage. He stated that they discussed the signage for the shopping center several years ago, and it was a beneficial exercise. He thinks the signage looks really good. It was important and they all considered it. It was a fairly lengthy meeting. In regard to the new store's signage for the shopping center, he would like to agendaize that and get that in front of them to make sure that it comports with the signage ordinance they have for that shopping center.

Planning Director Wehrmeister assumed it was a master sign program. She stated that they will look into that.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Gordon moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 p.m.; Commissioner Vaterlaus seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0.

Ayes: Commissioners Vaterlaus, Cooper, Gordon, Brown,
Nibbelin, Evans and Chair Campbell
Noes: None

Planning Commission Minutes
June 1, 2015
Page 25 of 25

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister