

MINUTES

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

February 19, 2013

7:00 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Campbell, Leon and Chair Evans
Absent: Commissioners Gordon and Langille

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Clifford

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director White
Assistant Planner Farbstein

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA Commissioner Clifford moved approval of the Order of Agenda; Commissioner Leon seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Campbell, Leon and Chair Evans
Noes: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: FEBRUARY 4, 2013 Commissioner Clifford moved approval of the minutes of February 4, 2013; Commissioner Leon seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Campbell, Leon and Chair Evans
Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 25, 2013:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

PSD-783-12 **Proposed is construction of a mixed use project with three**
UP-026-12 **buildings that have a total commercial area of approximately**
CDP-335-12 **1,700 square feet and three apartments on the upper floors.**
PE-157-12 **Approval of a Site Development Permit, PSD-783-12, Use**
 Permit, UP-026-12, Coastal Development Permit, CDP-335-12
 and Parking Exception, PE-157-12 are necessary. The
 commercial space in the ground floor of each building is
 approximately 600 square feet. The building in front is proposed
 as two stories with an apartment unit of approximately 600
 square feet, and the two buildings in the rear of the lot will be
 three stories with each containing an apartment unit of
 approximately 1,300 square feet. (APN 022-027-210 & 020).

Asst. Planner Farbstein presented the staff report.

Commissioner Clifford asked when the in lieu parking fee was adjusted, adding that it was put into place on December 6, 1986.

Planning Director White stated that, to his knowledge, there was no multiplier when established and it may never have been adjusted, although he didn't know that for a fact. If interested, staff could do the research.

Commissioner Leon commented that there was action by City Council due to dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency and he asked for clarification that, for this area, the local use plan and Rockaway Beach specific plan were in force as published in the records.

Planning Director White responded that he was correct, adding that several items such as the in lieu fee were still in effect, and by resolution on January 28, the Council certified that it was the case. Previously the Council was the final decision maker but, with the resolution of the agency, all development falls to the standard development process in Pacifica and, in many cases, the Planning Commission now becomes the decision maker, such as coastal development permits, although still appealable to the City Council. Regarding legislative changes such as zoning, the Council was still the final word.

Commissioner Leon commented that, in some cases, it was also appealable to the Coastal Commission.

Planning Director White agreed that these actions were appealable to the Coastal Commission.

Commissioner Leon concluded that it was because they were in the Coastal Zone.

Planning Director White responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Leon asked if the APN numbers were correctly listed on the staff report and paperwork.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that there was a typo with one APN numbers missing a number, reading that they were 022-027-210 and -020.

Commissioner Leon concluded that was what they were legally talking about at this time.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Brown asked what the in lieu parking fees were.

Planning Director White stated that, currently, the in lieu parking fees were \$3,000 per parking space.

Commissioner Brown asked if it was a one-time fee.

Planning Director White responded that it was.

Commissioner Brown asked what mechanisms were in place to ensure that the three commercial spaces were not used for residential purposes.

Planning Director White responded that, logically, they would probably have signage to ensure that the spaces were used in the proper way.

Commissioner Brown commented that they had big windows and only a sink and a bathroom, but it was a concern.

Planning Director White stated that when anyone wants to use a commercial space or any space, they would do tenant improvements for the new use and that is the time that staff ensures that the use was compatible with the specific plan in effect or is allowed by code. He added that they normally did zoning clearances for building permits in a variety of ways for commercial space and it was not a separate mechanism for this type of project.

Commissioner Clifford asked if code enforcement would come into play if someone made a complaint that commercial property was being used as residential.

Planning Director White stated that, if that happened such as someone not going through the tenant improvement process, code enforcement would be the mechanism to get compliance with the code, but he hoped that would not be the case.

Commissioner Leon stated that, in looking at the area and in the Rockaway Beach Specific Plan, the area seemed to be broken up into block designations for different purposes. He wanted to be clear that, when referring to the block designations with this property, it was Block 3 and what happens in Block 5 might be different than what happens in other blocks.

Asst. Planner Farbstein concluded that he was correct in that interpretation.

Commissioner Leon assumed that was why those designations existed for each of the areas.

Asst. Planner Farbstein thought one element was the parking because this area has close parking but in another part it would be out of that area.

Commissioner Leon thought it was significant because they have been dealing with Rockaway Beach and you realize that there are different areas with different requirements.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded that he was correct.

Commissioner Clifford asked who the proposed parking spaces belonged to, the businesses or the residents.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that, at this time, there was no assignment, although the applicant might want to add to that. She stated that the spaces could be designated for commercial use during the day and on evenings and weekends, they could be for residential. She reiterated that they were not designated at this time, although she tried to give an example of a breakdown in the staff report.

Jim Miller of Oculis Architecture and Design, was making the presentation for Steve Baldwin, applicant, and stated that he wanted to show images of the project from early sketches and how they ended up with the present three-building scheme. He first showed the view of the land from different directions then the various changes they considered over time. He showed a 3D rendering of the present proposed project. He mentioned that his client had put out feelers to possibly negotiate a purchase of the lots to the south and north. He concluded by showing an image if such discussions came to fruition.

Commissioner Leon commented that the driveway was 11 feet wide and he had observed that most driveways were two-way and wide enough for two vehicles to pass. In this situation, he thought someone driving in would not be able to see if there were empty spaces and, if there were none, they would have a problem because of the narrow driveway. He stated that, with the two compact spaces, they would have to make a number of maneuvers.

Mr. Miller acknowledged that one spot was like a 5-point turn.

Commissioner Leon agreed it was pretty tough, and that was his concern about whether it would work. He wondered what happens if it doesn't work.

Mr. Miller stated that they talked a lot about parking. They understood that the site was small and they were trying to do a lot. With only five parking spots, they thought a one-way driveway was sufficient to serve the spots in question. They haven't settled the question of which were residential and which were commercial, although he thought if they lived in that development, it would only take them a couple of days before they learn the vagaries of the parking requirements. He stated that, on the driveway, there was a path which allowed access to the front door residential unit. He thought 11 plus 4 to 5 feet was enough. He thought, if they went to a two-way driveway for five spots, it would seriously impact the front building and that building was extremely important to the project because of the street presence and he would hate to diminish it. He personally thought the parking was as well thought out or executed given the parameters of the current design.

Commissioner Leon thought one thing was that there should be a sign plan. He wondered if there would be a monument sign.

Mr. Miller stated that they have given some thoughts to signage, and they didn't plan a monument sign. They thought of a silk screen sign in the front building and in the rear buildings they had hanging signs from the projections that align with the commercial space below. He thought it would become more concrete as things progress.

Commissioner Leon mentioned it because they had worked on other properties and thought it can be a drawn out process based on material and sizes, adding that it can get sticky.

Commissioner Clifford referred to looking at the cost of undergrounding the parking and asked what he thought it would be.

Mr. Miller stated that they concluded very quickly that the cost of building a full complete underground parking facility for a lot of this size didn't make financial sense, although they didn't design something and cost it out. He also thought there would be issues in getting in and out because of dropping about 8 feet in grade and he thought ramping would take up the entire space and it didn't seem feasible.

Commissioner Clifford referred to several possibilities offered but he didn't see one where they put all the buildings on the front with parking in the rear. He mentioned seeing one on Palmetto which seemed to work for everyone with access in and out and not have to ask for variances and asked if they considered that in any of their possibilities.

Mr. Miller stated that they had, adding that they had 20-30 sketches on things like that. He explained that, with putting all the building up front, it becomes a singular building and belies the campus look. They also would have to have an elongated driveway to the back and they would be giving more resource to asphalt and it didn't produce any more pleasing frontage than with the current scenario.

Commissioner Clifford then mentioned signage and asked if they considered some kind of signage that would indicate the buildings in the back with more businesses.

Mr. Miller thought that was a great idea, and they would try to incorporate something to make the rear commercial spaces more viable.

Commissioner Leon mentioned speaking to staff earlier on commercial requirements for dedicated bicycle parking, and he wanted to bring that up.

Asst. Planner Farbstein referred to the code requiring the bicycle parking, and stated that she talked with the architect who indicated that it would be no problem to provide the 2-3 required bicycle parking spaces.

Mr. Miller thought it was a great idea, with it being a wonderful biking area.

Commissioner Leon stated that the plan called for a bicycle connected and pedestrian enabled environment and he appreciated that Asst. Planner Farbstein spoke to him about that.

Chair Evans referred to the back north building being forward of the south building, and he was guessing that it was because of the parking issues and they can't go past the two compact spots.

Mr. Miller stated that it was forward for a couple reasons. They didn't want to shove both buildings against the rear wall so as to get more light and air into the residential and commercial spaces and also create a small courtyard and the buildings can have windows and utilize for vistas. He stated that, in the south residential top floor, there was a bedroom that looks north and, with that building pulled west, it would have a very nice view of the hills behind Highway 1. He added that it was slightly esoteric that they wanted to make it look less formal in layout, because two buildings side by side was not as interesting as having them slightly skewed.

Chair Evans assumed that, if they had turned the south building 90 degrees, it was already against the back of the lot, and it would give them more frontal space.

Mr. Miller stated that idea came on early. He mentioned that they took scaled cardboard pieces and moved them around to find the most unique and best solution. He liked that kind of movement but, the way the campus looked, it didn't work. This was the final solution and he thought it was successful and they were sticking with it.

Commissioner Clifford asked if the city gave them a copy of the Specific Plan when they submitted their application.

Mr. Miller responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Clifford asked confirmation that it was not the General Plan but the Rockaway Beach Specific Plan.

Mr. Miller stated that it was in 2008 and he imagined that he did have it.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he wanted to be clear on that because, in the Specific Plan, on page 25, it was clear on the kinds of roofs that they wanted. He clarified that he wasn't saying that he didn't like their buildings, but the plan stated that gable or hip roofs were strongly encouraged on all buildings within the west Rockaway Beach sub area. He didn't know if he was aware of that, specifically that they were looking to create a certain look and we have been ignoring that and approving whatever came through. He was pointing it out to him as well as anyone else looking to develop in that area. He felt they have gotten away from that and he wanted to encourage people to move back to that and he thought making it look united and uniform would improve that. He assured him that he wasn't going to vote against the project because of flat roofs.

Mr. Miller stated that he shouldn't comment on the veracity of the Specific Plan relative to roof lines as he was not an expert on it. He stated that many of the sketches had gabled forms but he didn't recall any hip forms. He added that he didn't recall reading that and wasn't saying he was a slave to flat roofs but, on this project and the economies involved, these made sense. He pointed out that a lot of the existing structures around the site also had flat roofs. He stated that, as an architect, he wasn't trying to establish context.

Commissioner Clifford stated that the existing structures were before the Specific Plan. He reiterated that he was pointed it out to him but also to future developers in the area.

Chair Evans opened the Public Hearing.

Ron Maykel, Pacifica, stated he was planning to attend Planning Commission meetings because there were no police officers, mentioning that there were two police officers at the last Council meeting which went past 11:00 p.m., and questioning the cost in overtime fees. He mentioned that the lot has been empty for a long time, and he looked forward to seeing something happening there. He was glad to see Sue Vauterlaus present who was a member of Pacifica's Economic Development Committee. He liked the windows and also that parking was not on the street. He agreed with Commissioner Clifford that the design was not in conformity with what was intended to be there. He acknowledged that it was consistent with the apartment building but it was old and he thought it compromised the architectural integrity of the area. He asked that they take that into consideration. He liked the windows and natural light but he thought the architecture needed to be considered.

Bob Pickerrell, 875 Rockaway Beach, thanked them for involvement in this project. He referred to the fact that redevelopment by the state of California was now non-existent. He mentioned that there were several issues in the original development and disposition agreements that can no longer be established or implemented. He stated that the Baldwin family has been involved in redevelopment in the area, and he has known them for a long time. He has been happy working with them over the years, adding that they were considered to be esteemed builders and developers by San Francisco. He stated that Mr. Baldwin's quality is bar none, and he felt that being asked to work with him on his private home was a compliment. He stated that we should be happy that he has continued his existence in Rockaway because several items in the original DBA have not been able to be implemented. He stated that Mr. Baldwin has put a lot of effort into this project and he felt it was viable and needed.

Eric Cox stated that his family owns the two plain apartment buildings at 417 and 435 Dondee Way. He liked the design and didn't think it would block their light and air. He thought it would be the nicest thing in the neighborhood and he would support it. He understood there were some concerns about the three stories but he didn't share that concern. He stated that the building department knows how to plan check. He has enjoyed working with them and felt they were very professional and he was confident that nothing was going to slip through.

Chair Evans closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Campbell thanked the applicant for the informative 3D modeling. He appreciated the thought that went into the design, adding that the potential was there for a boring apartment complex and this reflects some imagination. He felt the design was appealing and he had no complaints. He appreciated the comments about the consistency with the specific plan and he thought this meeting could serve notice on some of the larger stand-alone projects coming through in Rockaway that they may want to conform with the Specific Plan that was passed a few years ago. He felt that this project in this part of Rockaway works. He appreciated the efforts at signage in the front that makes it clear that there is commercial in the back. He stated that, with the next phase, the third building to the south would complement it. He was a little worried about the building in the front blocking the views and creating a dark courtyard area. He felt this project was nicely done.

Commissioner Clifford stated that, overall, he liked the project quite a bit. He did have some concerns about the parking, adding that the area was small. He thought a 5-point turn to get a compact car out is pretty unusual and didn't seem like a normal use of the parking area. He wondered if they were trying to do too much with too little in putting 5 parking spaces with a

handicapped van compounded with an 11-foot driveway. He was curious how the fire department had allowed it when they always say it has to be 20 feet. He stated that he read that they had no comments at this time, and he hoped that they would not come up with a surprise when they come to the plan check.

Planning Director White explained that, when you think of the typical 20-foot clearance required by the fire department, it was to enable the fire personnel to fight a fire but, in this case, the lot was so small that they can fight the fire from the street and they don't need the 20-foot clearance on the property because they have it on the street.

Commissioner Clifford asked if that was the case for the buildings in the back.

Planning Director White responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he was envisioning a fire truck trying to get in there with all the spaces full.

Planning Director White stated that was the answer, they would not try to get a fire truck in there but would fight it from the street.

Commissioner Clifford thanked him for that information, but he still felt that a 5-point turnaround for a compact car was telling him that they were trying to put too much parking into that spot. He wasn't implying that he wanted to raise the rate on this applicant, but he felt that \$3,000 was about 1/10 of what it takes to build a parking structure which was what the Specific Plan calls for, i.e., two-story, three level parking and you would not get a space for anything less than \$25,000 a space, based on the new building regulations after Loma Prieta and Northridge earthquakes where a lot of structures came down. He wanted to make sure that the City Council knows they have to address this, specifically, that we have been working with the same rates since 1986. He stated that, in the approvals, we were saying the \$3,000 was going to cover the cost of parking and it would probably only cover the planning and approval process. He felt they needed to not create a future problem for the city financially. He acknowledged that he was ranting but he felt we needed to look at our finances long term and this was one area where we have fallen down badly. He read the parking requirements in the Specific Plan, and asked if paying the in lieu parking fees met the requirement for additional parking being provided.

Planning Director White stated that you could look at this a couple of ways. He stated that, in another area of the Specific Plan, it actually discourages on-site parking and encourages centralized parking. He thought you could argue that they are offering additional parking by putting it on site at all, adding that you could theoretically not provide any parking in developing the site.

Commissioner Clifford acknowledged that the in lieu fee was set up to create off-site parking in order to use the sites for commercial building, not for parking. He was reading his guiding document and wondered how they make this work since they weren't paying enough to create the parking and were being asked for an increase in FAR. He thinks it is a good project. He thought they needed to cut down on the number of parking spaces in the project, but he didn't think we have any place to put that parking since the parking lot was pretty full during the week. He felt this was a conundrum for him.

Commissioner Brown thought it was a bold project. He stated that it took him a while to understand and come to grip with how much was going on in the space. As he thought it through, he concluded that the approach was creative and considerate in the context of the neighborhood for what would make it a viable project. He felt this would be a great addition to the neighborhood and he appreciated them bringing the project forward.

Commissioner Leon wanted to address Commissioner Clifford's comment regarding in lieu parking, but first commented that he wanted to see a project go through. He was impressed with many aspects of the project, stating that the project was reaching pretty far out such as exceeding the floor area ratio when the Specific Plan says it should only exceed the floor area ratio if it was also producing more parking spaces. He stated that, if we agree that we are going to set aside a number of the requirements of the Specific Plan, they should take the time to understand and discuss what they were agreeing to set aside. Going back to Commissioner Clifford's comment, he referred to page 17 of the Rockaway Beach Specific Plan, where they talk about blocks and that not all of Rockaway was treated the same. He read from the plan about parking requirements. Then, because he was in favor of the project, he was suggesting that they do a couple of things to make sure they are on target, specifically, find someone who lets them know that the maneuvering in the parking lot was reasonable and will work. He hasn't heard without question that it was safe or a good plan since he has heard that they have to make five moves in a compact car to get out. He wondered what happens when someone is coming in and someone going out. He would be more comfortable approving the project if they had a qualified person to look at it and assure them that it will work, or they need to do something else. He mentioned other projects in Rockaway where they have had analyses done on the number of spaces being provided, etc. He thought that was great information. He would like to see, with this project, some type of information showing all that was needed and assurance that it was going to work. He mentioned that he had been in the area after most of the businesses had closed, and he couldn't find a parking spot because there was no parking on Dondee Way except for two cutouts. He mentioned that they could find parking in the city lot across from Rockin' Rob's, and he would like to know how it works out on balance. He then referred to the issue of the signs, and went to page 30 of the Specific Plan where it states that all proposed signs shall be included with the planning permit application. He asked if that should be included at the present time.

Planning Director White stated that, if the specific plan says it should, that was what was intended. He stated that they asked the applicant about it and they weren't ready with the sign program at this time, but staff was very eager to move ahead with the project. He believed you could do it separately, adding that they didn't know what the tenant mix would be with a lot of unknowns. He stated that, if that was the standard they want to adhere to, they would do that.

Commissioner Leon asked if there was some other way to do it without doing what it says in the specific plan.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that with the applicant's attachment to the letter, she asked him to address the signage and he talked about the types of signs, and on the plans he has identified the areas where the signs would be placed. Staff thought that showing the location and type of signage would be enough to address the issues in the Specific Plan.

Commissioner Leon was thinking of the project they went around and around on at the Pedro Point Shopping Center, and he got the impression that signs were a big deal in commercial areas.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that it was a different situation than this project. She stated they were talking about a shopping center with a variety of different tenants in a different location. She stated that on this project they were limited to where they can put the signage, although she thought it was a good idea to have additional signage alongside the driveway to indicate spaces behind. She stated that it was really only the front elevation where they can put the signs and they were limited. The issue with the master sign program was that there were different tenants, two different owners and they were asking for additional signage space which was not the case with this project. It was the master sign program and was a different situation.

Commissioner Leon asked if the businesses in the back were going to have signs.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that it was shown on the elevation where they would put the signage.

Commissioner Leon assumed that they didn't do calculations.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that they were limited on what they can do.

Commissioner Leon assumed they would be within a footprint.

Planning Director White stated that they didn't have specific signs to show them.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that, on page 25, they did call out the square footage that was allowed and they would check to make sure of that.

Commissioner Leon concluded that it was a different process than the one they went through with this project.

Asst. Planner Farbstein responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Leon thanked them for the information, stating that it put his mind at ease because he was afraid they had overlooked something. The only other issue was the types of materials, such as stainless steel or weather resistant type of materials.

Planning Director White thought they should have the architect respond to the use of materials. Since it was his design, there must have been some thought as to what materials would be useful on the site.

Chair Evans asked if the applicant would like to address this.

Commissioner Leon stated that they knew they were putting in a quality building and they want it to last. He stated that, in some projects, they condition the materials such as stainless steel, etc.

Mr. Miller stated that they understood the harsh nature of the marine environment nearby. They would like to design their buildings so that they withstand those conditions. He stated that they were at the stage where, given approval for the project, they would embark on a design development process in which they specify the systems they will be using. He stated that they haven't written down what they were using and where on the project. They had ideas, such as a rain screen system on the siding composed of fiber cement panels spaced over the weather layer.

As far as stainless steel, if it is necessary to use stainless steel as a fastener, they would use it, such as on the decks. He stated that, on the drawings, they hadn't committed to that because he didn't realize that it would be under discussion at this meeting.

Commissioner Leon mentioned that they have had a number of projects on this street and it becomes apparent right away when materials are not sufficient with the maintenance issues they see.

Commissioner Campbell understood the concerns about the parking because they were exceeding the FAR ratios and contributing in lieu fees. He thought the issue was not the applicant in the project but how much the in lieu fees are, and he suggested that maybe the Economic Development Committee might take this up as it seems worth taking up at a later date and not tied to this project. His perspective was that they were doing what was asked of them which was in lieu fees, although they may be too low. With the signage, he didn't want to stop anything at this time, but he did wonder, if signage is an issue, whether they could deal with it later, such as on a consent item. He also liked the idea of the silk screen metal back lit and they could address it at a later date if it was still an issue.

Planning Director White felt there were a number of ways to deal with that. He stated that there was some semblance of what they think the signs will be, but they don't have the particular signs. He thought they could make a condition of approval to defer that to staff where if it was different, they could bring it back to the Commission. He concluded that there were a number of ways to craft it so that they were content that the signage was being looked at.

Commissioner Campbell appreciated the sensitivity on the signs based on the shopping center experience with signage.

Planning Director Campbell mentioned, as pointed out, that the possibilities were very limited.

Commissioner Campbell also thought they were dealing on a smaller scale of building with parking and signage issues and he didn't think they needed the same studies as in other buildings. He thought parking would be more of an issue with some of the other projects coming up but he was not that concerned with this project.

Commissioner Clifford asked, if they reduced the required number of parking spaces, if they could make a safer parking lot or was this as safe as it was ever going to get.

Mr. Miller stated that he was not sure he understood the question.

Commissioner Clifford asked if the Commission was to consider allowing him to pay for one or two more in lieu parking spaces as opposed to putting them in that parking lot, could he make a safer parking lot than the way it was designed now.

Mr. Miller was thinking carefully. He felt it was obvious that, if there are four stalls on site versus five, the one offending stall would be removed and it would be an easier site to navigate. He wasn't sure safer was the exact word he would use.

Commissioner Clifford commented that he may be thinking in terms of his vehicle that was 22 feet long, and concluded that he wasn't going in that parking lot at all. However, there could be

delivery people, maintenance people, and as the parking was laid out, he would see a lot of people attempting to back out rather than trying to figure out how to turn around. He was trying to not approve a problem but find a solution now and avoid a problem down the road. He reiterated that he saw a potential problem with people trying to get too large a vehicle in there or trying to back out of the spaces and into traffic, knowing you can't drive as well backwards as forwards and California drivers can't drive that well going forward. If the applicant thought there was a configuration where people can maneuver inside the parking lot to allow them to come, park, turn around and drive out, that was what he was looking for.

Mr. Miller thought the three stalls facing north were relatively simple to navigate with plenty of back up space and ingress space. Of the two compact stalls facing east, the one farthest south was relatively simple. The graphic plan tried to show the worst case scenario for the worst stall. He concluded that, if one of those was eliminated with an in lieu fee and the project was approved, there could be less issues with parking on site.

Commissioner Clifford thanked him for that, knowing it was hard to commit.

Mr. Miller stated that he can't commit without talking with his client.

Steve Baldwin, applicant, stated that he would have no issue with removing one stall.

Commissioner Clifford thanked him for that. He didn't know what the Commission will do but he wanted to put that idea out there because he saw a potential problem and he hated to see someone getting hurt.

Mr. Baldwin referred to the building materials, but added that with some materials they were specified what they have to use. He stated that they would be using a premium product, adding that they had other buildings there which have been around for 20 years and still look brand new today.

Commissioner Clifford acknowledged that he has built in that area before and he was not worried about what he would do.

Mr. Baldwin stated that the materials will be first quality and last a long time.

Commissioner Leon referred to signage, and he stated one issue related to that was a building north of this project where they painted the corresponding unit onto their spaces so Unit 1 was painted on the stall and there was no question who parks where. Regarding removing a spot, one thing that wasn't decided was whether the parking would go to the residential units. He thought it speaks to the orderliness of the lot, knowing who was going to park where and who could park, and he wondered if he had any thoughts on what might work as far as who gets a spot or if it was an issue in his mind.

Mr. Baldwin thought it was a great question. He stated that there was no resolution, but he thought sharing would be the best. He didn't know how they would go about that because he didn't know how the commercial space will be used, whether there would be clients, etc.

Commissioner Leon stated that the area was envisioned as visitor serving and it speaks more to the commercial end of it, and he thought the parking should be dedicated to the customer base

coming to do business. The in lieu fees would go to the other parking locations. He thought there was no dedicated parking for the businesses on Dondee and they use the city lot. He thought there could be a possibility that the commercial customers would use the commercially provided space in the city lot and let the residents have a priority on the spots.

Mr. Baldwin referred to people going shopping with children, groceries, clothing, etc. He didn't have the answer but he was open minded.

Commissioner Clifford mentioned that he suggested they might increase the in lieu parking and he asked staff's thinking on that.

Planning Director White stated that, conceptionally, they didn't have a problem with it. He stated that, in some regards, the applicant was taking staff's lead in trying to put as much parking on site as possible, because staff was trying to minimize the amount of parking that has to be subject to the in lieu program and they did that. He agreed that the fifth space was fairly awkward and he thought losing that space would be a better arrangement. He thought, if the Commission was in support of the additional in lieu fee for that parking space, it would be a good solution.

Commissioner Clifford thanked him as he wanted to have staff's thinking on that.

Chair Evans appreciated all the thoughts and concerns. He was very much in favor of the project. He assumed most commissioners know he loves the idea of in fill, but the parking is an issue. Unless they can specifically say smart cars only, he didn't see how that would work. He had no problem in eliminating the problem spot and taking it down to four. He stated that this was a small lot for commercial, and he asked if it gives any benefit for that in the Plan.

Planning Director White didn't think there was anything specific in the Plan that talks about lot size per se, but it does talk about blocks. He wasn't sure there was any connotation one way or the other.

Asst. Planner Farbstein added that they encourage lot mergers and she encouraged Mr. Miller who did try to see about purchasing the lot. In this case, because the other property owner wasn't willing, it wasn't able to happen.

Chair Evans liked the idea of the two lots. He then mentioned that they were talking about the big lot in the center of the block, but he pointed out that there was another parking lot behind the Lighthouse Hotel. He asked if anyone had an idea of the parking spots in that one.

Asst. Planner Farbstein stated that she checked the public one which was about 50-55 spaces, and she thought the one he was mentioning was about the same. She stated that it wasn't used a lot and rarely close to being filled.

Chair Evans stated that it was never full.

Asst. Planner Farbstein agreed.

Chair Evans stated that it was just a short block away. He did agree with the commissioners that the one parking spot was a problem and he would not have a problem in eliminating it with in lieu fees. He liked the design. He knows it's tight but he liked the courtyard idea instead of having

everything up front. He thought the two-story units were very nice looking. He understood that the front one needed to be smaller and he didn't have a problem with that.

Commissioner Brown stated that he would like to proceed with the motion.

Chair Evans stated that he didn't see any shaking heads and he encouraged him to go ahead.

Commissioner Brown moved that the Planning Commission find that the project is exempt from CEQA and **APPROVE** PSP-783-12, UP-026-12, CDP-335-12, PE-157-12, and Specific Plan waiver, subject to conditions 1 through 26, based on the findings contained within the February 19, 2013 staff report and all maps, documents and testimony be incorporated herein by reference.

Commissioner Leon stated that they talked about a few things and he wanted to be sure they were clear and included. He asked staff to help them out if they need to add anything such as the bicycle issue.

Planning Director White stated that the bicycle regulations are development standards and they would apply those at the time of the building permit regardless. They can add it if they want, but it was required regardless. The other two areas that might need some additional conditional language was about the elimination of the parking space and payment of the in lieu fee and about the final sign design. He thought along the lines that the signs shall be as depicted generally on the plans and any significant deviation would need to come back to the Planning Commission for review and approval.

Commissioner Leon asked if it would be conditions 1 through 27.

Planning Director White thought it would be two additional conditions and maybe others.

Commissioner Clifford asked if they could alter the parking exception to include one additional space.

Planning Director White stated that they could but it results in a redesign of the parking lot and he would rather have a condition that says the parking lot shall be redesigned with a net elimination of one space and, as a result, the applicant would be required to pay the additional in lieu fee. He agreed that he was right that they could incorporate them together, but it was cleaner and reflects the deliberation.

Commissioner Clifford asked if what the Planning Director said could be included in the motion.

Chair Evans asked the maker if he had an objection.

Commissioner Brown had no objection and he was trying to craft the sentence.

Planning Director White didn't think he need to be exact about crafting the sentence as what they just talked about was the gist of what they wanted in there. Staff can craft the final language.

Chair Evans asked if he needed anything more from the motion maker.

Planning Director White said there was the piece about the signage. He asked if they wanted to add a condition about the signage or leave that to the discretion of staff when the final signs come in for approval.

Commissioner Brown stated that he wasn't a fan of adding a condition for signage at this point.

Planning Director White stated that they looked at it either way and would make sure that it conforms to the requirements of the Specific Plan.

Chair Evans stated they were comfortable with that.

Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Campbell, Leon, and
Chair Evans
Noes: None

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.

CONSIDERATION:

None

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS:

None

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Leon commented there was a fee study going on in the city and reviewed it. He didn't believe there was anything regarding in lieu parking fees.

Planning Director White stated that the fee study was not complete yet, and he stated that this was a fee that he identified as being inadequate for today's purposes. He stated that the fee study had its own scope based on the amount of money that the city can afford to pay to do the fee study and he wasn't positive that it could be included in the study.

Commissioner Leon stated that he would like to see our improved parking structure down there.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director White stated that, at the next scheduled Planning Commission meeting, they were going to have a study session on the Palmetto streetscape guidelines and would begin at 6:00 p.m. They will have a draft and they would like to get some comments from them in a study session format first. He confirmed that it would be March 4 at 6:00 p.m. He stated that there was one action item on the agenda and the meeting would start at 7:00 p.m. as usual.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Ron Maykel, Pacifica first stated that he understood that the boiler that provides heat for the chambers didn't work. He added that it was the City Manager's job to maintain public buildings, and he will have to give him a call about the heat. He then stated that he was present regarding the Highway 1 issue. He commented that the applicant had to come before the Planning Commission, pay money to have a public hearing for a small development in Rockaway and we have a major development about ready to take place in Pacifica which was in the draft environmental phase now and the city has done nothing and the public has not had the opportunity to voice their opinions, concerns or even support. He asked if there was anything the Commission can do to inspire City Council or the City Manager to do something about this issue. One concern was the commercial areas on the east side of the highway between Fassler and Reina del Mar, such as Gorilla BBQ, and right now they were having a rough time because of the highway being so close and, with another lane going east, it would ruin that whole commercial area. He mentioned having an old copy of the Economic Development Plan which addressed three components for business retention. He felt our first priority was to retain the businesses we have and believed the highway expansion was going to change that. He stated that we also have some threats to the Open Space Committee. He had some old information on the creation of that committee and he then passed out copies of that document.

Hal Bohner, Pacifica, stated he also wanted to speak on the proposed widening of Highway 1. He stated that many people feel strongly that the Planning Commission should look at the draft environmental impact report and have the opportunity to make comments to Caltrans on it. He stated that, so far, the City Council has not seen fit to make that happen, but a lot of people are trying to make that happen by talking to the Councilmembers and doing other things to promote that. He stated that he realized how important it was for them to look at the draft EIR. He stated that, with the project before them, they spent a lot of energy and time, as they should, on one parking space in this development. He stated that the draft EIR shows in a vague sense that Caltrans was going to do something really major at the east side of west Rockaway. They were going to widen, change the road structure and may be putting in parking or not. He stated that draft EIR is unclear. He stated that there were two alternative and they treat those different in terms of how they are going to deal with the land on the east side of West Rockaway. He was amazed that Pacifica apparently didn't know whether there would or would not be parking put in that area by Caltrans. He felt, if so, the city should take the lead and tell Caltrans what they want done there since parking is a big issue. He felt to leave it to Caltrans to do what they please with it was absurd. He was asking the Commission to do what they can to get a look at the draft EIR and be able to make comments on it.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Leon moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m.; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Campbell, Leon and Chair Evans
Noes:	None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director White