

**MINUTES**

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

October 5, 2015

7:00 p.m.

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

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

**SALUTE TO FLAG:** Led by Chair Campbell

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director Wehrmeister  
Contract Planner Turhan Sonmez

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

The motion carried **5-0**.

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: SEPTEMBER 21, 2015** Commissioner Evans moved approval of minutes of September 21, 2015; Commissioner Vaterlaus seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

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

**DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF OCTOBER 12, 2015:**

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that no liaison was needed.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

None.

**CONSENT ITEMS:**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**PSD-802-15  
CDP-357-15  
UP-067-15  
SYB-229-15**

**SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, USE PERMIT AND TENTATIVE (CONDOMINIUM MAP), filed by Ciyavash Moazzani, to construct one three-story condominium duplex and one three-storey condominium triplex (five units total), with the units ranging in size from 2,280+/- square feet to 3,188 +/- square feet on two separate lots at 15 and 29 Montecito Avenue (APN: 016-182-170 and 016-182-350). This project site is located in the appeal area of the Coastal Zone. Recommended CEQA status: Exempt.**

Contract Planner Sonmez presented the staff report.

Commissioner Vaterlaus stated that she did meet with Ciyavash and toured the other buildings prior to this meeting.

Ciyavash Moazzani, applicant, stated that it has been a pleasure to work with Planner Sonmez and staff. He stated that he didn't have anything to add, and was ready to answer any questions. He was looking forward to working with staff and moving the project along.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the center of the triplex, building 2, unit 4 and the recycle bins, etc., and stated that he didn't see a common storage area. He asked how they were going to address that.

Mr. Moazzani stated that he would like to introduce his architect, Jonathan Clark, who can speak to designs, etc.

Jonathan Clark, SDG Architects, stated that on the duplex units, the plan was to have refuse bins on the side yard behind the fence.

Commissioner Cooper asked where on the side yard, mentioning that it was narrow and the bins are wide.

Mr. Clark stated that they have five foot side yards on both duplex and triplex lots. He stated that the bins look large, probably 30 inches square, and they would fit within the gate. In the triplex unit, the intent would be to provide the refuse storage locations within the garage space because there is no side yard.

Commissioner Cooper stated that, at times, they were trying to remove the front doors visually from the street, either side or cantilevered from the side vestibule rather than the front vestibule. He asked if they looked at that or considered.

Mr. Clark stated that, as mentioned in staff report, when they developed the project, it was preferable for the front door to face the street, mostly for security reasons and people can see the front doors visible from the street, which they had on a previous project and this project was redesigned for these lots with that same intention because some people do not find side entries as desirable because of the security concerns.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he was looking at some of the elevations within the property and he thought they were about one foot above the street level for the foundation. Because of occasionally getting water, he asked if they have thought about raising the grade in this property.

Mr. Clark stated that would typically be deferred to civil engineers who are the experts on drainage. He stated that they were providing the appropriate drainage, and they asked them to put the building pads at a certain height from a building code standpoint. He stated that raising it above that is usually not necessary unless there was a critical flood issues.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he wasn't questioning the code, but had noticed that it was pretty close to street level.

Mr. Clark stated that, by code, they try and keep it eight inches above the surrounding grate and, depending on how they slope the garage driveway, it was probably within the 12 inches. He stated that they incorporate all the drainage properly and they hope things don't flood.

Commissioner Evans stated that he noticed on Units 1 and 2, they have the driveway going straight back, but on the plot plan, they have an indentation curvature on Unit 2. He wondered which it was.

Mr. Clark recapped that the landscape and civil plan show the curve for Unit 2, and his architectural plans show it straight back. He stated that the intention would be to follow the landscape and civil plans as drawn.

Commissioner Evans assumed that was with the curvature.

Mr. Clark responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans stated he had a concern, mentioning that they already have a side by side interior garage and the outer car would have to curve backing up to get out of the single car garage door and then it curves again. He asked if there was a problem in keeping the driveway straight back as in the garage floor plan.

Mr. Clark stated that he wasn't sure if there was a logistics issue of why it had to curve. He didn't think they would be opposed to looking at it going straight. He would have to check with the civil engineer and landscape architect.

Commissioner Evans stated that his concern was because backing up was difficult and with two curves he thought about keeping it straight, mentioning that all the other driveways are straight back.

Commissioner Cooper referred to Unit 4, asking if that was an enormous car because he didn't see how that car could fit in Unit 3.

Mr. Clark stated that Units 4 and 5 are the duplex units. Unit 3 was obviously the larger unit attached to the triplex. Because of its size, the width of the garage area was wider than the other two units and the garage doesn't have to be as deep to get to the minimum parking space sizes required by municipal code and the garage depth could be much shorter on Unit 3. He stated that,



on Unit 4, it has to be further back and it looks like you squeeze in there. He affirmed that the parking spaces meet the minimum municipal code. He agreed that the car was large and was a drawing of what a full size car would be, such as a 1970s Cadillac.

Planning Director Wehrmeister had a comment on the question on Unit 2 and the curve in the driveway. She stated that, on looking at the civil drawings, it looked like that section was adjacent to a catch basin that is to be protected, and she didn't think they could start the driveway slope transition on top of the catch basin. If it were to be straight, the slope would be on top of the catch basin.

Commissioner Evans stated that he wasn't sure what the reason was. He stated that it wasn't a deal killer but just a concern.

Chair Campbell opened the Public Hearing.

Brian O'Flynn, Pacifica, stated he was speaking in favor of the project. He was happy to see that the existing dwelling on the project which have gotten into a blighted state for a number of years and have probably reached the end of their life cycle given the quality of construction and harsh coastal environment. He was happy to see the area improved. He thought it would be a nice dovetailing into the city property when they do the mixed use development and will be more compatible having the nicer property across the street. He stated that he will be coming to see the city, stating he has a property at 2105 and 2115 Beach Blvd., and he has a nice project. He was excited to see the general improvement in the quality of architecture and materials.

Allison Schmidt, Pacifica, stated that she has lived on Montecito for about a year along with her girlfriend and try to keep it up. She mentioned their daughter and all the projects in which she is involved, such as the Spindrift school. She stated that it will be difficult as her way of life is going to change if they are no longer able to stay in Pacifica. She stated that the changes are all going upward, with loss of parking, etc. They were concerned about losing these homes due to change.

Chair Campbell closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Evans referred to Commissioner Cooper's question on Unit 3, stating that he didn't see any distance marking on the depth of the #3 garage, just width, and he asked the architect if he was missing something.

Mr. Clark stated that he was right that it was not designated. He stated that the municipal code requires a parking space of 9' wide, 18' deep, and he confirmed that the garage meets the minimum even though it is not called out.

Commissioner Evans concluded that it was definitely there.

Mr. Clark confirmed, adding that there was no way they would be able to build anything.

Commissioner Cooper mentioned that, if you look at sheet 1 of 7 on the tentative parcel map, it gives brief dimensions, 5.25, 5.92 and 8.38, which would give you 18, 19.4 feet.

Commissioner Gordon stated that the location of the project was pretty close to the water.

Mr. Clark responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Gordon stated that, if you take a stroll along Beach Blvd., you will see a lot of residences that have not fared very well, given the conditions. He asked if he could speak about the precautionary or preventative materials they are using, specifically the plan for keeping the construction in better shape than the neighbors have fared.

Mr. Clark stated that, being in Pacifica and right on the ocean, anything with salt was a great concern. He stated that most of the materials are chosen to fare well in that environment. He stated that the primary materials being used was stucco, cement based material which will hold up fairly well in the environment. He stated that another concern was metals. He stated that the rails were not stainless steel but galvanized and painted to protect against the elements as best as possible. They mount them a certain way so that, if there was water intrusion and corrosion, they can be easily replaced from a construction maintenance standpoint. He stated that the triplex building was supposed to have cement fiber siding which is another cement based product for durability reasons. They were proposing composite panels which were a smooth fiber cement product laid out in an architectural pattern seen on elevations. They were primarily using a lot of cement based products and treating metals exposed to the elements as best as possible, with very little wood to mitigate what is seen in this environment.

Commissioner Evans asked if the driveway was permeable pavers or concrete.

Mr. Clark stated that it was concrete and not a permeable product.

Chair Campbell stated that he has walked through the area in high tide and seen sandbags and flooding. He thought this project was low to the ground considering problems the other buildings are presently facing. He asked if he would lead them through the thought process on why it wasn't raised.

Mr. Clark stated that he can lead them through the thought process, adding that he didn't design the grading. He explained that the civil engineer looks at the site as it exists with the goal of providing proper drainage, etc. He stated that the building is required to be a certain distance above the grade. He then picks the height of the building based on the most cost effective way to make things work, and they get a foot change because they don't have to bring in a lot of dirt to raise the building up. They use the existing ground as best as possible and still be able to construct a foundation within the building code requirements. He wasn't sure he could speak to the flooding of the streets as he doesn't live in Pacifica and wasn't aware of that.

Chair Campbell understood, and stated that he might direct a question to staff. He asked staff's opinion on the flooding and forces of nature affecting the homes presently, and he asked if they had looked at that.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they have a flood plain management ordinance and the site is not in the designated flood plain. She stated that, in implementing that ordinance, when a project comes in for a building permit, the building official needs to determine that it is at a level that is outside the flood plain. She stated that the civil engineer is aware of that and has designed the project as such.



Chair Campbell assumed this was outside the flood plain zones.

Commissioner Vaterlaus stated that when they saw a previous project on Santa Rosa, she asked this question, i.e., instead of being condominiums, did they consider them being attached single family homes.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that she had no history on Santa Rosa and apologized that she could not comment on that, but the condominiums were what was proposed and staff did not make a request to change the status.

Mr. Clark added that, for all intents and purposes, they were attached single family homes. He explained that what makes them condominiums was that they didn't have property lines between each unit.

Commissioner Vaterlaus commented that they have a homeowners' association.

Mr. Clark explained that it was because it was a condominium with no property lines. Each unit owner does not own that whole piece of property.

Mr. Sonmez added that the project was reviewed subject to the cluster home development requirements which were for four owner condominiums as opposed to four rent apartment buildings.

Commissioner Gordon referred to staff's mention of doing an examination of the project currently under construction by the same applicant nearby in Santa Rosa, and they looked at how it was progressing.

Mr. Sonmez stated that he didn't do an in depth site visit but drove by it and stopped and looked at it.

Commissioner Gordon wondered if he had any observation about how that prior project is going and if there are any red flags, etc.

Mr. Sonmez stated that he did not have a construction background and the project was not at the stage where it was complete and it was going to be at a point where the planner needs to go out and final it. It was a little early for that and he can't comment, but it looks like a high quality development.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated, speaking for the Planning and Building Divisions, there has been no issues with the project on Santa Rosa.

Commissioner Cooper stated that, on some of the plans there was a rogue fire hydrant that would appear to interfere with some of the driveways. He asked if they have looked at that.

Mr. Clark stated that he understood that the fire department has a condition to relocate that fire hydrant.

Commissioner Cooper asked if that was in the conditions as he did not see that.

Mr. Clark stated that it was shown on the civil plans, sheet 5 of 7, as a note to relocate existing fire hydrant, moved to be outside of the triplex on the most eastern side.

Commissioner Cooper asked staff if that was typically included in the provisions.

Planning Director Wehrmeister asked if he was referring to relocating the fire hydrant.

Commissioner Cooper responded affirmatively, adding if it was sufficient enough to have it on the plans.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that the fire authority may not have commented or provided a condition because they saw that on the plans but, if the Commission feels it is necessary, they can add a condition.

Mr. Clark stated that there was a condition that talks about whether there is a lack of fire flow to provide a fire hydrant, and he might have mixed that up with the relocation. At that time, when they do building permits, a fire flow test would have to be done and, if not appropriate fire flow water, they would have to work with city staff and engineering to provide an appropriate fire hydrant.

Commissioner Cooper asked if he would have a problem relocating the fire hydrant as part of one of the provisions.

Mr. Clark asked if outside of where it was relocated now.

Commissioner Cooper stated just the provision to relocate the fire hydrant as part of the conditions for approval.

Mr. Clark wanted to be clear. He asked if they were talking about relocating the existing fire hydrant or relocating the fire hydrant they are proposing.

Commissioner Cooper meant the existing fire hydrant where it currently is. He wanted to be sure it got relocated. Even though it might show on the plans, if it comes back as something the fire department was to do, he would like to add it as a provision that they will relocate it.

Mr. Clark reiterated that he just wanted to be clear about what they are talking about.

Commissioner Cooper clarified that he wasn't going to have them move it twice.

Chair Campbell thought it was a big project and comes pretty close, almost having a hard time making the first finding that the privacy of nearby residences will not be reduced and the second finding that the architectural features and proposed structures would be integrated. He didn't see neighbors coming out against it, which he thought was interesting. He thought it looks like it's meeting the building requirements for flooding, which was a big concern. He understood that it was cost effective to not fill in as much dirt, and he hoped that they don't have flooding of this in the future. He thought that would be a shame considering all the warning lights as they approve the project. He stated he was inclined to vote in favor of it at this point.



Commissioner Gordon felt it was definitely an upgrade in terms of modernizing the area. He appreciated the design elements, especially the façade facing the street, which has some appeal with the balconies and various textures. He thought the other views were blocky and nouveau penitentiary, but those aren't visible by anybody being the rear and side. He was fine with that. He liked the trees and it was asking for no variances. He mentioned it was 33 feet high in elevation but sounds like it's consistent with other buildings in the area and there are no variances. He likes how it will be fitting within the development of Palmetto. They are certainly going to need residents visiting the businesses in the area. He was in favor of the project.

Commissioner Cooper agreed with the opinions of the fellow commissioners. He thought, taking into account that there could be flooding and materials were important to make sure it looks nice. He felt the condominium association was responsible for a lot of the structure. Having high grade stainless steel for a railing would make the property look great for a much longer period of time, mentioning the stainless steel railing in front of the Council chamber building that still looks great. He mentioned that stucco was a good choice, and he urged them to take the time and money and look at upgrading some areas with cheaper materials. He stated that he wanted to see the trash bins off the street and not visible to the public. He was in favor of the project, adding that it was a good improvement for the area and something needed in the area. He thought it was a shame they can't facilitate everyone's wishes when they make decisions, but he thought this was the right move for our community.

Chair Campbell referred to mention about decorative metal, railings, etc., and asked if they can condition the use of stainless steel that won't rust in the coastal environment.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated they could condition, but suggested they ask applicant for comments before they do so, but it would be an acceptable condition to add.

Chair Campbell asked applicant for an opinion. He mentioned that they have so many instances where rust starts to run down the side of the house and it looks awful.

Mr. Moazzani stated that he didn't have a problem with that. He thought, on rock tide, all their nails were stainless steel on the outside and they took that into consideration. He was trying to live at rock tide but timing wasn't right for him and his wife, so now their plan was to hopefully live in one of the units in the triplex and he was fine with stainless steel. He hoped the railing won't come back and kill the deal.

Chair Campbell assumed that places marked as decorative metal rail would all be stainless steel.

Mr. Moazzani responded affirmatively.

Chair Campbell concluded that they will add that as a condition.

Commissioner Evans stated that he lived in direct view of the ocean and it was surprising what that salt air does to metal. He stated that the only thing that stands up is stainless, adding that sometimes poor stainless doesn't, and cooper or plastics. He stated that he has replaced galvanized right and left as it does not work. He agreed with that condition on the stainless. He liked the design. He mentioned looking at one they approved some time ago, and he thought it looked like a small version of this design and he commended keeping it in line with what was going on. He mentioned that not everyone was in favor of modern, but he was, although not



something they can dictate. He liked the idea that he broke up the front area quite nicely with the different designs, and it doesn't look "blockish" like the sides, and no one is seeing the sides. He felt it was a nice design and he wanted to make sure they stay on top of the elevation issue. He mentioned that they approved the project behind this one and it was a similar design and he didn't see why they couldn't approve this one. He felt this looks good to him.

Commissioner Vaterlaus agreed. She saw the other units and thought they were quality built. She thought it was very consistent because they were right behind. She mentioned that these were the only single families left on the block, with all the others multi-unit and it fits in with the neighborhood. She stated that there were several similar examples and she felt it fits in and she agreed with the additions.

Commissioner Gordon moved that the Planning Commission finds that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; approve Site Development Permit PSD-802-15, Use Permit UP-067-15, Coastal Development Permit CDP-357-15 and Tentative (Condominium) Map SUB-229-15 by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A; and incorporates all maps and testimony into the record by reference and additional conditions that anywhere where metal is used in the construction of the project, that stainless steel be used, instead of other materials, in the exterior of the building and fire hydrant will be relocated by the applicant; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0.

Ayes: Commissioners Cooper, Gordon, Evans, Vaterlaus  
and 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.

**CONSIDERATION:**

None.

**COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:**

Commissioner Gordon welcomed the new contractor, asking him for his name.

Contract Planner Turhan Sonmez introduced himself.

Commissioner Gordon thanked him for the good job on this project.

Chair Campbell also thanked him for a good job.

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that there were none.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Campbell thanked counsel for being present.

Commissioner Evans mentioned some material that was at each place.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that it was a notification from GGNRA regarding the Milagra Battery trail improvements planned for next year.

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Vaterlaus moved to adjourn the meeting at approximately 7:50 p.m.; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina  
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

---

Planning Director Wehrmeister