

MINUTES

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

October 15, 2012

7:00 p.m.

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

Planning Director White mentioned that Public Meeting Stenographer Barbara Medina was not present and he would be filling in.

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

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Leon

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director White
Assoc. Planner Diaz

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

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
OCTOBER 1, 2012** Commissioner Clifford moved approval of the
minutes of October 1, 2012; Commissioner Langille
seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF October 22, 2012:

Planning Director White stated that there was nothing that he was aware of that relates to Planning Commission business.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ADOPTION OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE UPDATE OF THE CITY OF PACIFICA GENERAL PLAN 2007-2014 HOUSING ELEMENT. The project is an update of the City of Pacifica General Plan Housing Element as required by the California Government Code. Last revised in 1992, the current update covers the 2007 to 2014 planning period as required by State Law. Recommended CEQA status: Negative Declaration prepared.

Assoc. Planner Diaz presented the staff report.

Commissioner Leon directed staff to page 122, stating that he discussed this with the Planning Director and was stating, for the record, that it didn't reference that there was quite a bit of attendance and constructive public feedback given. He acknowledged that they didn't take minutes from the study sessions but there has been summary or direction or feedback from the study session.

Assoc. Planner Diaz responded that he might have mentioned it on page 6 but it might not be that clear regarding the study session of the Planning Commission regarding participation.

Planning Director White thought there was no direct reference to 2011, and he felt they could add in a notation and reference to the 2011 study session. He was more interested in their conversation regarding the contents of the study session. He had mentioned that to Assoc. Planner Diaz before the meeting and it was his opinion that most or all of the comments were incorporated into the draft. He acknowledged that they did not have anything at the moment to confirm that, asking the Assoc. Planner if he had a summary that could be provided to the Commission.

Assoc. Planner Diaz stated that the only thing he had a draft of the housing element that was reviewed at the study session of 2011 and referenced some of the comments that were made and were incorporated.

Commissioner Leon asked if he recalled whether there was anything on sea level rise in any of the notes.

Assoc. Planner Diaz stated that he would check.

Commissioner Leon stated that he had not seen any reference in the housing element to sea level rise, and he thought that was one of the items that did come up. He planned on covering that on deliberation of the item. He was merely pointing out that he found that on page 122 with reference to other public participation but did not mention that.

Planning Director White thought that would be corrected.

Assoc. Planner Diaz stated that he thought there might have been a discussion of sea level rise. He also thought one of the Commissioners was going to get back to him with certain language to see if that language would be acceptable in incorporating it into the housing element.

Commissioner Clifford was hoping staff could enlighten him as to the significance of the letter from the state. He asked what happens, if they were to make or suggest changes to the draft, based on the letter.

Planning Director White stated that, based on the timeline mentioned earlier, this was a long iterative process, mainly between the City and the Department of Housing and Community Development of California. He stated that, getting this conditional letter of compliance, is really gold when you're trying to get a housing element certified through the state process. He states that the letter essentially says that they reviewed the housing element, with a lot of back and forth negotiations, and they found it to be in compliance with state law. That means that the City can adopt that with the understanding that, if they send back this document or another that was virtually the same document, it will be certified. The letter is very important. Without it, it is very hard to proceed through an adoption process without knowing what the state is going to do. He reiterated that having it was important to the City and they would not proceed without it. He stated that if the state had balked or wasn't happy with the draft, they would have come back and tried to find ways to make the document comply with state laws. Luckily, they have a letter stating that it complies with state laws and, as far as they are concerned, if the housing element is adopted, that they would be willing to certify it.

Commissioner Clifford assumed that "this housing element" is the draft in front of them but, if they make any significant suggestions or changes, that could go out the window.

Planning Director White stated that the key was the significance of the change. If there are factual errors, such as a reference to a meeting, reference to numerical data that doesn't add up, or other references mentioned earlier, they can make those changes as they are just factual changes, and that doesn't change that the state sees them as complying with the housing element. If they change policies or procedures, implementation measures, etc., those could necessitate going back to the state, and going through that iterative process. To be clear, it has taken over two years just getting to this point of declaring this a compliant document, and the meeting referenced by Commissioner Leon was two weeks before he arrived which was two years ago. He felt it was very important, and the changes they might want to consider or look at should be considered very carefully.

Commissioner Brown asked for more information about the timeline. He commented that this was the housing element for 2007-2014 and this is 2012. They have gotten the letter from the Department of Housing and Community Development in July of this year. He asked if it was general practice that you would want to get all of this done back in 2007 or is this standard that five years in to a 7-year plan, you are good to go.

Planning Director White thought it was a good question, adding that every jurisdiction handles it in a different way. He thought, ideally, you would want to get it done before 2007 because the cycle is 2007-2014. He commented that Assoc. Planner Diaz had gone over it but the City has missed a couple of cycles but, in California, it's not unusual. He thought the state took a dim view of cities not making an effort to comply with housing laws in every cycle, but we were making that effort now. While we're late and in a position to adopt it late, he thought we would almost immediately be forced to the next cycle of 2014. He mentioned that they sort of change the cycles depending on the economy but we believe it's 2012-2019. He stated that, even after doing all this work and getting the concurrence of the state, we are almost immediately going to turn around and start doing it again. He didn't see this as a lost effort because they were also in

the process of doing the General Plan again. He thought the timing might be good in many ways because of finishing up the General Plan and be able to incorporate a new housing element at the same time. He reiterated that he was correct in assuming the past was a bit spotty and they would ideally like to be further ahead than they are.

Councilmember Brown thought it was a lot of work and a lot of coordination to get it this far and he thought they were in good shape for the next one.

Chair Gordon asked what the practical consequences were of the City not being in compliance.

Planning Director White stated that then your General Plan could be determined to be invalid, and if your General Plan is determined to be invalid, any regulations that are implemented by the General Plan could also be considered invalid. He added that he could give an apocryphal story, mentioning that when he worked in Sonoma County, the County's General Plan was deemed to be invalid as a result of their housing element being challenged in court and determined to be invalid and, for a period, all their developmental regulations were suspended and they were only able to issue building permits for projects that were related to public health and safety. He acknowledged that it was an extreme case, and the only one he had ever heard of, but that was a potential consequence of not having a valid General Plan.

Commissioner Langille referred to questions asked about the timing of the state funded census and asked if that relied on the 2000 data because of the timing of the housing element.

Planning Director White stated that it was having the data available in order to put it into the draft in order to give it to HCD and have that iterative process. He added that you need to understand that, during that 2+ year period, we didn't have the ability to change the data or language substantially in the middle. They were dealing with the draft, and they produced the letter we hope to get as a result of that draft. He explained that, if we wanted to go in now and say we have better, more up to date data, and suggest that we use that data and apply it to this draft, that would be a substantial factual change and we would almost undoubtedly have to go back to HCD and have them review the whole thing and we're in a never ending loop of what was the most current data. He thought that, ideally, as planners and Commissioners, they would love to use the current data but it was not always available at the time that the draft is submitted.

Commissioner Leon wanted to get to the topic of using current data. He stated that he had two pages of tables that are taken from the housing element draft which all rely on 1990 and 2000 data which they know is approximately 13 years old. He didn't want to belabor that but felt that one of the requests from the study session of January 2011 was to use the most current data. He was a manager for the 2010 census, and the meeting was in 2011. Data was coming out, and still rolling out by blocks and districts and states in the normal fashion and they have their own timeline. It actually paralleled data from the American Heritage Survey that can be relied on. The point he was trying to make was that they had professionals in real estate and land use professions in Pacifica that could be relied on, and there was actually parallel data from the American Heritage Survey that can be relied upon. He stated that, if we weren't able to use that, he would have liked to know up front that they weren't going to be able to use that data and not be surprised when he got the package and find out that they were still stuck in 2000. He understands the predicament they were in and didn't think there was a way out of it for practical purposes for the City, but it becomes obvious when you look at all the tables and data contained in the tables. He stated that the obvious changes seen around them with the aging population,

college graduates not finding work and returning home, and households not shrinking like they were. He thought these were really significant land use issues that could be data driven and they could refer to their housing element data in the most current form. He thought he was spinning his wheels and thought there was no option to revise the tables other than to go back to the start.

Planning Director White stated that he was sympathetic to the comment and ideally they would like to use the best data available at the time in 2011. He added that he wasn't here when it was drafted, having come shortly after that, but at that time, it was felt that the best data available was used in the draft. He thought the true test, given that this was an exercise to satisfy the state and state law, is that the state was happy with that data. They used it, analyzed it, accepted it and the City had a letter saying they are in conformance. He stated that, as mentioned earlier, after they adopt this housing element, they were going to start on the next cycle and will be using the 2010 data at that point because that will be the best data available to the City even though the cycle is going to come almost at the end of the census. He reiterated that it was a bit of a moving target and thought, if the circumstances or timing were different, they might be in a different place.

Commissioner Leon stated that he would leave that alone, then stated that he mentioned earlier that he felt they should at least have accurate information so, while there was no page number, he directed staff's attention to behind page 68 of the draft, there was a page called 23, and on turning the page, there was a map of Pacifica, turning the page again, there was something called Table B which had no page number. He stated that, what stuck out on the bottom of apparently a spreadsheet, on column 3 it mentioned commercial to residential ratio, and he felt it was obvious on 2318 Palmetto that the commercial square footage has a ratio to the residential that was not right. He pointed that out and asked that they double check the figures on the table even though they were accepted by the state. He thought it should be about 50% and he didn't know how that number got in there. He asked that they double check the numbers because people will be looking at it and relying on it at some point. He stated that there was another issue which was not a substantive make it or break it issue, but on one of the elements on page 91, you have action program 9 then on page 83 you have action program 8 which is okay. Then, on page 84, action program 8 ends at the middle of the page and they get into a section called Housing Development. He was sure the data was accurate but, in his mind, it was misplaced, sandwiched in between two action programs for which it has nothing to do.

Assoc. Planner Diaz asked if that was the one on #5 housing development and then it goes into the other section.

Planning Commissioner Leon stated that he was correct, stating that he didn't know if that belonged in another section. He didn't need to know that now, but he wanted to point out that he had a question on that.

Planning Director White stated that, going back to the table he mentioned, he did some quick math and he thought the construct of the table was confusing and actually the percentages were correct. He explained that on 2318 Palmetto, if you combine the 2,018 and 4,056 square feet to a total square footage, the percentage of commercial square feet was 33% of the total. He thought it should have been characterized differently and put in the table in a different way, such as commercial square footage, residential square footage and total square footage, to make that make sense.

Commissioner Leon thought the heading was wrong.

Planning Director White stated that he would say that it was misleading, but the percentages are correct. He assumed that was what the table intended to do.

Commissioner Leon stated that the column heading ...

Planning Director White reiterated that it was the way it was described, and he thought they could fix that and make it clear but he thought it was actually correct.

Commissioner Leon thought that was reassuring. He stated that he wanted to bring out the other one, mentioning that he was a staff person in a prior life and he would like to put a product out that people can follow without too many questions. He thought that covered the 2010 data, which was significant. The other question was regarding a section that deals with small houses on small lots and his interpretation when talking small was about 800 square feet, but it doesn't really say what it is. He stated that he had talked to a prominent builder in town and he was rethinking his building plan in Pacifica and he was looking at building small houses on small lots and thinking about 800 square feet to a thousand or something in that range. To his mind, he thought that would help the City meet their affordability goal for the lower range housing that they were not meeting.

Planning Director White asked if he had the page reference.

Commissioner Leon stated that he did, but had to look for it.

Planning Director White was just curious so they could mark it now.

Commissioner Leon understood.

Planning Director White stated that the world has changed a bit since the drafting of the housing element and people are rethinking their housing.

Commissioner Leon stated that he remembered they had 10. The goal was 10 and he thought it was near the front. He thought the goal of 10 per year was doable, but he thought there was a conflict in the lowest housing ranges which were 3 or 5 a year and this far exceeded the 3 and 5 and he thought maybe the number crossed a little bit and they could do the small home is 10 and the lowest income could be 5 and 5 so they match up or they could increase the goal in one or the other.

Planning Director White stated that they would find the section.

Commissioner Leon stated that, if he came back to it, he would, but he thought those two should definitely meet up. He had a question on page 105, where they made reference to action 15a, amend the density bonus ordinance, and apparently they weren't in conformance with state law on that and he wondered what the law was and if they should make a reference to the law.

Planning Director White stated that there was a basic law that the state outlined and then there were individual ordinances that individual jurisdictions adopt, some of which are more intense than even what the state law required. He stated it was sort of a moving target, which has been changing over time, stating that it used to be a 25% bonus and a 35% bonus under certain circumstances. He thought there were a number of variables in that. However, they were saying

that it was recognizing that the City was not in compliance and one of the implementation measures was to turn around and draft an ordinance that would bring them into compliance.

Commissioner Leon thought it was the density bonus part.

Planning Director White agreed that it was the density bonus ordinance. He thought that it was interesting that the state law applies whether they have an ordinance or not. If someone came in with a project that wanted to utilize the density bonus, they could even without the City having a local ordinance.

Commissioner Leon thought they had a dicey situation they were opening up on page 83, action plan 7a.

Planning Director White stated that he thought the small house item was 16, action program 16, right below the density bonus ordinance. Is that the one you were referring to?

Commissioner Leon asked if it says 10.

Planning Director White states that it says 10 units per year, right below the density bonus.

Commissioner Leon agreed, adding that he might make a note that, when you look in the back of the book, when they have the least affordable housing group, the goal is 3 and 5 per year. So, he thought there was an opportunity there if they actually can make that small lot happen.

Planning Director White stated that they would look at that.

Commissioner Leon mentioned page 83, action plan 7a, and suggested that staff look at unforeseen consequences there because they were making an action plan to upgrade streets and he thought, in the City, they had a lot of streets that have not been maintained that are not accepted by the City and, if someone voluntarily upgrades their house, maybe that's a good thing.

Planning Director White stated that, again, it was an implementation measure and what the actual program was going to be has yet to be decided and, given it's a voluntary program, it was even a little looser than that.

Commissioner Leon stated that it was voluntary on the public.

Planning Director White stated that he got his point, and he didn't know if that was the intention.

Commissioner Leon stated that it was the way he read it, that it was voluntary on the public.

Planning Director White stated that they could spell it out.

Commissioner Leon stated that it was mentioning it from the standpoint of the City.

Planning Director White thought it was pretty hard to have a voluntary program that leads to mandatory sorts of requirements, if you want to have a voluntary program. He stated that they would take a look at that.

Commissioner Leon stated that the last one, page 81, action plan 6, he noticed on the mobile home park, they have written in there that they would like to preserve 91 mobile homes.

Planning Director White stated that it was 93.

Commissioner Leon acknowledged that it was 93, adding that he would like to know what the monitoring for that was. He thought there might be some changing conditions out there. He asked staff to double check what the current situation was out there.

Planning Director White stated that they would take a look at it, stating that he was not sure it was 93 at this point, and that was a number they would have to double check. He thought it was probably 93 when it was written. They would double check because they were in the process of making changes. He believes it was over 90, but not sure it was 93. He stated they have had a lot of interaction in the past year or so.

Assoc. Planner Diaz mentioned they were not intending in removing any of them that exist.

Planning Director White thought they wanted to preserve what they have.

Commissioner Leon thought the City has made some pretty strong policies as far as the ownership category of mobile home. He thought they had a rent control or some kind of condition.

Planning Director White stated that it was not something that the City has direct authority over. They had indirect authority in the sense that, if someone wanted to change it from one thing to something else, such as if they were stating that they didn't want the mobile home park and wanted to put in whatever, they would have to come back rezone the property, probably redesignate the property in terms of the General Plan designation. That was where the City came in, where they could have a policy that would prevent that from happening.

Commissioner Leon suggested he throw a hypothetical thought in, such as a mobile home moved out and, for whatever reason, instead of renting space to someone else, they brought in their own dwelling and now use it as a rental unit.

Planning Director White stated that it was about a mobile home park. It didn't say anything about the arrangements in terms of whether people lease or rent. He mentioned that there was a variety of arrangements in mobile home parks on how people actually live. Sometimes they own the unit, sometimes they don't. Sometimes they lease the land and lease the unit. It was their understanding that, at least with this mobile home park, the direction they are going is they want to lease the land and the unit and they retain ownership of everything and that will be purely a rental situation. I think it's the best situation, and that was what they were trying to preserve.

Commissioner Leon agreed, adding that it was really affordable housing.

Planning Director White agreed that it was affordable until something comes in. He added that he had no idea what the current rents are. If they are making improvements, there is obviously a market.

Commissioner Leon stated that there have been improvements.

Planning Director White added that the state sort of dictates and has authority over how they operate. The City's issue is the land use underlying that.

Commissioner Langille referred to planning to get back on the sea level rise issue, and she got caught up on more of the coastal erosion but didn't have much information on sea level rise in the area. She would get back to them on that. She had a question on page 122, demolition and replacement in coastal zone. She wasn't sure at what point the city's considers the apartments at the top of the Esplanade area condemned. She mentioned that some of those apartment units were never going to be occupied, and there is no way to save at least two.

Planning Director White stated that, although they were not currently habitable, they were not condemned. That was still a bit up in the air, but it is determined given the type of situation. He thought anything was possible and, if enough engineering was brought to bear on that site, they could save the units. He thought she observed what they all observed there, and it seems unlikely, but they cannot dictate that to the private property owner and, if they wanted to go through that engineering exercise and get the Coastal Commission to agree to the improvements, then they could do it. He added that, to be perfectly honest, they have been pushing the owners to try and tell the City was going to do and what the plans are. He stated that it wasn't a situation they like to see, but the current status was that they are not condemned and are not off the books.

Commissioner Langille asked if there was at least one that was not inhabited.

Planning Director White stated that there was a substantial part of one building that was not inhabited. If you walk by on the street, you can see it.

Commissioner Langille stated that she walked under those buildings.

Planning Director White stated that he also walked underneath which was a very interesting exercise but, if you walk on the street side, there are actual red tags on the doors that are not inhabited. They just replaced them recently because the weather had destroyed them over time.

Commissioner Langille assumed so, but at some point those will be taken off.

Planning Director White stated that something will happen on that site in the near future and hopefully it is a controlled situation, rather than an uncontrolled situation.

Commissioner Langille mentioned that people have asked her what was happening with those, and she says it's up in the air.

Commissioner Leon stated that he thought he forgot something that would be of interest to all of them. On page 98, they have plan #12 which looks like they are going to have a Planning Committee subcommittee to review the design guidelines and he hadn't heard about that. He wondered if there is a charter developed that they would follow.

Planning Director White stated that it was not yet because they are action programs and, until the document is adopted, they can't take action on the program. That's the way implementation measures work, they adopt a plan, create an implementation plan and move on with each of those pieces.

Commissioner Leon assumed that it's step 1 and then go from there.

Planning Director White agreed. He thought what they probably will do, which he has done in other cities and they can talk about it, is once a policy document like this is adopted, they would turn around and come back with the implementation plan for them to review so they could see what the priorities are. He stated that they can't do everything at once because there are a lot of things in there, but the state was expecting things to get done at the same time. He reminded them that they have a very short window. He stated that if they adopted it today, which they are not, they would have a two-year period to do all the implementation measures rather than seven years which they would have had if they had started from the beginning. He felt it was clear to him that some of these would roll into the next one, which was the best way he can put that. He stated that gives them the opportunity to prioritize the things they want to get done sooner rather than later.

Chair Gordon opened the Public Hearing and, seeing no one, closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Gordon reiterated what their next step was on this item.

Commissioner Leon wished they could use 2010 census data but they will not be able to do that. So, he thought Planning Director White laid out pretty much where they were headed with this, otherwise the City won't have anything happen until the next cycle.

Planning Director White commented that it was very soon.

Commissioner Leon agreed, adding that what he heard at this meeting was that this work would lay a good foundation for the next and they will have benefit of fresh data for the next one.

Planning Director White stated that was clearly the intent. He thought that, working with the ACD staff which took a very long time through this process, they were very receptive to the idea that they were building the data in this cycle to help us in the next cycle which they obviously see the City moving as well.

Commissioner Leon added that he had reviewed the negative declaration and he saw no harm being done there, so he will move forward. He felt he couldn't stress enough the need to have the most current data at all times but they already know that. He was for approving both with that understood.

Commissioner Clifford stated he wanted to talk about how they get to housing for the very low and extremely low segment of the market. One thing he thought the City needed to consider was relooking at its parking ordinances. He thought the parking ordinances didn't allow for tandem parking and he didn't understand what difference it made to the City about tandem parking but he can see where the cost of building full two car parking added to a small additional unit to a home to get a small rental unit into a home puts it out of the low, very low or extremely low income level person's reach once the unit is built. He would like the City to look at its parking ordinances to facilitate the actual building of units that could meet those needs.

Planning Director White asked if he was suggesting an additional action item or implementation measure that would include parking regulations relative to the affordable housing.

Commissioner Clifford responded affirmatively.

Planning Director White stated that, changes within the draft now would pose a problem for them. Theoretically, if they add additional language or additional implementation measures, he thought they could safely do that, depending on what the implementation measure was and was not in conflict with something else that was already in the document, which they would have to look at. He thought they might take a critical look under what policy they might want to exist within it and where that might fit into the existing framework. He thought that, given the situation that they have in the process and if the Commissioners were receptive to that sort of thing, they could make that recommendation to the Council, along with their recommendation to adopt the elements and they could carry that forward for them.

Commissioner Leon was supportive of Commissioner Clifford's idea. He clarified that they would not send that recommendation forward as part of this.

Planning Director White agreed, adding that they would be saying that the Planning Commission reviewed the housing element in its entirety and understands that the state has already essentially found it to be in compliance with state law, but were suggesting an additional implementation measure relative to tandem parking. In other words, you are adding something, not taking away, not changing something already in the draft so it was not something he would think ACD would be unhappy with. He thought, if it helps the provision of affordable housing, they would be fine with it. He stated that, if they did make that recommendation, before they go to the Council, they would probably check in with them and run it by them to take a pulse about what they think about that sort of thing. He added that he had dealt with parking regulations relative to affordable housing in other jurisdictions and, usually, the ACD was receptive to that. They even like to go further. Rather than just allow tandem parking, they might suggest eliminate the need for a parking space for a secondary dwelling unit, which is a bit in conflict with other parts of the state law. He wasn't saying that they want to go that far because that wasn't contemplated in the negative declaration, but to allow tandem parking, which still meets the basic parking requirement just in a different configuration, was a reasonable suggestion.

Commissioner Leon supported that.

Commissioner Langille stated that she thought he said it already, but she asked clarification that this would just apply to second units.

Commissioner Clifford responded affirmatively.

Planning Director White also commented that it would not apply to the primary residence, just tandem parking being allowed to provide the parking required for the second unit.

Commissioner Langille stated that she would support something like that.

Planning Director White stated that this was an implementation issue. They didn't have to be all that specific. They were not writing the ordinance or changing the ordinance, just suggesting that they look into that and implement that through whatever appropriate means.

Chair Gordon stated that he was in support of Commissioner Clifford's interesting and practical suggestion.

Commissioner Langille stated that she was in favor of moving forward with this. She knew there were a couple of revisions and updates, with dates and other issues, and she assumed that page numbers will be on the table of contents.

Planning Director White acknowledged that all that would be fixed.

Commissioner Leon stated that he was prepared to second a motion or make a motion.

Chair Gordon stated that he didn't think a motion was made.

Planning Director White stated that he did not hear a motion, adding that if he was interested in making a motion, he asked that they could act on them separately which would be helpful. In one case, the Commission has the authority to adopt the negative declaration and the other they were making a recommendation to the Council.

Commissioner Leon moved that the Planning Commission **ADOPT** the attached Resolution entitled "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PACIFICA ADOPTING THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE UPDATE OF THE CITY OF PACIFICA GENERAL PLAN 2007-2014 HOUSING ELEMENT"; Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

Commissioner Leon moved that the Planning Commission **ADOPT** the resolution entitled "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PACIFICA RECOMMENDING CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE UPDATE OF THE CITY OF PACIFICA GENERAL PLAN 2007-2014 HOUSING ELEMENT"; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

Chair Gordon asked if this was appealable.

Planning Director White stated that the action on the negative declaration was appealable, but the recommendation was obviously going to be voted on by Council, and they tentatively have it for the first meeting of the Council in November.

Chair Gordon 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 COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Roger Medler, Pacifica, stated that he had asked somebody to contact him about Seaview Tire and Brakes violations, but no one has contacted him.

Commissioner Leon asked if there was a role for the Planning Commission in this.

Planning Director White responded that there was none.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Leon moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m.; Commissioner Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Langille, Campbell,
Leon and Chair Gordon

Noes: None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director White