

MINUTES

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

May 16, 2011

7:00 p.m.

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

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

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Clifford

STAFF PRESENT: Associate Planner Diaz

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

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
MAY 2, 2011** Commissioner Evans moved approval of the
minutes of May 2, 2011; Commissioner Leon
seconded the motion.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he would be abstaining from voting on the minutes.

The motion carried **5-0-1**.

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

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 23, 2011:

None.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS:

**ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION Certifying that the 2011-2016
Capital Improvement Program is Consistent with the General
Plan.**

Associate Planner Diaz presented the staff report. He stated that Ray Donguines, Associate Engineer, was present to answer any questions.

Commissioner Leon asked what criteria they used to base their opinion and finding that the CIP was consistent with the General Plan.

Associate Planner Diaz stated that it was based on the policies of the General Plan, explaining that most of the items listed fall under the community facilities element where it talks about public improvement.

Commissioner Leon commented that the Coastal Plan was incorporated within the General Plan, and there were numerous projects within the CIP that fall within the coastal use.

Associate Planner Diaz responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Langille referred to the Calera Parkway project, and asked what element that fell under, circulation or more than one.

Associate Planner Diaz stated that it probably falls within circulation but most appear to fall under the community facilities element.

Commissioner Langille acknowledged that their purpose was not to approve or disapprove any particular project. While she had not been on the Commission very long, she wondered what would happen if she had concerns about one of the projects.

Associate Planner Diaz asked if she has a question about one in particular.

Commissioner Langille stated that it was the Calera Parkway Highway 1 Improvement. She explained that she hadn't given it a lot of thought, but she thought it was inconsistent with encouraging residents to use Samtrans and other alternatives to motor vehicle transportation. She acknowledged that this was the old General Plan, and the new General Plan may have different goals and policies, but did wonder about staff's thoughts on this perceived inconsistency.

Associate Planner Diaz stated that, in this case, it would fall under the circulation element and it would be an upgrade to a street which was a policy in the circulation element.

Commissioner Langille assumed that generally these don't conflict.

Associate Planner Diaz stated that the idea of capital improvement projects was not totally out of the realm of the General Plan, mentioning the circulation, scenic highways and community facilities elements, which were capital improvements that benefitted the City.

Commissioner Langille wondered if any Commissioners had any similar thoughts.

Chair Campbell, using one program on page 34-2 as an example, asked if that didn't comply with their opinion of the General Plan, then would the whole document not comply.

Associate Planner Diaz stated that perhaps, and asked if he was talking about one that was a previous project or a new project.

Chair Campbell suggested that they say it was a new project.

Associate Planner Diaz stated that it would probably throw everything out.

Chair Campbell asked what was the case if it was a previous project.

Associate Planner Diaz stated that, if it was a previous project, it was already found to be consistent with the General Plan in the past. Most of the ones carried over were approved in previous years.

Commissioner Evans referred to the noise element section which mentioned encouraging Caltrans to build noise barriers along Highway 1, etc., stating that it was listed against land use and conservation elements, and he was asking for their reasoning on having that in the program since it wasn't something the City would be doing.

Associate Planner Diaz asked if he was referring to having it in the new project.

Commissioner Evans stated that it was in the text but he didn't see it referred to in the new projects and he was trying to understand why it was mentioned if it wasn't in the new projects.

Associate Planner Diaz stated that he wasn't quite following, asking if he was referring to the land use and goals policies and action programs.

Commissioner Evans responded that he was correct, adding that under the noise element it mentions encouraging Caltrans to build noise barriers. He reiterated that he was trying to understand why that was in the Capital Improvement Program under the land use and conservation elements.

Associate Planner Diaz was not sure why that was done when it was put as short term.

Commissioner Evans thought it wasn't one of the new ones anyway.

Associate Planner Diaz responded that he was correct.

Commissioner Clifford thought that Pacifica was no longer the lead agency on the Calera Parkway project anyway, stating that San Mateo County Transportation Authority has taken over the project.

Associate Engineer Donguines responded that he was correct.

Commissioner Clifford reiterated that it was not a Pacifica project per se.

Associate Engineer Donguines agreed, stating that we were now just support.

Commissioner Clifford asked whether the project was actually a County project, not a City project.

Associate Engineer Donguines agreed that it was a County project.

Commissioner Brown stated that he was trying to make sense of the roughly \$3.5 million new projects, putting them into the context of the roughly \$60 million or so, and he realized that all of them had different funding sources. He asked if there was a place where it listed the number of Capital Improvement projects with their dollar amounts and their sources of funding to put this into context. He explained that adding \$3.5 million to the City's wish list might change his opinion on some of them if he was able to see the complete funding source.

Associate Engineer Donguines thought it might be maintained at the Finance office but, on the project level for the CIP, they didn't add up all the costs and itemize them by funding source.

Commissioner Brown stated that all of it was provided in the book, but it was one per page.

Associate Engineer Donguines stated that some might say "to be determined" because it was a current project and they were still looking for funding. He added that, until the City Council approved a project, the funding was not sure.

Commissioner Brown stated that he would find it useful to see the numbers added up and roughly where they were coming from, and would be comfortable with a "TBD" column. He also asked if there was a place where they could see completed projects that were no longer in the Capital Improvement Program, giving an example of having completed \$1 million but adding \$3.5 million.

Associate Engineer Donguines explained that whatever they complete the previous year would stay in the current book, listed as "complete." Then, the following year, it would not be included in the book. He reiterated that they didn't have a running tab on what comes and goes.

Commissioner Leon referred to the coastal element and coastal use permits, stating that there were a number of projects that involved west of Highway 1 projects, then asked if they ever see an application come before them for a coastal use permit on any of the projects. He commented that he had been on the Commission for six years and had never seen one.

Associate Planner Diaz stated that, if it required a coastal development permit, it would come to the Planning Commission. He added that he wasn't sure if any of them would have required it, but reiterated that, if it did, it would have come through the process.

Commissioner Leon asked whether any new use or expansion of use would be applicable the same as a private application.

Associate Planner Diaz stated not necessarily, adding that it depended on the type of project, because there were some projects that may be exempt.

Commissioner Leon reiterated that he was asking because, in the six years he has been on the Commission, he had never seen one.

Associate Planner Diaz reiterated that it depended on the type of project.

Commissioner Leon commented that, so far, it has been all projects.

Commissioner Brown referred to the parking lot restoration project, running around \$30,000, to restore the wastewater treatment plant parking lot because of damage done during the biodiesel project, and asked why it was on our tab. He wondered, if someone came in for a project and damaged the parking lot, why the City was picking up the tab and not the people from the biodiesel project.

Associate Engineer Donguines stated that he didn't have an answer to that, mentioning that it was a new project from our wastewater plant and, unfortunately, Maria Aguilar, from wastewater department, could not make it to the meeting, and she was the project manager.

Commissioner Clifford thought he might have Commissioner Brown's answer, explaining that the company went bankrupt and was no longer in existence and there was no one to go to get them to pay and we were stuck with it.

There were no public comments.

Commissioner Leon stated that, every year, he makes the same request. He asks for a presentation by all involved with a broad stroke of all projects in the coastal zone that would be of interest to the Commission, giving an example. He felt that, if there was no benefit to the City for bringing this to the Commission other than to vote on it and not be able to review or take action of any kind, he would consider having staff certify that it meets the General Plan requirement and be done with it. He believed that the Commission's involvement in any issue coming before the City should add value of some sort. He felt the Commission added value when looking at projects and coming to reasonable conclusions, but he didn't see where the City gained anything by bringing this before the Commission, other than to read the adoption resolution and nothing happens. He mentioned some examples of projects around the City, and thought there were opportunities for the Commission to add value, but he felt that could only happen through the Commission having some interaction. He was willing to take staff's recommendation because there was nothing else available to them indicating that any of the projects didn't meet the General Plan elements or were not consistent. He thought Commissioner Brown said it well, observing that there was a very generic sheet for each project and there was no substance to the description. He thought it would be of value to know if there was anything not consistent because of the guidelines, but they only get a project number, funding source and location. He reiterated that he didn't believe they were providing any useful action and he thought they could streamline the system if that was something the City wanted to do.

Commissioner Langille agreed with Commissioner Leon in general terms. She added that she had meant to ask about the Esplanade trail, stating that it sounded fairly extensive but she couldn't tell from the description whether it would require any further permits. She acknowledged that the cost was important but more importantly was where it was located and whether it was subject to future erosion, etc., but she couldn't tell by looking at the information in front of her.

Associate Planner Diaz stated that they weren't approving the projects now. If one of those projects was developed, they would look at it and, if it required some permit, it would go through

the proper channels to be reviewed by the Planning Commission and the public. He reiterated that once Public Works decides to move forward, they coordinate with Planning to see if any permits are required and, if so, they would be taken through the proper channels.

Commissioner Langille stated that there was one program which appeared to be a duplicate, Linda Mar Fire Station well demolition on one page and demolition and closure of monitoring wells at Linda Mar Fire Station on a second page.

Associate Engineer Donguines stated that it was a duplicate, with the second one being an error.

Commissioner Evans stated that he understood the reasoning for bringing it before them, but not the reason why. He stated that, if they have nothing to say about a project, they could streamline this by eliminating the Commission. He mentioned that staff did administrative approvals now for projects.

Associate Planner Diaz agreed that they do. He added that he understood what they were saying, but explained that the government code requires that it come to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Evans referred to the Rockaway Creek west Highway 1 restoration, stating that he understood the reasoning, but asked if some of that creek backs up to two or three private parcels of land.

Associate Engineer Donguines replied that it did, explaining that part backed up to Holiday Inn and Nick's, but the creek was maintained by the City.

Commissioner Clifford thanked Engineering for getting this to them earlier this year than in the past. He appreciated the extra time to look through things.

Chair Campbell seconded that comment.

Commissioner Leon promised that he would look at this year and see what, if anything, comes before them to consider for value and approval of any items within the coastal zone. He stated that, next year, if nothing has come before them, he would like staff to come back with some means of streamlining the process because it was obvious that they were not adding value to this process. He hoped that they would be able to get an overview of some of the projects, adding that some are very significant, mentioning a few by name. He stated that he would like to have some type of presentation on those when the studies were complete and available for review.

Commissioner Leon moved that the Planning Commission **ADOPT** the attached resolution entitled, "A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Pacifica Certifying that the Proposed 2011-2016 Capital Improvement Program is Consistent with the General Plan;" Commissioner Langille seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Leon stated that he usually watches the City Council meetings when he doesn't attend and he noticed that, when it comes to administrative business, there must be a line item for designation of liaison, because of the mayor asking if there is a Planning Commission liaison. He stated that he would like staff to clarify that, because he interprets that there must be an understanding that they have designated a Planning Commission liaison to attend every meeting and he felt that, if none of them are there, there was an understanding that they should have one there. He asked that it be mentioned to the City Manager, suggesting that they might specifically state that there is no designated liaison from the Planning Commission at that meeting, so there is no assumption that they were always going to be there.

Commissioner Clifford welcomed Commissioner Brown, adding that he was not at the meeting when he first came on board. He did watch the meetings and was quite impressed with how quickly he has "hit the ground running" and was contributing greatly. He then apologized for his last two absences, adding that he didn't anticipate that happening again.

Chair Campbell was glad to see him back.

Commissioner Evans was glad to see him back as well. He explained that he may be a cause of the issue Commissioner Leon mentioned because he usually attends every City Council meeting, and they usually recognize him as a liaison. Not having been at the last meeting, he didn't know what was said. He added that he goes as a citizen and they see him, acknowledge him and mention that he was there. He thought that may be part of the confusion.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he was at the last meeting and they acknowledged him as the liaison. He assumed that, if they are there, they have a liaison regardless of whether they have anything to say as a Planning Commission representative.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Clifford moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:35 p.m.; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized loop that crosses itself, positioned above a horizontal line.

Planning Director White