MINUTES

CITY OF PACIFICA PLANNING COMMISSION COUNCIL CHAMBERS 2212 BEACH BOULEVARD		August 1, 2011 7:00 p.m.
		Chair Campbell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
ROLL CALL:	Present:	Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Leon, Evans and Chair Campbell
	Absent:	Commissioners Gordon and Langille
SALUTE TO FLAG:		Led by Chair Campbell
STAFF PRESENT:		Planning Director White Associate Planner Diaz Management Analyst Claycomb
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, Leon, Evans and Chair Campbell
	Noes:	None
APPROVAL OF MINUTES: JULY 18, 2011		Commissioner Leon moved approval of the minutes of July 18, 2011; Commissioner Evans seconded the motion.
The motion carried 5-0.		
	Ayes:	Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Leon, Evans and Chair Campbell
	Noes:	None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF AUGUST 8, 2011:

Planning Director White stated that there were no land use items on the agenda and no requirement for anyone to attend, but they were always invited to attend.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

CONSIDERATION ITEM:

1.	**UP-882-01** **PSD-699-01** **CDP-203-01**	**EXTENSION OF PERMITS for the construction of 43 residential units (19 single-family detached homes and 24 townhouses) at the 4000 block of Palmetto Avenue, Pacifica (APN 009-402-250 & -260).**

Commissioner Evans recused himself for this item.

Associate Planner Diaz presented the staff report.

There were no public comments.

Commissioner Clifford moved that the Planning Commission **EXTEND** Use Permit, UP-882-01, Site Development Permit, PSD-699-01 and Coastal Development Permit, CDP-203-01, for the development of 43 residential units at the 4000 block of Palmetto Avenue (APN 009-402-250 & -260) to August 12, 2012; Commissioner Leon seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-0-1.**

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

Commissioner Evans returned to the dais.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS:

2. **Discussion of Final Existing Conditions Report for the General Plan Update project.**

Planning Director White stated that since this was a discussion requested by the Commission, there was no staff report. It was provided to allow the Commission and the public to make further comments and staff was present to listen to the comments, take notes and pass them on to the General Plan consultant for their use.

Commissioner Clifford asked that staff confirm that this Existing Conditions Report was already approved by City Council.

Planning Director White stated that he was correct. The Council accepted the report and it was in its final form. He clarified that this proceeding was not intended to make any changes but reflect on the information contained within it.

Commissioner Leon asked if they were in deliberation now.

Chair Campbell stated that there appeared to be public comments pending.

Commissioner Leon stated that he had a question, for the record, regarding the timeline and action. He thought that on August 15 they would have a public hearing followed by a meeting by the City Council for further action on the document and process, and he asked that staff confirm his thinking.

Planning Director White confirmed that he was correct, explaining that they saw this as an opportunity to revisit the Existing Conditions Report because there had been a while with a gap between the time it was first reviewed and the time it was approved by the Council. He stated that on August 15 they would be taking on the Alternatives Report which was available for public review at this time. Approximately a month after their public hearing on August 15, the City Council would also take up that item and hopefully achieve a final or preferred alternative.

Commissioner Leon stated that the motivation and outcome prompting him to suggest this as an agenda item was to keep a focus on the Existing Conditions and Key Issues and derive any questions or further information from those to "keep their eyes on the ball" and to have a continued focus on all the elements within the report.

Planning Director White asked, to be clear that he was following the direction of the Commission, if the expectation was that this item would also appear as a discussion item on August 15. Since he had not understood that to be the direction, he asked clarification.

Chair Campbell thought they would need to discuss that as an ongoing agenda item; however, they had two commissioners absent.

Commissioner Leon thought one issue was that since they first discussed this, many meetings had elapsed before it came to them and it was now against the August 15 meeting. He thought they had a firm timeline that was published for the General Plan update, and now he would like a revised timeline regarding the process.

Planning Director White agreed that they owed them that. He stated that the milestones remained unchanged, but the timing and the funding have changed. He thought they could include that in the August 15 packet.

Chair Campbell opened public comments.

Dinah Verby, Pacifica, stated that she was confused about the process and appreciated the clarification as now presented by staff. She had gotten the information about this hearing but was surprised that the City Council had already accepted this report because she wasn't aware that it was a public report until now. She stated that, on the June 13 City Council agenda, it was "completion of task 3 and accept the Existing Conditions Report Addendum, Chapter 6, Transportation and she thought all that happened at that time was that the City accepted a portion of the report. She reiterated that she was confused about what happened before, now and in the future. She would appreciate having it clearly spelled out for everyone and well publicized. She felt this was an extremely important document and process and they needed to be sure the public was well informed. Since no one was present, she didn't think the public got what was going on.

Julie Lancelle, Pacifica, referred to Dinah Verby's comments, adding that she didn't want to absolve herself of any responsibility for keeping track of this process, but she agreed with her that it was a significant process and an important document. She thanked Commissioner Leon for putting this on the agenda to begin to refocus the community's attention on this process. She commented that August was difficult because many people were out of town. She was glad that it was put on this agenda and brought to her attention. She thought it was incumbent to focus on what would be happening on the 15th and begin to bone up on what has transpired up to this point with the process. She mentioned that many had been involved in the earlier workshops but she was aware that the process had slowed down because of budget issues, but it didn't detract from the fact that this was an exceedingly important process for this community with far-reaching consequences. She thanked the Planning Commission and she looked forward to the meeting on the 15th.

Chair Campbell closed public comments.

Commissioner Clifford thought he could answer part of Dinah Verby's question in terms of what happened in the past. He stated that the full report was approved and accepted by the City Council. He thought the confusion came because there was a delay due to a conflict in the traffic report in the Existing Conditions Report and other traffic reports. He asked staff for confirmation.

Planning Director White stated that some of this transpired before he arrived, but he understood that the Existing Conditions and Key Issues Report was drafted in July 2010, went through a couple of different hearings and, at that time, the Council accepted the report with the exception of Chapter 6, making some specific changes to that chapter and then having it come back to them. That portion was what they accepted on June 13.

Commissioner Clifford reiterated that it was accepted in two parts.

Planning Director White responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans asked if they had a date when the original report was accepted by City Council.

Management Analyst Claycomb stated that it was September 1, 2010.

Commissioner Leon reiterated that the intent of this meeting was to bring focus to it and he felt they had accomplished that already with this discussion. He acknowledged that, on delving into the content of the report, there were important decisions to be made, especially in the residential and future residential areas, as well as commercial options needing to be finalized and it was important to understand the document. He explained that, before this meeting, they had a special Open Space Committee meeting for which he was a liaison. He stated that they went over the source maps. He mentioned that the existing and future residential areas report and three options for commercial development in Pacifica were what they looked at, as well as the existing General Plan designations for every area of Pacifica. He felt that it was a very in depth data type analysis, and he was prepared to get into some of what they discussed. One thing they discussed was that, in the existing and future residential areas map, there were eight key areas identified where they were either trying to match the zoning and the General Plan designation or make some determination regarding the properties, which were from the Fish and Bowl site to Linda Mar Pacifica Park hillsides. He stated that the point he was trying to make was that, on reviewing each of the elements of those eight properties, they would find inconsistencies with either the General Plan designation maps themselves or inconsistencies within each description of the property as it relates to underlying zoning or designations. He raised the issue so that, going forward, people will pay special attention to each of the designations of zoning and General Plan to be very clear. He stated that, in the final report, the actual descriptions tied to the map don't always agree with the map or they raise questions as to which is valid. He stated that they would get more in depth on this at the August 15 meeting but he was making sure it gets in this meeting's minutes and available for everyone to review. He thought the final book was available on line on the City's website and lists all the letters from the public forums and those submitted to the Planning Department or Elizabeth Claycomb who was coordinating the effort. He thought there was great value in reading all of the concerns and comments from the public regarding the document and process. He felt they were in a good position and he was glad they had agendized this part which he felt would be a good segue to the August 15 meeting. He was hoping that the public and decision makers take time to look at the specific information on which they would be making decisions. He mentioned that there was confusion regarding how to interpret the materials and how to present those concerns to make sure they were meaningful and led to some type of resolution for the confusion involved. He thought this was still an issue based on the Open Space meeting where they went through some of those same issues. He felt that, when dealing with choosing from the three commercial options available, one has to go to the three maps side by side to see all three alternatives at once. He thought that was difficult for people to follow but you have to do that to decide on which alternative you want to give feedback. He liked the data to be easy to understand and clear to read. He thought, if you don't know how to read it, it would be a very confusing process. He stated that he hasn't had the benefit of reading the approved revisions on the traffic item in Chapter 6. He seemed to recall that our consultants concluded that the Highway 1 traffic problems at Fassler and Reina del Mar were traffic control issues, not load capacity issues on the road which contributed to the LOS because Caltrans Calera Creek Parkway project was operating under the assumption that those intersections were LOSF, at a failure rating. That was a big concern for him as an issue to get resolved. He mentioned that there was another project that had a traffic study done recently at those same intersections which found that they were operating at an acceptable level. He felt there was some new information which went beyond even the consultant's and Caltrans' studies. He thought that would have a big determination as far as what kind of decisions will be made on Calera Creek Parkway. He then wanted to hit a few highlights and the reason he wanted to bring it forward. He stated that he would give page references so they can follow. On Chapter 1-4, our growth and housing needs for the next 20-30 years are going to see an increase of about 3,300 people, estimating 1,290 units in that period. The charts on page 1-6 show that, of all housing needs we have, we have failed to meet the housing needs for the three lowest income levels identified by the report and we have overshot the highest income level category of housing. He felt that was significant, pointing to the type of housing on which we are short. He thought something significant on page 1-6 was the market potential in Pacifica being local retail, tourist retail, boutique and luxury resort hotel, with graphs extrapolating the occupancy tax revenues which justify the recommendation. The chapter on sea level rises was also significant. He had asked that they do a special meeting on sea level rise and its impact on Pacifica. He stated that within the last month there had been a major scientific report showing accelerated sea level rise in the future over what was publicized even a year ago. He thought it was in our best interest to have that meeting go forward soon. He urged the City to pursue that information to have the most current information as far as the impacts. He stated that, after talking with experts in the field, he was told that Pacifica was one of the most studied places in the United States as far as coastal erosion and sea level rise with numerous reports. Experts from around the world come and study the effects of coastal erosion and sea level rise in Pacifica and he felt we should take advantage of that information. He had already talked about the maps, commercial development alternatives and housing, zoning and General Plan designations. He urged that people look at those online, reiterating that they need to look at three maps to make a determination on the alternatives. He would leave that for his comments and he looked forward to the August 15 meeting.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he read reports on that sea level rising and thought it was an El Nino type of situation with the most significant part being the erosion factor, not the difference in sea level rise but the direction of the waves and impact on erosion. He understood that erosion was going to be significantly greater than originally projected based on this data. He thought it was something Pacifica had to look at because of so much property that was right on the coast and subject to this erosion. If it was going to be accelerated, he felt we needed to get a handle on that now to make decisions on what they will decide about property that is directly on the coast.

Commissioner Brown encouraged the public to go on line and search for the Pacifica Planning Commission Existing Conditions Report. He stated that one thing he did before applying to join the Commission was to read the Existing Conditions Report from the previous General Plan. He stated that the document was written 30 plus years ago, and one thing that struck him was that it also was trying to look forward 25 to 30 years, adding that it nailed a lot of the demographic transients. He thought there was some underlying research in the report and he didn't believe it was that intimidating to read. He stated that there were great charts that gave you a general sense of the types of pressures that are facing the city and the types of decisions we will have to make as a community as to how we want to adapt to those and grow. He again encouraged everyone to do the same research that the Commission and others have done and be prepared to have that conversation.

Commissioner Evans asked Ms. Claycomb to explain the definition of "match" for him and possibly others. He stated that he was looking at the existing and future residential areas map and it has "match zoning" for several different areas, and was looking for the general definition.

Management Analyst Claycomb stated that they were striving to reconcile the discrepancies between the zoning and the General Plan designation and that was what it referred to.

Commissioner Evans stated that his next question goes along with Commissioner Leon's comments, mentioning that he knew of one area in the north end which was designated for high density residential and he felt that entire area was at least 50% or greater on a grade on the hillside and they wouldn't normally approve something like that. He was trying to understand the definition that has been given to some areas which, if they came before the Commission, he didn't know if they could approve them.

Management Analyst Claycomb understood that it was existing, and that was one thing they were looking to reconcile to be sure that the zoning designation and the General Plan designation made sense for the properties and parcels that are of discussion.

Commissioner Evans thanked her, adding that he assumed others would get benefit out of that explanation as well.

Chair Campbell asked staff to summarize where they will be on August 15 and what will be discussed so that it will be clear for the public.

Planning Director White explained that, on August 15, they would be discussing the Alternatives Report which was the end of Task 4 and was preceded by a community forum for public participation. He stated that there were three distinct alternatives provided in the report but that didn't mean that any one of those alternatives was the preferred alternative, because it could be a piece of those or a hybrid or anything in between. He stated that determination will happen through the process, with the City Council ultimately directing them. He stated that they will have a staff report in the normal packet delivery time frame to give them some context. It will be coming from the General Plan consultant, and it will establish what was expected at that meeting. He stated that, after they hear public comment, they were looking for a recommendation to the Council on what they believe that vision could be for the city and is the ultimate objective, adding that the Council has to end up with that objective also.

Commissioner Leon referred to the Existing and Future Residential map being referenced, and he explained that one thing they found out when going through the eight properties on that map was that, on Examples 1 and 2, it showed the existing General Plan designation, but on Examples 3 through 8, it didn't tell them what the existing designation was. He stated that they were then faced with looking at the future without a point of reference. He stated that there was confusion because it was not consistent in the format. He asked, if the title of the map and report is existing and future, that it show existing and future. He thought that feedback would be coming to anyone who looks at it and sees it.

Planning Director White stated that, before they move on from this item, there was a comment made about having this as a discussion item on an ongoing basis, and, if that was the Commission's desire, they would do so, but he was asking for a definitive direction. He did have a concern about that for the August 15 meeting because there might be some confusion about the two items, adding that they had separated them purposely to avoid that confusion.

Chair Campbell felt that they should keep the August 15 agenda clean and not have this item on it, but he was open to comments from the other commissioners.

Commissioner Evans agreed with him, adding that he felt the August 15 meeting was large enough as it was without any more confusion. He didn't have a definitive thought one way or the other but, if they had this as a continuing item, he didn't think it should be on the August 15 meeting.

Commissioner Leon agreed that there was no sense in having both at the August 15 meeting. He did feel strongly that the data contained in the report was of ongoing use and, since they were at a slow point on the agendas, he thought it would be a good use of their time and it would help them with their planning.

Commissioner Clifford also agreed that they should keep the August 15 meeting clean with the one item. In terms of an ongoing item, he mentioned that when he was on the Open Space Committee, they would have items on the agenda for the possibility of talking about them, but if there was no discussion they just moved on. He asked if they could do that with the Commission agenda.

Planning Director White thought it could be a continuing discussion as time allows. He thought there lots of ways to characterize it, but he was asking for them to be clear about what was intended for the agenda and, if that language was permissible, and they were giving him that direction, staff would be happy to put that on the agenda after the Alternatives part was resolved.

Commissioner Clifford reiterated that it was a suggestion from past experience.

Planning Director White agreed that it was important for the public to understand that it may or may not be discussed on a particular agenda.

Chair Campbell thought continuing this item was a possibility, but he would like to get it clarified as to how they proceed with that, public notification and whether the consultant will be at the next meeting.

Planning Director White stated that the consultant would be present for the August 15 meeting which was part of the scope of their work. He added that they could not be at this meeting because it was not within the budget set for that task, and they would not be present on an ongoing basis because it was not part of the budgeted task. Referring to public notice, he thought it was hard to know how to give public notice when you weren't sure it would be discussed in the first place. He felt there was a potential problem and he would take direction from the Commission and facilitate the conversation but he didn't want to confuse the public or themselves in the process.

Chair Campbell personally thought it might be worth bringing back to the Commission when they had the other two commissioners to talk about how they go forward, adding that their slow period may be coming to an end as they end the summer. He wondered if any other commissioner had any further thoughts on taking a look at continuing this item as a continuing agenda item to make sure it was most effective and the public understands what they were doing when they take a look at the item.

Commissioner Brown stated that he was a fan of very clear agenda items, and not a fan of having something that may or may not be discussed on the agenda. He agreed that this was an important document but, after they have the meeting on the Alternatives Report, they may see that there are more pressing things to bring up. He recommended that they bring this up when they have a full Commission and see what the priorities are and, if it was worth being on the agenda, that they put it on the agenda with a possible reason for what they are trying to discuss with bullet points. He thought they would likely get a better response from the public when they knew what was on the agenda and what they were going to be discussing. He agreed that these were critical documents for our community and he would encourage discussion.

Commissioner Evans agreed with Commissioner Brown that they return to this thought to discuss in a meeting in September when they would hopefully have the rest of the Commission and can then discuss if they want to bring this back, possibly for one meeting or recurring meetings. However, he also did not like the idea of saying that they might or might not have it on the agenda. He felt it was confusing to him and the public.

Commission Leon was in agreement with having the entire Commission present and discussing it further. He stated that he would have no problem going through each chapter once a week as an agenda item. He definitely saw that they could discuss it every week, and he also didn't think it was a good idea to say maybe they would discuss it or not. He would prefer that they make a commitment to specific chapters and find what was of value for them. He mentioned that they still had a draft housing element out there and it was a big part of this and he thought they had lost a little bit of sight on that. He expected a fairly comprehensive document coming back on that subject. He was satisfied having a full Commission and going forward. He agreed with Commissioner Brown that it was a critical key document and was worthy of the Commission's attention. He looked forward to the next meeting to see if the full Commission comes to an agreement at that time.

Chair Campbell stated that the discussion of the Existing Conditions Report was viable and he thought the discussion raised awareness of it and they would take another look at whether or how they want to continue with this discussion to add value and get the public out with adequate notice.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

None

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director White stated that his only item was a continuation of the conversation at the previous meeting, which was looking for items that they might consider for their tour of projects that have been previously approved and built. He asked that they communicate their ideas by phone or email, etc.

Commissioner Leon asked if he wanted to take some now.

Planning Director White stated that, if he had some ideas now, he was ready.

Commissioner Leon stated that there were two locations on Pedro Point, the entire street of Danman with mixed use commercial, and one recently completed on Kent.

Planning Director White asked if it was a single family house.

Commissioner Leon responded affirmatively, adding that he would like to also look at Connemara and Walgreens which was controversial at the time.

Planning Director White stated that he would leave it open because they were trying to get something together in the fall so, if they have any other ideas of projects to include, they would come up with a list and bring the list to them to decide what they were going to see to be sure they can manage it in one day.

Commissioner Clifford stated that there was one approved when Commissioner Leon was on the Commission, stating that it was not on Sheila Lane but on a court. It was one house with a map that was approved, and they have leveled two additional lots but have not returned with plans for the additional houses. He would like to look at the one house that was finished.

Planning Director White asked if it was near Sheila Court.

Commissioner Clifford stated that it was near Sheila Lane, possibly Minerva, but he didn't really remember the name of the street, adding that it used to be an agricultural plot if that helps.

Commissioner Leon thought it was the first little court above Linda Mar Boulevard on the left.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Rick Zipkin, 725 Oddstad Blvd., stated that he would like to talk about the proposed assisted living complex at 721 Oddstad, in back of where he lives. He stated that he and several others in the area calling themselves protectors of San Pedro Creek were quite against it for many reasons, such as what it will do to the wild life with some of them endangered or potentially endangered such as the steelhead salmon, etc., and their mating habits, etc., would be severely altered, especially with all the construction. He felt that could severely inhibit the mating habits, adding that they were there much longer than all of us. He stated that it was a beautiful pristine place and they would like to keep it intact, possibly by making it a protected area. He felt the area was also too small for what was planned for it. He felt that the project was too tall and there was only one entrance and exit and he questioned whether it was legal. He then mentioned that the neighboring homes would be subjected to quite a bit of noise and would be disturbed with something like that. He stated that the area was always commercial and he asked if it was now residential. He questioned how that happened without the neighbors hearing about it. He concluded that the residents were against this complex and he stated that if they could see their way clear in defeating it, it would be good for the residents and the wildlife, keeping the pristine area intact.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

The motion carried **5-0.**

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Clifford, Leon, Evans and Chair Campbell

Noes: None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

____
Planning Director White