

MINUTES

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

March 17, 2014

7:00 p.m.

Chair Evans called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Absent: None

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Vaterlaus

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director White
Assistant Planner Farbstein

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

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans

Noes: None

Chair Evans stated that he would not be voting as he was not present for the January meeting.

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
JANUARY 6, 2014** Commissioner Nibbelin moved approval of the
minutes of January 6, 2014; Commissioner Vaterlaus
seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0-2**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Nibbelin and
Vaterlaus.

Noes: None

Abstains: Commissioner Campbell and Chair Evans.

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 24, 2014:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. **CDP-342-14
PSD-786-14
SUB-223-14** **COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, CDP-342-14, filed by the applicant/agent, Mike O'Connell on behalf of the owner, Aaron Wright, to demolish an existing building, to subdivide a parcel into two lots and to construct a single-family dwelling on each lot at 251 and 261 San Pedro Avenue (APN 023-034-020, 030, 040 & 050). Recommended CEQA status: Exempt.**

Assist. Planner Farbstein presented the staff report.

Commissioner Gordon referred to the staff report mentioning that a lot of the homes in Pedro Point have been approaching the 35-foot height limit and that this was about 22 feet in height.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded that it was two stories and 22 feet. She stated that she might have to change that thinking because an earlier project was one story but was 24 feet. She stated that the more recent ones were coming in smaller and lower.

Commissioner Gordon asked if the projects in the more immediate area were mostly comprised of one, two or three stories.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that, in this particular area, the newer homes were actually three stories. She stated that there were a few among them that are one story with the beach cottage look. She referred to one close to the Fresh and Easy area which was three stories and maxed out at 35 feet. She thought that was constructed six years ago.

Commissioner Gordon asked confirmation that there was not a uniform height going on in the area, but rather an eclectic look.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded affirmatively, stating that since she has been working in the City of Pacifica, most of the projects have been three stories and right at the 35-foot height limit. However, her last two projects have been 22 and 24 feet, and things are changing in the space of the last 15 years.

Commissioner Cooper referred to a utility pole in a driveway, and asked if that pole was only serving the current cabin.

Asst. Planner Farbstein thought that was the case, but she would defer to the applicant to address that.

Commissioner Cooper then referred to the storm drain system and catch basins in the area, asking if there was either in the area to catch the runoff from the road.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that she was not aware of any other than the one across the street that was recently approved in January.

Commissioner Brown stated that he thought the swing parking was attractive with less garage door facing the street which makes them seem cozier, but he wondered about the room to back up and turn around.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded that they just barely make it at 25 feet. She stated that the lot was 50 feet wide and, with the garage, they have 25 feet. She stated that there was an area alongside that she wanted to keep landscaped but she thought the back of the car could overhang that.

Commissioner Brown did wonder about that.

Asst. Planner Farbstein reiterated that the rear of the car could overhang it.

Commissioner Brown asked if swing parking triggered CEQA or were there other factors.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that it was a permit for site development or planning permit, which was approval of a site development permit and additional planning permit. She also pointed out that the setback in the front yard was reduced.

Mike O'Connell, applicant, stated that they found the conditions of approval acceptable. Referring to the question on catch basins, he didn't think there were any underground storm drain facilities until they get to Danmann or Livingston, where the underground storm drain system starts. He explained that projects are typically required to detain and infiltrate the runoff from their site during the 10-year event. In a hundred-year storm, the water flows via overland release into the street. He stated that, as part of the project, each lot will have its own infiltration pit or detention system which is similar to what they are doing across the street at 280 San Pedro. They were also constructing a new curb and gutter in place of the existing situation which was sort of an asphalt swale and was less pronounced on their side of the street. Because of that, they can construct a curb, gutter and sidewalk. Regarding the existing joint pole, it will sit between the two proposed driveways. They will work it out with PG&E but they are assuming there will be a new drop for each house to have an underground service from that pole. He stated that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Commissioner Gordon referred to Commissioner Brown's question regarding swing parking and the amount of space available to back up and get in and out of the garage. He asked if there were any engineering standards that apply to this kind of parking, such as minimum amount of space.

Mr. O'Connell thought there may be because he knew there were for parking lots. He thought someone in Pacifica decided that the 25 feet was adequate. He mentioned that he had a similar condition with limited space to back up at his personal home and, depending on how he gets in, he can get out of there without a three-point turn but sometimes not. He thought it mostly depends on the skills of the drivers. He felt a plus was that the driveways were not severe regarding the gradients. He stated that he could get back to them on what the standard was for single lane parking lots, etc., but he didn't know if it translates.

Commissioner Gordon thought he might have to direct his question to staff because it was hard to evaluate the space and the challenge posed by this configuration.

Planning Director White stated that we do have a code standard of 25 feet, as mentioned in the report. He thought it was hard to say if it was adequate for every situation, car and driver.

Mr. O'Connell thought they would probably have to run a turning template for the various types of vehicles, such as a sedan, SUV, etc. Larger vehicles might have trouble making the swing parking.

Commissioner Brown thought he understood the setbacks more. He asked if the 32 feet was to the front porch and the 10 feet was to the side of the garage.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Brown then asked if it was going from the 15 feet requirement on the front yard to the 10 feet which was allowed by doing this.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded affirmatively, adding that it was upon approval of the site development permit.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he was concerned about the utilities since we were trying to put everything underground where possible. He thought it was a requirement of a lot of the permits, including this project. He asked if they were planning to relocate the pole or have PG&E relocate the pole to the center, or was it already in the center. He thought it was off base on the rendering.

Mr. O'Connell stated that it was not quite dead center, but he thought it was in the public right-of-way and he didn't believe it needed to be relocated. Unless there was a compelling reason to do so, he didn't think PG&E would be interested in relocating it.

Commissioner Cooper asked if he was going to drop down to underground from there into the homes.

Mr. O'Connell responded affirmatively. He explained that there was one overhead service to the existing house which they will lose. He didn't believe there were any existing drops on the pole. He explained that PG&E had a limit on how many drops they can have per pole, which was why they sometimes go through the process with the city conditioning the project with an underground service but PG&E then says they can't underground it because there was already a maximum on the pole. He didn't think that was the case on this pole, adding that they were going to lose one overhead service and that will free up space.

Commissioner Cooper referred to specifying pavers in the driveway, and he asked if they were pervious pavers where they will get ground water back into the system or just run off.

Mr. O'Connell explained that, since they were going to have an infiltration pit or detention system, they would probably be pervious pavers with some kind of open grated gravel beneath. He thought that, since the driveway slopes to the street, that would likely get collected in a sub drain towards the front of the driveway near the property line and the water would be conveyed by a pipe to either a detention pipe or infiltration pit.

Commissioner Cooper referred to a patio in the back of the building that overlooks the drip line of the tree and asked if it was also a pervious patio.

Mr. O'Connell thought they had concrete in the plans but they were open to pervious pavement at that location. He thought that, by the time they bring in all the pavers for the driveway, it would probably be easier to do the patios in pavers also.

Chair Evans opened the Public Hearing.

Alice Whealy, asked if there was going to be a sidewalk or walkway in front of the two houses.

Chair Evans stated that he would ask staff to answer that.

Ms. Whealy assumed there was a public right-of-way there, but she would continue after she gets an answer regarding the sidewalk.

Chair Evans suggested that she continue while they are looking for the answer so she doesn't lose her allotted time.

Ms. Whealy felt they were bulky buildings for the site because of the maximum limit on the lot. She expected that, with a bulkier building than before, there should be a minimum public good provided. In that area, she thought the public good would be a walkway or sidewalk, explaining that there was a problem with people having to walk in the streets in the San Pedro area because many of them do not have cars. She stated that so many buildings were built with the assumption that everyone can get into a car and drive away but that was not the case. She mentioned that the elderly and children are in the street all the time. She mentioned that there was a sidewalk on the corner by the cat hospital but the house next to this development does not have a sidewalk yet but was a relatively small house. She expected that, when someone does some new development, the Planning Commission will demand that a walkway be put in there as well. She felt there was a need for it because of a paper street connecting San Pedro with Stanley, and pedestrians go up and down all the time. She added that the opposite hillside was harder to put a sidewalk. She felt, if they have to give up the quality of life because of bulky buildings for a small lot, the developer should at least return to the public which, in this case, should be some sidewalk for the pedestrians.

Planning Director White stated that they looked at the plans and there was not a sidewalk being proposed as part of the project. He added that there was a condition that talked about existing curb, gutter and sidewalk but there probably are not existing curb, gutter and sidewalk. He stated that, if there was a desire to look into the feasibility of a segmented sidewalk, they could craft language that would allow that to happen. He explained that they rely on Public Works to tell Planning what the standard is and they have not applied a standard for a new sidewalk. He stated that there might be a good reason for that, such as not enough right-of-way, etc. He didn't know and there was no staff from Public Works to answer that question. He reiterated that they probably could craft some language for them to look into that as part of the development of the property.

Mr. O'Connell stated that they were on board regarding the sidewalk, explaining that it was on the tentative map. He thought it was standard and he thought the city had an ordinance for new sidewalks across the frontage of new houses, adding that, if not, Ray Donguines has not been telling him the truth all these years. He thought the Commission had an outdated plan because it was a comment from Engineering. He stated that they were late with the comments, and it came down to the wire with their responses. At the last minute, they said they needed the sidewalk and

they can conditionally approve the project. He stated he had it on his latest drawings which he emailed to Van and Ray. He stated that they were fine if they had to add the language but it was on the map.

Chair Evans concluded that it was affirmative on the sidewalk.

Commissioner Cooper stated that the sidewalk shows on his set, with a notation mentioning new curb, gutter and sidewalk. He thought it was important to make that a condition, adding that he thought all new developments had the sidewalk.

Planning Director White thought they could add that to Condition 27.

Chair Evans closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he forgot how they added a condition as far as the Planning Commission was concerned.

Planning Director White explained that typically they would articulate what they wanted added to the condition, specifying what it was, and they would either craft a new condition or, as he suggested, add on to Condition 27 which already talks about curb, gutter and sidewalk and they would add the language in as part of the motion.

Commissioner Gordon questioned why if it was already in the plans.

Planning Director White thought the problem was that they have different plans that have different things on them, and it was a matter that plans were submitted at different times. He thought it was better to be safe and put it in there and, if it was on the tentative map plans, it was a moot point.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked for clarification that they would be amending Condition 27 to make it clear that sidewalks would be required across the frontage of the project.

Planning Director White responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Cooper moved that the Planning Commission find that the project is exempt from CEQA; **APPROVE** Coastal Development Permit, CDP-342-14, Site Development Permit, PSD-786-14 and Subdivision, SUB-223-14 by **ADOPTING** the attached resolutions for the proposed single-family dwellings at 251 and 261 San Pedro Avenue, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A, including revision of Condition 27 to include sidewalk, curb and gutter; and incorporate all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Vaterlaus seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

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

Chair Evans commended them for a nice looking, conservative project.

Chair Evans 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.

COMMISSION ITEMS:

2. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.

Planning Director White stated that the protocol was first for nominations for the Chair and Vice Chair second. He explained that he put this at the end of the agenda to reconfigure the seating chart for the next meeting.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked who the current Vice Chair was.

Planning Director White stated that it was Commissioner Brown.

Chair Evans moved to nominate Commissioner Brown as Chair; Commissioner Nibbelin seconded the motion.

Commissioner Brown asked if he could vote for himself.

Chair Evans responded affirmatively.

The motion carried **7-0**.

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

Chair Evans moved to nominate Commissioner Gordon as Vice Chair; Commissioner Vaterlaus seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

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

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Cooper commented that, in his neighborhood on Perez, there was a recent development and he hasn't seen that the street was paved. He asked if this was the right forum to ask about this.

Planning Director White stated that he would look into it.

Commissioner Gordon stated that this was related to what Commissioner Cooper just asked. He thought it would be great to find out what the requirements were, when they get a new development, in terms of sidewalks such as paving, etc. He thought it would be nice to know.

Planning Director White acknowledged that it comes up from time to time, and he thought it would be worthwhile, if not to have a member from Engineering present, to provide a summary of what they consider when they apply conditions of approval to a project. He thought it was different for each project. He thought there were standards, but there were variations depending on the circumstances of the project. He gave the example that, if the street has been paved recently in front of a development site, there may not be an absolute requirement to repave it entirely. They were tailored to the project but, because it does come up, they can ask the question and maybe get a guide that they can all use.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Roger Medler, Pacifica, spoke about issues with Seaview Tire and Brake Center.

Chair Evans thanked everyone for their support during his tenure as Chair.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he did not know the address of the speaker.

Chair Evans stated that he did not have an address.

Mr. Medler stated that his address was 527 Dolphin Drive, Pacifica, CA.

Commissioner Cooper thanked him.

Mr. Medler commented that he hoped they could be of some help. He stated that he has been doing this a long time and he was really fed up with it.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Gordon moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:38 p.m.; Commissioner Nibbelin seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,

Noes: Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director White