

**MINUTES**

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

August 15, 2011

7:00 p.m.

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

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

**SALUTE TO FLAG:** Led by Commissioner Clifford

Commissioner Brown arrived.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director White  
Management Analyst Claycomb  
Also present – Dyett & Bhatia Consultants  
Leslie Gould and Peter Winch

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

The motion carried 7-0.

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

**APPROVAL OF  
MINUTES:  
AUGUST 1, 2011** Commissioner Clifford moved approval of the  
minutes of August 1, 2011; Commissioner Leon  
seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0-2.

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

**DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING:**

No 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting for August is scheduled and no need for a liaison.

**CONSENT ITEMS:**

None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**  
None

**CONSIDERATION:**

**Presentation and discussion of the Land Use Alternatives and Key Policy Issues Report for the General Plan Update.**

Planning Director White commented that this was a discussion and hopefully recommendations related to the alternatives report. He stated that he would be turning it over to Leslie Gould of Dyett & Bhatia, as part of the consultant team assisting the City in doing the General Plan Update but first, Management Analyst Claycomb was going to read into the record the names and addresses of the public who have submitted written comments. He added that the Commission have either received the comments in the packet or received the comments this evening.

Chair Campbell asked if the public should speak after all staff and consultants were done.

Planning Director White thought it would make sense to have the presentation first, but if the Commission preferred a different order, then that was okay.

Chair Campbell agreed with the suggestion and thought they would have public comment after.

Ms. Gould agreed, stating that they had organized it topic by topic, with four major topics. She thought they could ask questions at the end of each section and decide if they want public comment then or later.

Chair Campbell thought the best thing would be to have public comment at the end, after all presentations were done, and people could talk about the topic in which they were most interested.

Management Analyst Claycomb read the list of all citizens who had submitted comments in writing prior to the meeting.

Ms. Leslie Gould of Dyett & Bhatia introduced herself, as well as Peter Winch, her coworker, with whom she would be sharing the presentation. She then gave an overview of their presentation.

Peter Winch then addressed the first topic of existing and future residential areas.

Ms. Gould asked if the Commission had any questions.

Chair Campbell brought it back for questions by the Commission, but would put public comment at the end to cover everything. He was concerned that the public could have their three minutes before all the presentations are done and they realized that they had missed their opportunity to talk on another topic.

Commissioner Leon referred to the current zoning code which had a designation for Hillside Preservation, but he noticed that the maps didn't identify the Hillside Preservation District on properties which had that designation associated with it. He was attempting to point out that specific issue, noting that it was not part of the discussion.

Mr. Winch clarified that they were doing the General Plan designation, not the zoning designation. He stated that, if they look at the zoning map provided, it did show the HP District and they tried to take that into account when addressing development capacity. He gave an example of how they looked at those properties as having a low density designation. He reiterated that it was taken into account but he wasn't mentioning it.

Commissioner Leon mentioned that we have state and county designated scenic highways in Pacifica, and he thought they were not shown on any of the maps that he was aware. He assumed that they would play into any thought process as far as making a distinction or determination of density of zoning, adding that he would bring it up at some point to tie it into specific locations. He was merely making a preliminary statement at this time.

Ms. Gould then addressed the second topic, commercial areas and economic development.

Commissioner Leon referring to the three alternatives, A, B, C, asked confirmation that both B and C took place in the Sharp Park area.

Ms. Gould stated that she thought he was correct.

Commissioner Leon thought it was interesting that there are two alternatives of the three in one area. He recognized the difference, but still thought it was significant that there were two alternatives for the same area.

Ms. Gould stated that they really had to look specifically at the feedback they got, and it was not B or C.

Commissioner Leon then referred to the weighted method of determining the top vote getter and Table 3-1, stating that Alternative B was the top point getter.

Ms. Gould asked to which he was referring.

Commissioner Leon stated that it was Alternative B, Table 3-1, page 313.

Ms. Gould asked to which item he was referring.

Commissioner Leon stated that it was for the alternatives, but he didn't know if she shows it on the slides, but in the book they have a roll up of all the voting.

Ms. Gould thought, for most of them, it was honestly the best to look closer. There was Alternative B and Alternative A overall. She stated that, when she talked about each site, it got much more specific.

Commissioner Leon stated that they had a roll up with the actual numbers and weighted scores. He stated that it appears that Alternative B was the top point getter.

Ms. Gould stated that it was both, explaining that you have alternative points as Alternative B, but when you had votes on the preference, it was Alternative A that definitely got the votes on the preference. It was No. 2, not preference 1.

Commissioner Leon stated that it was highlighted, and he noticed the highest score was B.

Mr. Winch further explained that it was two ways of slicing the same information. He stated that the point of going to the point system was that a lot of people chose A as their first choice, but a lot of people also chose A as their third choice, which indicated that there was significant disagreement with it at the same time, and B was more of a middle ground, but it often shows as their second choice.

Commissioner Leon stated that he didn't want to belabor it, but the point he was trying to make was that they had a weighted score and they have one that was the highest and one that has the lowest.

Commissioner Langille commented that the issue came up before about the quarry development and Alternative A was based on unrealistic expectations of commercial development. She thought the process was based on the specific plan never having any sort of constraints analysis, so she asked if the specific plan will be updated as part of it. She asked how they get to this point with the specific plan and questions whether it has to be updated. She mentioned that there was talk about updating the specific plan. She stated that, as currently zoned, it allows 2.1 million square feet of commercial, but she agreed with their analysis completely that there is no way there will ever be that much development allowed.

Ms. Gould explained that they were not hired to do the specific plan. She stated that they will put in the General Plan what the Council directs them to do and they will note that all of the different constraints make it likely that the current specific plan does not work. She questioned whether they could go any further than that.

Commissioner Langille stated that, as far as the public information process, a lot of people will look at the document and think Alternative A is it. She wanted to make sure the public was kept aware of why and how choices are being made, even though there is a specific plan out there that says certain things are allowed but was not feasible.

Ms. Gould stated that the Council could take the action to not allow the specific plan at all, but that was not within their control.

Commissioner Langille reiterated that she wanted the public information out there. She then stated that the senior housing was confusing. While she definitely felt there was a need for senior housing, adding that she didn't have the terminology in front of her, i.e., assisted living and places where there were three levels of senior housing including independent living, assisted care and basically a nursing home. She asked how it worked, and whether it would depend on the use. She was trying to get her mind around it, mentioning that a lot of people have input about senior facilities, and she asked if that would contribute to qualifying for the housing element or at what point would a senior facility contribute to that.

Mr. Winch stated that he would have to look at the zoning and maybe it would have to change. He thought it would be permitted, and they would imagine it to be a higher density format of housing and would likely take place in a medium or high density residential district, and would presumably be permitted in the mixed use district or even some of the commercial districts, since it was also more like a service use. He stated that they wouldn't be controlling the outcome with this process but would be saying that this would be a potentially good site for senior housing.

Commissioner Langille thought it would be great as part of the planning process to identify sites that might be appropriate for those uses.

Planning Director White thought part of her question was about whether or not senior housing can count toward the affordable housing goals, and he stated that it depends on the situation but it can.

Commissioner Langille stated that they could identify that as a goal to identify those sites and have the full range of senior housing count. She referred to the point in the process of compliance with SB 375, i.e., and combining residential and commercial, stating that there wasn't a lot of focus on transit-oriented development. She acknowledged that there was some talk of it in the document, but that was a subject near and dear to her heart, and she asked how they plan for the transit-oriented development. She asked at what point in the process that would come in.

Ms. Gould stated that they have shown several places where it could be higher density transit-oriented housing, adding that Pacifica didn't have a huge amount of transit where they would normally call it that, specifically they have shown several sites that were higher density and near Highway 1. She stated that they had pointed them out on the map. She thought it was an important issue to highlight because it counts as affordable housing but also because it was transit-oriented and they can live in a high density near the freeway.

Commissioner Clifford referred to the several recommended layers of commercial and he asked if they can be overlaid with each other, i.e., commercial retail and commercial office space could be on the same site.

Ms. Gould was looking at the different categories and asked him to repeat the question.

Commissioner Clifford explained that they have retail commercial and office commercial. He stated that both of those could be on the same site, with commercial retail downstairs and office space upstairs, having both designations on the same site.

Ms. Gould agreed.

Mr. Winch added that you could only have one designation, but the designation could accommodate different types of actual retail, explaining that you would stress one type, then you can have mixed use.

Commissioner Clifford explained that he was attempting to make sure that, as we go forward, developers don't look at something that says it is office commercial and they think that is the only thing they can do there. He wants to be clear that they can also plan some retail and, vice versa, if retail, then can also plan some office space. He thought that was what they were saying.

Ms. Gould responded that it was true, but she clarified that the hotel visitor commercial was restricted to hotels and visitor commercial and you could not have office and not have retail.

Commissioner Clifford thought that was very clear as it was defined. He just felt the other two seemed to be able to be mixed and matched.

Commissioner Gordon thanked them for the presentation, which he felt was clear and helpful. He liked the way they handled the fact that Pacifica needed a town center badly, and they have always looked at Rockaway as providing that but he felt it was pragmatic of them to realize there were constraints there because of, not only the environmental issues but also the two shots at it have failed. He liked not putting all the eggs in one basket and approaching it as a hybrid of Alternatives A and B, and focusing on Palmetto if Rockaway doesn't pan out. He then referred to moving north on Palmetto where they come to the industrial uses, and he saw that they mentioned that a complete change of use to retail was not realistic. He stated that we were unique and not many oceanside communities can say they have car repair and storage space, etc., which were important but were right on the bluffs which was odd. He referred to the cute downtown aspect and then going northward to uses that were a little odd, and he asked how they reconciled the two, and what they meant by the change of use not being realistic.

Ms. Gould stated that it was its own area and separate from the shopping center to the north and Palmetto Avenue to the south, and she didn't think it was realistic to get rid of the industrial. She felt it was not legal and not really feasible and it would be better to let it change slowly over time so that they can have existing uses but not future new industrial uses. She stated that some of those pieces of land over time, up to 50 years, will wither away and something will happen.

Commissioner Gordon liked the idea, and asked how they zone for that to accommodate that transition.

Ms. Gould stated that it was a suggestion that they do not put community preferred retail, which is not the answer. She stated that you call it commercial recreation as the new use, and the existing uses can stay for as long as they want to stay which is the law. Over time, when new uses are introduced, it would be commercial recreation, on the ocean front side. She stated that, on the other side or eastern side of the freeway, they were talking about retail and housing.

Commissioner Evans felt it was a very good presentation, adding that he appreciated the details of spelling out how it works and the different alternatives mentioned. He thought it was a great idea to look at different alternatives. He stated that he keeps coming back to the same thing, which was the steepness of our hills. He looked at the map, and on Gypsy Hill, with Alternative A, they have hotel, visitor commercial and Alternative B, has the high density residential. He stated that they all know the area and stated that you can't even walk on the area so he asked how they can zone it to be anything but open space. He stated that there were also several other such areas. He reiterated that he was having difficulty understanding the recommendation of zoning an area which, if it came before the Planning Commission, they wouldn't approve it.

Ms. Gould believed there were some flatter pieces of the lot overall. She stated that they were not talking about developing the entire piece. She pointed out on the slide that there was the area that was purple which had a little part of it that was more flat than the rest and they could fit a hotel which would be a destination hotel that they come there for a view and a weekend off. She reiterated that they could fit something on a portion of it, but not all of it.

Commissioner Evans stated that the second part of that was that to put anything more than what we have would require cross traffic at Sharp Park, and there would be major changes to deal with on the site. He stated that he liked the idea of zoning everything, but he thought there were certain areas where it was going to be difficult to do anything with it.

Commissioner Leon asked if this was the appropriate time to get into details on specific properties or will they come back and have further deliberation.

Chair Campbell thought they should come back for further deliberation after they hear from the public and give them a chance to get in their comments and they can give them a choice to stay or not.

Mr. Winch then addressed the third topic about what they do with the coast, which was an intersection of environmental issues and the requirement of the Coastal Commission jurisdiction and the new issue of the potential for sea level rise.

Commissioner Leon mentioned that, within the last month or so, there was a scientific study, name unknown but by a nationally recognized scientific group, on revisions to the acceleration of coastal erosion and sea level rise, based on new studies of weather patterns, etc., and he was mentioning that to see if they were going to update any projections or maps pertaining to sea level rise or erosion or will Pacifica be seeking those types of studies when applications are made to guide us in decision making.

Mr. Winch stated that, before the General Plan comes out, they will make sure that it includes the most recent and relevant information. He thought there might be a need for Pacifica to be part of or undertake a more detailed study at some point.

Commissioner Langille found it difficult to look at some parcels, asking if the Carlson property was in that zone or not, and how do we plan for putting a lot of development on a parcel that may be subject to sea level rise. She thought it was useful to have parcel specific information regarding potential impacts, possibly a new mapping. She stated that we have lost land in Pacifica and she thought it would be helpful to have mapping of the land actually lost in the last 30 years which would be useful for the public. She felt a vulnerability assessment needed to be done at some point to allow much more effective land use planning. She acknowledged that we have the Pacifica Institute information and mapping costs a lot of money but she felt, with more information coming out, it was entirely plausible to leverage what other agencies were doing, such as Caltrans which has to deal with Highway 1 being susceptible to sea level rise. She felt that vulnerability assessment would be very helpful for Planning Commission purposes or public information.

Ms. Gould stated that it would not be possible for the General Plan to have that type of analysis, because it was at least \$250,000 to \$500,000 or more, basically more than half just for that. She stated that they had prepared these maps, but they were clearly not land use specific but overall, general, warnings, but not mentioning specific risks to specific sites. She felt that would require another funding commitment from the Council, which may or may not be possible.

Chair Campbell referred to talking about a landowner having to show adaptability to sea level rise, and asked if they were envisioning that they come in through FEMA for a LOMR or LOMF for the conditional letter of map revision to increase the site elevation through in fill or built on stilts or whatever and come in and get the FEMA maps changed for insurance purposes.

Ms. Gould stated that they were not necessarily thinking of the FEMA process because these weren't mapped this way on FEMA. The FEMA flood maps do identify some greater risk, but the other pieces of the area aren't FEMA NFIP but they do have some danger. They said that, if

they were changing their lot and intensifying, they have an individual study that shows it was not a risky area or a highly risky area, and exactly how much detail was involved and what it will cost would have to be worked out which would be a new potential requirement to have it studied.

Ms. Gould then addressed the last piece, public open space, which was almost 50% of the City.

Chair Campbell thanked them for the presentation which was extremely informative and well presented.

Chair Campbell opened public comments.

Todd Bray, Pacifica, stated that he had a couple of suggestions for language or caveats. He referred to the housing needs assessment numbers from ABAG, stating that he called ABAG and the numbers were not mandatory, because they could not legally force the City to have a specific number of units. A caveat has to be added, regarding the assumption that this was something that has to happen or be put in the report, stating that this was voluntary thing that the City was deciding to do based on numbers and was in no way a requirement by any state, county or federal agency. He also thought a caveat should be added for the statistical information being presented tonight based on the meeting in January, because anyone there felt it was rather confusing and a little out of shape. He thought there were strong statistical numbers being presented to justify certain things, and a caveat needed to be added to those statistical numbers saying that this meeting happened to be something confusing to most people and several people had asked that the meeting be done over. He referred to an attorney who had done a study on the quarry for the Peebles Corporation and, when he was asked what could be done with the quarry, his opinion was no project. He suggested several caveats, i.e., with the housing, it would be voluntary, and the statistics be qualified as not being a real number because of only about 100 people in attendance.

Samuel Casillas, Pacifica, stated that he had attended all the meetings for this, and he commended the consultants for their hard work and the time and energy that the Commission has put toward this. He felt they started from the wrong premise, especially from the standpoint where they needed Pacifica to be going. He felt that we needed to be building a destination economy based on our core assets which was open space. He felt that we needed to transition away from the bedroom community mentality which was not going to get us there. He mentioned the suggestion built into the plan regarding more multi-unit or in-law housing was a thorn in his side because he thought a recommendation needs to be done to outlaw and ban the in-law units, especially in the monster homes. He felt that was making Pacifica less affordable and cheapening the quality of life. He referred to the monster (mega) home ordinance, and stated that we needed to put some teeth in that. He stated that the recommendations, such as the Pedro Point recommendations, were ranked lowest of any and he didn't think it was something we should be doing, such as thinking about hotels in Pedro Point and more apartments. He commended the consultants for thinking about revamping the northern part of Palmetto Avenue to include commercial recreation with high density mixed use.

Jon Harman, Pacifica, thanked them for the opportunity to present his opinions. He was a resident of Pedro Point and was shocked at the recommendations of the consultants of a hotel and high density housing which were completely out of character with the Point that he and other residents know and want to preserve. He felt they were a neighborhood of individual homes and didn't have a lot of commercial, and putting a hotel and high density housing would destroy their neighborhood. He mentioned some other problems with the idea, such as access in and out of the



community which would burden the one road. He stated that their neighborhood lacks a park. By the recommendations for parks for neighborhoods, he felt they deserved a park, adding that he didn't think the beach functioned as a neighborhood park.

William Bradford, Pacifica, stated that he was there to speak about the East Fairway Park parcel above the baseball field. He thought he had heard some good news, but he wanted to add his comments. He felt that any development beyond what was currently allowed on that parcel would be a negative impact on the neighborhood. It was currently agriculturally zoned which allows one house with possibly a second unit. It also has a B5 overlay requiring one-acre lots. He stated that, with the Hillside Preservation formula and estimated a slope of approximately 30 degrees, he concluded that they could only disturb 1.36 acres, again one house and he believes that to be the best use for that space. He then shared some current marketing issues regarding the parcels, specifically that the last time the parcel changed hands was July 1, 2005 with a transfer value of \$700,000. On July 22, three weeks later, the property was put on the market for \$1 less than \$1.5 million. He stated that it has been on and off the market with the highest price at \$3.5 million and \$3.95 million. He then quoted the marketing information which suggested that the property could be rezoned and subdivided with great potential to build a cluster of townhomes, condos and apartments. He stated that whatever they develop will have a lot of pressure to exceed what they are allowing, and he suggested that they be very clear with the General Plan saying that one house can be built on that parcel, with the original price in 2005 being the true value for that single home lot.

Bruce Ferry, Pacifica, stated that he hoped to speak first and Mr. Breck Hitz to follow him.

Chair Campbell stated that they could both have their three minutes.

Bruce Ferry, Pacifica, stated that he was a board member of the Pedro Point Community Association and the Pacifica Land Trust. He stated that their association sent a letter and was going to read the letter with Mr. Hitz giving some background and explain how they came about putting the letter together. He then read the letter which applauded the undertaking of a comprehensive update of the General Plan but expressed the PPCA's concern about the recommendations for the Calson site, such as a hotel, etc., strongly opposing all recommendations.

Breck Hitz, Pacifica, stated that he was also a board member of the Pedro Point Community Association and the Pacifica Land Trust. He stated that their recommendation was to reject further review of any development of Pedro Point that violates the existing character and fails to comply with neighborhood park standards. They feel the shopping center should remain as is or possibly rezoned as commercial recreational where feasible. He explained that at their July meeting, the update for the General Plan was on the agenda and caused consternation among the residents, and they had another meeting at which they put together a general draft of the letter they just read and which was edited and sent to the community for approval before submitting to the Council.

Ron Calson, Pacifica, stated that he has owned the property for about 15 years. He mentioned some of the previous plans which never occurred. He was in general agreement with what has been said regarding the Pedro Point alternatives. He stated that he had submitted a plan for the property which would include a park and moderate to low density residential, and stated that the south end of the Pedro Point Shopping Center would also be a good location for a park,

mentioning some of the specific positive aspects such as complimenting the shopping center and acting as a staging area for coastal trail hikers, etc., and stated that the package also included an example of what was done at Stinson Beach. He also mentioned that the consultant's study didn't discuss any hospitality or retail at Pedro Point.

Michael Johnson, 340 Manor Drive, stated that he was new to this process. He mentioned his personal experience when his home was hit by an 18-wheeler and felt what should be mentioned was to improve the safety on the roadways and improve emergency evacuation for disasters, signage on Skyline restricting trucks, etc. He mentioned talking to a long-time resident who questioned why they didn't make Highway 1 a tunnel and not dissect the Sharp Park area but use that space on top as commercial, open space, from north of Manor to Palmetto.

Joanne Gold, Pacifica, stated that, as a resident of Pedro Point, she had the same comments as her neighbors. She was initially confused with the original recommendation for the Calson site land use designation. She stated that in parts of the General Plan, there were specific recommendations made that conflicted with the alternatives for the site, such as the required neighborhood parks based on numbers of residents, and the Calson site as a potential expansion of public open space and the overall approach for ensuring the unique character of neighborhood vacant infill sites, which does not violate the existing character of the neighborhood. This information causes her not to understand the recommended alternatives which include a hotel, mixed use residential or multi-family housing on the Calson site, and she asked the planners to fully consider land use designations that would maximize the opportunity for a neighborhood park at the Calson site and at least meet the General Plan standard of 2.5 acres of neighborhood park per thousand residents. She also encouraged them to revise the alternatives for Pedro Point development to comply with the existing General Plan standard which includes alternatives for open space and reject any alternatives that violate the existing character of the neighborhood, adding that she does not understand how the alternatives suggested could not fail to violate the character of Pedro Point.

Jim Odgers, Pacifica, stated that he would not like to see any more ugliness on Gypsy Hill Road. He felt it looked nice as it was, adding that there was now some construction going on up there and he hoped it would not rise too high above the treetops. He was unclear on the oxymoron of open space residential. He felt the quarry site was mentioned except in the beginning. He felt they had to be careful on what goes on there. He then thought there were a lot of vacancies in the hotels now, adding that he would really like to see an ocean view restaurant besides Taco Bell. He didn't see the need for new commercial development until the empties were filled. He felt Pedro Point was covered. He thanked them for using consultants instead of developers, stating that he was tired of the out of town vultures telling him that 50% open space needs to be raped. He felt that we lived here because it was beautiful.

Gil Anda, Pacifica, stated that he looked at the General Plan and had some concerns, specifically that this approach by the community may or may not have been realistic or consistent with highest and best uses. He felt that the neglect of our economic development was going to come at a cost. He stated that, in the last state of the City article in the Tribune, it was mentioned that our City was spending down its reserves in spite of making a lot of cuts. Another concern is the section on adaptation, using the premise of sea level rise, to condemn properties, take away a person's right to protect their property. He stated that the redevelopment of the west side of the wastewater treatment plant in Sharp Park was turned into a park and that was the most commercially valuable part of the property and he asked what opportunities they were taking

away. He felt that would cut a lot of the opportunities we have, and we need them. He stated that, in restricting the remodel and addition to properties located within the effected zones, one concern he had was the remodel of Nick's. The two things were a real concern. He referred to dissenting opinions on global warming and sea level rise, stating that he managed to find them from very credible sources, specifically mentioning Joanne Simpson, who died in 2010 and who was an award winning climatologist, and read her opinions on climate warming.

Karen Rosenstein, Pacifica, stated that she had more comments after the January meeting from people who were asking for a redo because they found it extremely confusing. She agreed with them, adding that any decision making data from that meeting would be highly unlikely to be duplicated again. She agreed with many comments she has heard from the public and from the Planning Commission and would urge caution on building on the hillsides. Rather than building commercial and high density type of low income housing on the shopping centers, she preferred that they redeveloped the present shopping centers versus going through another quarry battle in the town. She was unsure about what was the west end of Cattle Hill and would like that clarified at some point. She lived in East Rockaway and thought they might be talking about the same area. She stated that there was mention made of a neighborhood park in that area and she recommended that they talk with the neighbors in that area because they had great concerns about having that area opened up to the public in general. She agreed with the comment made earlier about the economic destination. She disagreed with John in that, for many of them, the beach is the park for them.

Victor Carmichael, Pacifica, stated that he has been involved with the development of the plan and he had some comments regarding the extreme north end of town, the area across from the northern dunes which was the Fish and Bowl area. He stated that they had struggled against the development for ten years because it was difficult to develop. He stated that it was stopped by the Coastal Commission because of the defined wetlands in the area. He stated that the fish part was zoned as low density residential, and the bowl part was high density residential, and development was going to go in the high density residential zoned area. His point was that they needed to look at rezoning the entire parcel low density residential which he felt they could get away with because the Coastal Commission has defined two areas in the fish part as wetlands and it makes the whole parcel difficult to develop. He acknowledged that they were mixed together and down zoned to medium density residential, mixing them together, but he didn't think that was appropriate for the area which was very unstable and part of a drainage going down to a ravine cutting into the highway, right by Joan Levin's house.

Sue Vaterlaus, Pacifica, stated she had gone to the General Plan meetings with one question being what we like about Pacifica, which was the open space and the beaches, which everyone loves. She stated that the question wasn't asked if we wanted to see more open space, adding that we would like more beaches but that was not possible. She then referred to the people on Pedro Point who were talking about the Calson land. She stated that there was a reason why it was called the Calson land, because he owned the land. She stated that, if they want a park there, they should buy it because the City cannot afford to maintain a park because we were losing money all the time and we don't have economic development which we need. She felt that we had tried to pass taxes to improve it but everyone felt nothing would happen, but now people have gotten fired because we have no economic development which we need and we need both economic development and a destination.

Julie Lancelle, Pacifica, thanked everyone for moving ahead with this important process which was a long time coming. She stated that she has lived in Pacifica for 25 years, adding that the previous General Plan took place prior to her moving here. She understood that it was a long process involving numerous public meetings for the public to have the opportunity to thrash out their concerns because the issues of development versus open space protection was longstanding in Pacifica. She felt it was difficult to justify the short period of time that this process was taking. She understood the financial constraints, but she felt they needed time to evaluate the alternatives as they have been presented, i.e., Fairway Park and Park Pacifica was considered open space residential, Fish and Bowl had serious habitat issues which came up in the previously proposed development. She felt that needed to be reviewed. She stated that we were all veterans of a number of battles which have taken place in this community and took up a lot of time and energy. She felt this was the opportunity to get it right and make appropriate zoning at the specific properties based on our previous experience. She was surprised by the high density at Pedro Point. She felt that was a single family residential neighborhood and the recommendation seemed inappropriate to her. Manor Drive was very low residential. She felt that access from Sharp Park Road to Gypsy Hill was extremely treacherous and it terrified her to think of some high activity use that had to be accessed onto that property from Sharp Park Road. She appreciated the trail planning map and the trail system idea.

Clorinda Campagna, 1 Gypsy Hill Road, stated she was an owner and a steward of Gypsy Hill. She wanted to be on record so anyone can see it, so she submitted a written response. She referred to a chart included with the letter on how the update of Gypsy Hill and the zoning would affect them. She felt that what she put was much more reasonable, i.e., very low density residential or low density and special use and she would like all the commercial to be removed. She stated that the open space residential be rezoned to very low density or low density residential. She then explained how they got commercial there at the insistence of the City, and added that they have been the stewards of that land since 1980. She stated that they had offered a portion of the area to the Land Trust but they denied it, which was why there were no public trails on the property unless they decide to do it themselves. They now proposed a retirement center, a retreat center, private homes and public open access, and they would like to see that in the future. She stated there was a lot more information in her letter for people to hear but there was no time.

Chair Campbell closed public comments.

Chair Campbell called a break from 9:03 p.m. to 9:10 p.m.

Chair Campbell referred to a comment made about ABAG goals for affordable housing, which were not requirements, and he asked staff for their view on that.

Planning Director White responded that they had a slightly different view of how much of it was a requirement. He stated that there was a state law requiring all jurisdictions to accommodate their fair share of housing, but not by physically building them but with policies and General Plan designations to allow that level of housing to exist in all the different income categories. They were currently including that in the draft of the housing element. He mentioned that there were those who tried to deviate from the statutory requirement and were shut down, giving an example of a county that was prevented from operating in a normal way because of inadequate housing elements. He felt this was serious and the laws were being ratcheted up, with the ABAG fair share numbers being statutorily required.

Chair Campbell wondered if the plan might benefit from that discussion, adding that he had heard from others that it was not clear to them as to the origin of the numbers and how mandatory they were. He thought the need for high density housing appeared to be driving some of the train, and it would be good to have that explanation.

Planning Director White thought it would be a matter how they achieve the number of units that they were allotted. Given that there was a scarcity of land remaining, the natural progression of thought was to look for areas that can accommodate a higher density to accommodate the number.

Commissioner Evans asked for clarification as to the requirement of park space per thousand people.

Planning Director White said that it was a different requirement and he would defer to the consultant.

Mr. Winch stated that it was a current General Plan standard, essentially a city goal to provide that level of parkland for residents.

Commissioner Evans asked if that meant it was not a requirement.

Mr. Winch agreed that it was not a requirement.

Commissioner Leon referred to the Fish and Bowl having an extension because it was wrapped up in the legal arena. He stated that there was an appeal for the required Coastal Development Permit on the project which was scheduled in court. He asked, if the appeal is denied and there is no Coastal Development Permit, where we would stand with zoning or planning on that property.

Ms. Gould thought the key was getting the decision, adding that she didn't know what that decision would be. She felt that would determine whether there is a mandated number or not.

Commissioner Leon thought that, whatever the underlying zoning is, if the Coastal Development Permit was not approved, anyone in the future would have to deal with that.

Ms. Gould responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Leon referred to the density transfer for the northern bluffs, and asked why we were entertaining a density transfer. He stated that the site had existing zoning and whoever has that would have an application that would be weighed on its merits and he didn't understand why a density transfer would be recommended.

Ms. Gould stated that it was not necessarily recommended but was an option.

Commissioner Langille referred to a reference in the staff report regarding the market potential and market analysis conducted for the General Plan update, stating that it was not part of what they were discussing but asked if it would be part of the General Plan.

Ms. Gould asked if it was a reference to the market analysis.

Commissioner Langille stated that it was on page 3 under Market Analysis conducted for the General Plan update.

Ms. Gould stated that they did conduct the market analysis and has been completed. They can read the full document which was released earlier. She added that it did encourage the hotels.

Commissioner Langille agreed with the comments that Pacifica needed to become more of an economic destination, referring to information in the staff report about how Pacificans aren't spending enough money in Pacifica and we need to support our existing commercial development and redevelop what we have. She mentioned having a lot of vacant store fronts, especially on the east side of Highway 1 between Vallemar and Rockaway with a lot of commercial space with easy access to the highway. She asked, as part of the Climate Action Plan Task Force, how we identify hubs where we have higher density housing, shopping and access to transit. She felt that will be looked at in the General Plan but it was important to her as part of the Climate Action Plan Task Force and the Planning Commission. She stated that we have a lot of issues with building new houses and identifying needs, but she has heard over the last couple of years that we need senior housing, and identifying areas where they would be appropriate would be great. She reiterated that we need a vulnerability assessment for the sea level rise. She referred to the report which said that the erosion model was approximate and not appropriate for partial specific land use planning. She acknowledged that we didn't have a lot of money but she didn't see how we update our local coastal plan without that information, questioning the possibility of getting grant funding, adding that it was essential to planning for land use and sea level rise. She referred to Pacifica becoming a poster child for coastal erosion in the last year, stating that we lost some units and would continue to lose units in northern Pacifica. She stated that we didn't want to be the poster child for sea level rise and coastal erosion but felt that we are going to be and she would like to see effective leadership in planning for that. She mentioned redevelopment and how important it was, acknowledging that there was new commercial development needed. She stated that, in looking at the parcels and hearing comments from everyone, she was reminded that a lot of the parcels didn't have houses on them because a lot of them were difficult to build, with some areas being extremely steep or due to habitat and drainage issues. She addressed a few, i.e., Fish and Bowl was more appropriate as low density residential, and northern bluffs as open space residential. Upper Monterey and Manor were really steep and some development can be appropriate, but upper Monterey seemed more appropriate for very low density residential. The Manor site was extremely narrow and dropped off, and it was hard to tell if it was open space residential or very low density residential but it was hard to picture anything more than a couple of houses. She thought Fairway Park's proposal was updated but seemed appropriate as open space residential which was what it was now. On Pedro Point upper slopes, it was one of the more beautiful neighborhoods in Pacifica, being mentioned as a great place with diversity in housing styles, but in the winter there was water running down the streets and never planned for effective drainage. She felt anything besides very low density residential or open space residential at the upper slopes would be inappropriate, with open space residential as most appropriate. She agreed with the proposal of medium residential or low density residential on Linda Mar Boulevard, adding that there were plans proposed before and they haven't been successful due to being over planned. She agreed with Park Pacifica hillsides as open space residential or keeping the current designation which are appropriate. In the Alternatives, because there was never a lot of constraint analysis done at the quarry site, Alternative A was very optimistic. She thought a combination of Alternatives B and C was appropriate. She stated she would like the focus to be on the Palmetto area, looking at transit hubs and where they can have higher density housing to go hand in hand with commercial, along with the recommendations of

regional planning and the Transit Authority. Going back to the quarry, she stated that she thought of the Asilomar Conference Center which was on one of the slides, adding that she thought of that and stated that she didn't know if Pacifica could handle some high end hotels. She stated our vacancy rates were already problematic, adding that she knew they had done the market analysis which said hotels would be appropriate, agreeing that there were certain places in town where they were appropriate. She referred to the Pedro Point Calson property, mentioning the water rushing onto the property. She thought there was a creek there at some point and it was wetlands until the berm was built. She felt the City has ignored the drainage issues and not very nice looking ditch. She thought it used to be a creek and wetlands, and thought it would be nice to have the natural values restored to the east part. She felt that commercial was not appropriate, although she didn't know if it was very low density residential. She thought a park was appropriate but she didn't have the answer to what was best. She liked the recommendations for Linda Mar, the higher density housing and housing above retail. On Gypsy Hill, she thought everyone would agree that commercial was inappropriate, citing the traffic concerns. She didn't know if the traffic concerns would fit a small scale retreat center but it would be great to have public access on that site. On 1-6, she would go with the existing recommendations. She also thanked them for the great trail map, adding that she didn't know how we would pay for the under passes or over passes, but agreed that we needed them. She would like to implement everything on the map.

Commissioner Gordon appreciated the feedback from the public. He felt the great thing about Pacifica was the wide range of opinions, referring to the comments made about the third meeting and whether any statistics were drawn from that meeting in January.

Ms. Gould stated that she had heard from people about concerns regarding the meeting being confusing and from others who had a good time and felt that the reactions were all over the map.

Commissioner Gordon referred to statistics that the consultants had presented regarding the various alternatives on the quarry and Palmetto and asked if that information was based on the responses from that meeting or an earlier meeting.

Ms. Gould stated that they were drawn from that meeting. She thought that they have to take it as feedback from a meeting and was valid, but agreed that it wasn't the only answer and the numbers were not precise but were merely input.

Commissioner Gordon referred to someone asking where the west end of Cattle Hill was, and he was also not clear and asked for clarification on it.

Mr. Winch demonstrated from the presentation, stating that it was directly opposite the quarry site on the other side of the coast highway.

Commissioner Gordon stated that, prior to the meeting, he thought the discussion would be centered on the quarry, but all the input centered on Pedro Point and the Calson property. He asked for some feedback regarding the thinking that went into the recommendations, and the Calson property in particular.

Ms. Gould referred to the comments about the 2 ½ acres per community which was a goal but not a requirement and very few neighborhoods come close to meeting the park standards. She didn't think it was a fair issue, but it was an issue on that property because, now, it was zoned for

commercial recreation or retail, and they were trying to be more flexible and allow some low to medium density housing, some open space and a hotel. They thought it was big enough to have all three of those uses, but acknowledged that input from the community was all over the map. The Commission will need to listen to everyone and make a final recommendation.

Commissioner Gordon then referred to Gypsy Hill, stating he liked Ms. Campagna's vision of the property more than what was being recommended. He stated that they all drive Sharp Park Road and have all had death defying experiences driving down it and they get concerned about traffic issues and bringing more uses onto the area. He was open to the consultant's thought.

Ms. Gould stated that they were recommending a hotel, adding that there were a lot of different kinds of hotels. She stated that it would be a destination site and would generate more traffic than at present but she didn't think it was a high use because they would only be using a small piece of the land. She stated that they could take another look at the access, suggesting that they might need to build a new access. She acknowledged that it was not flat, but it was flatter than the rest of the site.

Commissioner Brown agreed with a lot of the statements expressed. He thought it was wonderful that people had done their research and came to share their opinions. There were disagreements but it was a civil discourse in the early stages of getting to a General Plan. He appreciated all the work done so far and thought the detail was impressive and they have shown themselves to be pragmatic. He thought they were hired to put their opinions out there. He felt the real focus was on the economy and balancing that with why people live in Pacifica. He liked the emphasis on a city center, which was missing from Pacifica. He also liked the trails, especially seeing it as a way to connect the city which he explains to friends as being five canyons and the trails are ways to get around and visit other neighborhoods. He referred to the questions about the data being based on about 100 attendees. He stated that he was in the business of making conclusions from financial and operational data and he wondered if there was a way to get a few more points of view besides 100 out of 14,000 (approximately 40,000) because he wouldn't want to make a recommendation to the City Council without a larger database to look at. He would be more comfortable if they could put this on line and allow polling to get that number up to a statistical significance. He asked if that has been considered.

Ms. Gould stated that there was \$10,000 in the scope of work for a survey of some kind, which could be done. Until now, they had felt like the questions were general, with some complicated, and putting out a general survey would not necessarily get them the right answer. She reiterated that there was money and it was worth talking about what they want to do and at what point. She thought they might be ready to do it now, whereas earlier she didn't think they would have gotten answers they could use.

Commissioner Brown stated that was good to hear. His second question pertained to the definite constraints that faced some of these neighborhoods. He recalled looking at Gypsy Hill and the math indicated that the amount that could be developed on the lot was 0 sq. feet, given the steepness of the lot. He then mentioned the quarry, and the likely constraints that a third or two-thirds would have to remain open space. He asked if there was a way to bring a little more of those constraints into the General Plan process.

Ms. Gould asked if he meant assigning a more realistic number to the buildable land in the quarry site.



Commissioner Brown stated that he meant not just the quarry site, but other sites that were very steep, mentioning the site on Manor where they were proposing higher density housing but it was a deep slope and a narrow spot that could be developed. He asked if he was crossing the border into that zoning.

Ms. Gould agreed that he was crossing the border a little. She stated that they couldn't do a site analysis on every site because that would not be a General Plan. She suggested that they could look at the slopes again and decide if there was a flatter piece that could be developed. She thought the answer was yes, but that would be as far as they could go. She thought they had gotten some answers on the Rockaway/quarry piece and they will get some more which may basically say that two-thirds of the lot needs to stay undeveloped versus one-third, and that means they could fit some development there and that was it.

Commissioner Brown asked if the alternatives would stay as they are to be consistent, or will the alternatives be modified based on the findings.

Ms. Gould explained that, at this point, they had the three alternatives, and they were asking them to make recommendations for the final alternative and they have put actual language and they would like to vote in some way at this time.

Commissioner Brown understood that it was through those lines, based on the recommendations. He remembered reading the market analysis but he could not find it, and he asked them to remind them as to where it was found.

Ms. Gould asked if it was on the website.

Ms. Claycomb thought that is was where it was.

Commissioner Brown asked if it was entitled Market Analysis.

Ms. Gould stated that it was economic analysis by EPS.

Commissioner Brown stated that a few questions have come up around that and was making sure that the public had that information available if they want to visit it. He referred to his comment about the economy, and he agreed that the hotels were attractive to develop for the hotel transient occupant tax. He felt that the market analysis helped him get comfortable with some of the recommendations seen at this time.

Ms. Gould stated that they had a hotel economy now that hits one benchmark in terms of cost, but the idea was that there were other types of hotels and other costs that could be added. She asked the Commission if they were willing to go through their questions and ask if they generally agree or disagree with their sense of the issues.

Chair Campbell felt that the public raised a lot of interesting points and he was still digesting what they raised and felt that he needed to explore some of the issues a little bit more. He might need a little more time before he votes, based on the questions raised. He asked about the timing.

Ms. Gould stated that they were supposed to be at the Council at the end of September or early October. She stated that they would need to schedule a separate meeting but it would be with

staff only because they didn't have the money to come to a second meeting. They could meet with staff and then give the Council their final recommendations. She explained that they were asking based on the PowerPoint and they weren't asking for the number of units, etc. She stated that, on the Council slides, they will put that it was basically what they heard from the community and what they know about the site itself.

Chair Campbell stated that he would take suggestions, but he wondered if that might not be possible to have this vote at the next meeting with staff and have an up and down vote on the alternatives based on this meeting and their research over the next couple of weeks.

Ms. Gould stated that it was not on the alternatives but based on the recommendation, piece by piece.

Commissioner Leon agreed, stating that he liked to be thorough and complete in his analysis and thinking. He stated that the original timeline was scheduled to be finished last year and we were already behind the final timeline for completion. He thought there was plenty of latitude to continue to have an opportunity to give it their full consideration. He stated that he had comments on some of the items that were easier for him to speak on, and he would like to get into the process. He thought that one way was to look at the way it was presented which led to some confusion. That thinking was to have only three alternatives with multiple components. They could also look at it another way because each location was identified on each of the alternatives and they could look at it site specific with all three alternatives in that format and look at a different range of possibilities. He felt that would give more value to the decision. He stated that, with the bigger picture, he would like to digest the public comment and fine tune his preparations for the next meeting. He was prepared to give comments now or wait for other commissioners to respond.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he had a question on the density transfer on the bluffs. He asked for the status of density transfer in that area now, mentioning that there were receiver sites and transfer sites. He was part of the Open Space Committee as they were going through that but he didn't remember the density transfer status of the bluff area was at this point in time. He asked if it was a site that can density transfer already.

Ms. Gould didn't believe that they already had a density transfer place. She stated that it was an idea and it didn't have to be applied there and was not currently applied now.

Commissioner Clifford stated that, if it was not already one, he was concerned about adding to the already existing density transfer sites. He thought there were a certain number of receiver sites and a certain number of sending sites already identified and he was uncomfortable with adding more to that. He thought that some of that land can continue to be developed, adding that there was a lot of engineering that can take place to allow development of the existing sites. He then stated that he was excited about the idea of the transit villages, especially the one on Linda Mar and he had been pushing that idea for years himself. He was excited to see that incorporated into this. He also believed that Palmetto should be the primary focus as a downtown destination, coupled with the Chamber site. He was uncomfortable with the idea of giving up on the beach front and turning it into open space. He would like to see if there was a way to continue to develop that.

Ms. Gould asked if he was talking about Rockaway.

Commissioner Clifford clarified that it was the wastewater treatment, with the Chamber as part of that. He referred to the sea level rising, and stated that there were engineering situations that can take place. He stated that, on the Mississippi River, all of the large casinos were essentially large barges that float and there were similar developments in Holland where they have entire subdivisions that can float. He didn't think it was out of the question that the area could be developed with structures even though the ocean was going to rise in the next 100 years and be underneath them. He reiterated that the structures can meet the requirement of being able to withstand sea level rise. He was not willing to label it open space. He was a little concerned about the idea of a hotel on Gypsy Hill. He will read and look at it some more but, for now, he was very concerned about any high traffic in that area. He felt it was a low density residential area and he didn't think that a hotel was a good fit up there. He loved the trail map, and he thanked them for that. He added that he would like to see those trails developed over time. He was hearing from the other commissioners that they would probably continue this to digest the public input and what the Commissioners said to each other.

Commissioner Gordon understood that they were voting on everything on the slides where a recommendation was requested, and he counted ten.

Ms. Gould stated that those were the specific ten related to the commercial areas.

Commissioner Gordon stated that he also counted residential and he counted ten overall.

Ms. Gould stated that the residential had eight themselves.

Commissioner Gordon thought they were cleverly combined into one slide.

Ms. Gould reiterated that there were eight.

Commissioner Gordon thought they were talking about 18 or 20 different recommendations.

Ms. Gould stated that it depended on how they want to do it, adding that one was much smaller than the other.

Planning Director White stated that there were a number of ways to forward recommendations to the City Council. Because of the way this was set up, there were specific recommendations being made based on the comments he has heard at this meeting. He stated that, for some of them, they were in general agreement and there wasn't going to be much discussion about a different recommendation from the Planning Commission than what the consultants were already offering. He thought the concentration should be focused on the area where there was not complete agreement and, if they can come up with statements or alternate recommendations, they can convey those to the City Council in a rational way. He felt should they focus on the areas of disagreement it may be easier than dealing with 18 or 20 individual recommendations.

Commissioner Gordon saw the value of hashing it out with the consultants present and, if they push it to another meeting, they won't.

Planning Director White agreed, stating that, if they have questions only the consultants can answer, they won't be there.

Commissioner Gordon stated that, based on the late hour, it could be grueling. He was thinking that they dive into the areas of disagreement while they have the consultant and get the feedback and take a vote or not, depending on how the discussion goes.

Commissioner Evans stated that he liked most of the ideas and he agreed with the idea of hitting the ones they aren't happy with because those were the ones they would be hearing about. His two major points are Gypsy Hill and Pedro Point areas. Referring to Gypsy Hill, he pointed out that the Planning Commission has turned down projects there because it was on a ridgeline. He stated that, if it came before them again, he would not support it. He felt low density housing was fine, even a retreat center of some sort, but he didn't see any kind of commercial or retail happening. For Pedro Point, he pointed out that they had 16 speakers and they did a fantastic job getting their points across with most of them as residents of the area were in agreement. He then stated that, if they were to divide the Calson parcel into standard lots, it would be a maximum of 48 lots. He liked some of the ideas he heard and agreed it should be developed to some point, with housing being a major issue in relationship to the ABAG requirements, but he was not sure about high density housing there. He commented that they were having problems with commercial and retail and he was hesitant on anything like that. He would like to see low density housing with some park feature. He thought the experts came up with some good ideas and he would like to see more of that, but not medium or high density with commercial or retail. He liked the idea of mixed use in the shopping centers. He thought they could put housing on top of the shopping center in the middle of town that was dying. He thought the idea of mixed use in all the shopping centers was a great idea because they had the parking for it, adding that Manor had a lot of high density housing behind it. He thought the northern Palmetto industrial idea was perfect, commenting that they have been tumbling over that for quite a while. He realized it was late but he thought they needed to come up with something for the consultants and he was in favor of going through a couple of them to give something to them instead of not having them back the next time.

Commissioner Leon started with the Fish and Bowl, stating that he would like to see lower density on the parcel.

Ms. Gould asked which one he was referring to.

Commissioner Leon stated it was #1. He then pointed out that, in the existing and future residential areas map, there were eight properties listed and only the first two give the current General Plan designation, i.e., #1 and #2, and #s 3 through 8 do not. He thought it created a complication.

Mr. Winch stated that they did provide the existing General Plan and they were in their packets.

Commissioner Leon then mentioned northern bluffs, open space residential with no density transfer. With upper Monterey, they had proposals there, mentioning that it was HPD and they have had negative calculations along Hickey and Monterey. He felt the HPD had value there. On lower Manor, he questioned whether they could build a road there. He felt that should be HPD, and they should know if they were able to put a roadway there, stating that on going further than 250 feet they would have to put a fire truck turnaround and he didn't know if that would fly. On Milagra Canyon, he suggested open space residential with HPD overlay. On East Sharp Park, Talbot was a ridge and sloped on both sides and highly visible from Highway 1, and he thought they made a mistake not putting that in HPD because it was a problematic street and a dead end.

He would like to see that at the lowest density. On Gypsy Hill, around Clarendon and Francis, he thought you could have a little increased density and take advantage of some below market rate issues. He believed all of the ridgeline should be zoned either very low density or open space residential to match all the rest of the HPD in the area. He commented that Sharp Park Road was a scenic highway and Gypsy Hill was all HPD, and there were very specific requirements for view, view sheds, scenic highways, referring to the scenic outlook there which he thought was the only one in Pacifica on a highway. He felt commercial was totally inappropriate there, adding that they had the area coded as a wildlife movement corridor and a high value further analysis needed prior to development. He thought they were spinning their wheels, adding that it would lend to consistency and promote the open space and natural topography of Gypsy Hill by making it all the same. On Fairway Park, it was zoned OSR and he didn't see a problem with that one, which was #5. He thought they could keep the current General Plan designation on the undeveloped slope. Across the way at Bradford, he thought there were some very low residential and that was fine. He mentioned that there was some duplex housing there.

Ms. Gould stated that it was just the one little piece.

Commissioner Leon agreed, adding that there were some duplexes behind the Moose Lodge.

Ms. Gould stated that they were only talking about the Moose Lodge.

Commissioner Leon stated that the parcel the consultants were talking about could be considered low density residential, depending on whether they were on the higher number on low density residential.

Ms. Gould reiterated that they were only talking about the Moose Lodge site, and she asked if it would be LDR or MDR.

Commissioner Leon stated that he didn't have the specific size and didn't know what the potential was when you apply MDR and LDR, and he thought LDR would be okay. He thought it would go 9-15 units per acre.

Mr. Winch stated that it would be medium density.

Ms. Gould also stated that it would be medium density, not low.

Commissioner Leon agreed to MDR on that parcel. On #6, the upper slopes, he felt they want to keep those as low as possible. On Linda Mar, low density residential with medium on Linda Mar. On #8, open space residential. He stated that they heard him on the commercial for Gypsy Hill along with his reasons. He stated that, with the shopping center at Oddstad and Terra Nova, there was opportunity with a lot of ground and there were already a lot of multi-unit properties in the area. On the other commercial, he would come back after he hears what his fellow commissioners have to say. He stated that he was one of the people who thought there was confusion at the third meeting and even the consultants acknowledged that, commenting that they have to live with that, referring to page 3-14 dealing with West Sharp Park and one on page 3-15 dealing with Pedro Point. He thought that was the value of the public testimony and their deliberations to help work through that. He agreed with Commissioner Brown's suggestion of spending a little extra and getting some more data beyond the 100 samplings before it goes to City Council. He also felt that, somewhere between Alternative B and Alternative C for the

commercial, would be the way to go for Pacifica. He wasn't sure how extensive the study was, but he thought West Sharp Park and East Sharp Park had the greatest ingress and egress of any location in Pacifica with secondary roads, overcrossings, etc., unlike most of Pacifica with only one way in and out, and that was an important piece.

Commissioner Langille stated that was what she was trying to do earlier when she went through all the designations. She thought, procedure wise, doing an up and down vote was more confusing than to hear from each of them individually then find consensus, especially for the residential. She thought if they vote and don't agree, then they could take a vote on to what they agree on, or would it make more sense to hear from the individually. She stated that the commercial area alternatives were confusing because the recommendations are a mix of A, B and C, giving an example of the West-East Sharp Park addition of an elementary school program at Oceana High School campus and she had never noticed that before. She thought saying generally what they think as far as the commercial area alternatives, they might not capture what they feel. She thought the residential was fairly straightforward but the recommendations on commercial alternatives were a mixture. She would like feedback from others on how they would go through those individually, whether by areas, etc.

Ms. Gould suggested that they go through each one, such as the easy residential ones, and then the commercial ones, and at least if they have an idea that the consensus was that they were on the right track or they were not, then they would know what areas they have to focus on.

Chair Campbell agreed with that approach, referring to sub issues, like the elementary program at Oceana, because he thought at some point their recommendations need to carry through as recommendations and they don't need to debate every fine point. He agreed that they go through the general classifications and, if they have finer points to make, maybe there is another vehicle to deliver those.

Commissioner Brown thought he ended up where he was headed. He stated that they have 18 recommendations, and suggested they go through them one at a time and, while voting on each one, they could say they are for the recommendation with the following modification. He just felt that some systematic way of getting through this was required.

Ms. Gould asked if they were suggesting at this meeting or at another meeting.

Chair Campbell thought they should do it tonight.

Commissioner Brown suggested they get into it and set a deadline.

Chair Campbell thought they needed to keep it general and not get into every fine point. He thought they could possibly get into a finer point at another meeting but go through the general alternative at this meeting.

Commissioner Clifford asked about the commercial recreational for North Palmetto, and he asked about how the industrial sites would be reclassified as commercial recreational, he was wondering how they protect the property owners. He mentioned that they had them in for a study session on rezoning the area, and the issue came up that, if the Commission makes any changes even though they become non-conforming, they would have problems getting loans to function as businesses there. They wouldn't want to place them in a hardship situation by changing the designation and

then they can't go to the bank to keep their business. He was concerned about what kind of policy they make that would or attachment to the General Plan that would protect them in their existing businesses or existing land use.

Ms. Gould stated that they had two choices, leaving them as commercial industrial and ask for improvement standards on the front line or make the bigger leap to commercial recreation but all industrial businesses can clearly stay, with the zoning written clearly.

Commissioner Clifford thanked her for the information, adding that he had remembered all their concerns of what would happen to their businesses if they did anything with the zoning in the area. He loved the idea of making it more user commercial as opposed to the industrial sites, but he did have a problem with harming the existing businesses. He stated that they walked away from that study session because of their concerns.

Ms. Gould suggested that they start and see whether they are going anywhere.

Chair Campbell stated that he would take one more comment then they would close off this phase and go to a vote.

Commissioner Evans asked for the Director's comments on what they should do next on procedure.

Planning Director White stated that it was their hope, which he mentioned earlier, that they concentrate on the areas with disagreements between the recommendations by the consultant and their collective view. Based on any possible alternative recommendation, they could convey that to the Council. He thought it looked like that was the direction they were headed and he hoped they could do it in a timely way and reach the finish line.

Ms. Gould stated that, for the Bowl and Fish site, they recommended that they maintain medium density zoning.

Mr. Winch stated that it was not zoning, General Plan designation.

Ms. Gould indicated the pertinent areas on the slide.

Commissioner Leon asked for more detail because the areas indicated on the slide were less than what was in front of them.

Mr. Winch then explained the prior specifics on the bowl area, concluding that it was indicating high density and they were scaling it down to medium density. The fish site had medium residential in the General Plan and zoning was for low density residential and they would be sticking with the lower of the two.

Commissioner Leon stated that they had already mentioned it a few times that the density transfer was optional and he would not be in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that they were saying no density transfer.

Mr. Winch stated that they were not talking about the northern bluffs, but the Fish and Bowl.

Chair Campbell stated that on #1, match to the lower of the General Plan or zoning.

The consensus was in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that #2 was the bluff sites and they were recommending that they change the designation.

Mr. Winch stated that it was for open space.

Ms. Gould stated that there was no transfer of development rights program that applies and it is proposed as open space residential with no TDR.

The consensus was in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that #3 was where they were matching the zoning of HDR along upper Monterey and LDR and very low residential south of Manor Drive.

Mr. Winch stated that they had an LDR parcel at Manor Drive and in the canyon very limited.

Ms. Gould stated that low density was the predominant zoning with a middle small piece of bright yellow that is the low density. She reiterated that it was predominantly very low density residential south of Manor Drive with high density residential along Monterey.

Mr. Winch stated that it was important to keep in mind that this didn't mean that ultimately development is going to actually be able to take place at this density because other considerations remain, such as slope considerations.

Commissioner Leon thought it would be easier to deal with it if they split it in two.

Ms. Gould agreed, stating that on Monterey they recommended HDR.

The consensus was against this.

Ms. Gould asked about the very low density residential south of Manor Drive.

There was no consensus.

Ms. Gould asked what they would have that was lower.

Commissioner Leon suggested open space residential. He asked if he could make a motion for open space residential; Commissioner Evans seconded that motion.

The consensus was in favor of that option.

Planning Director White asked if there was general disagreement about upper Monterey, and he asked if they wanted an alternative recommendation.

Commissioner Langille suggested very low density residential.



Commissioner Leon mentioned that they had experience with those properties because they are in HPD and the calculation defaults to minus and that would tell him that they would give it the lowest density which would be open space residential. He made a motion for open space residential; Commissioner Langille seconded the motion.

The consensus was in favor of that option.

Ms. Gould stated that #4 would be taken separately. On Talbot Drive, they proposed to raise it from the present LDR in the current General Plan to HDR.

Mr. Winch stated that it would match the zoning designation.

Commissioner Gordon asked if they were making the HDR proposals to be in compliance with ABAG requirements.

Ms. Gould responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Gordon stated that, as they vote no, they were creating a political or policy issue for the City.

Planning Director White explained that they were creating a potential numerical problem based on the draft housing element which was not yet done.

Commissioner Gordon stated that they have to get HDR somewhere.

Planning Director White thought, depending on recommendations and tallying the numbers, that they would have to point out what that means in terms of how it affects what they have already calculated. He wasn't saying that they should or should not make decisions based on that but there will be a reconciliation that will have to take place.

Commissioner Gordon stated that, in a sense, recommending HDR for upper Monterey even though it could never be built there was being able to show that they were in compliance in terms of intent.

Planning Director White agreed, but it was yet to be determined whether the state would actually accept that because they want feasible building sites, not just theoretical. The analysis on that was debatable.

Commissioner Leon thought Talbot ran to Eureka Square and he thought the concern was that the upper reaches of Talbot where it was most visible with a ridgeline was the area that makes sense to have the lower zoning designation. He suggested picking a point that differentiates the most visible ridgeline portion of Talbot and give the higher density down lower where the multi-units were and it transitions from a high density apartment type construction to single family construction, and they could have higher density in the higher density blocks and lower density in the lower density blocks.

Mr. Winch responded to his suggestion.

Commissioner Leon states that it was a situation where you try to make a designation for Talbot and then it becomes an issue because the higher reaches were highly visible and he didn't think that was conducive to high density.

Ms. Gould stated that they were only talking about the small upper area.

Mr. Winch stated that they were talking about the parcels on lower Talbot, just up slope from the shopping center or just behind the shopping center.

Commissioner Leon thought it would have to be specifically mentioned that way.

Mr. Winch stated that they were talking about that, and had specifically mapped the parcels on which they were voting.

Commissioner Leon asked that the minutes be clear on that.

Ms. Gould asked if they were changing the decision on Talbot Drive and if so asked that they vote again. So, she mentioned that Talbot Drive was high density on the small piece behind the shopping center.

The consensus was in favor.

Ms. Gould then mentioned #4b, very low density residential, open space residential on the flank of Gypsy Hill. She referenced the slide and asked how many said yes.

The consensus was in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that they would take Fairway Park separately, with VLDR above Fairway.

Mr. Winch stated that they had changed their recommendation based on community input, and asked if they should vote on the new recommendation.

Ms. Gould suggested they try that one first.

Mr. Winch stated that they adjusted their recommendation to say open space residential on that parcel which was a step down from very low density residential.

Ms. Gould reiterated that it was open space residential on the piece east of the freeway.

Commissioner Gordon asked that she announce the votes after they were done.

Ms. Gould stated that it was 7-0. She stated that it was medium density residential on Bradford Way, immediately to the south of the freeway and was a very small site where the Moose Lodge is.

Planning Director White stated that it was 7-0.

Ms. Gould stated that #6 was Pedro Point on the upper slopes and they recommended that they match the General Plan.

Commissioner Brown asked that they mention the General Plan designation.

Mr. Winch stated that it was open space residential.

Ms. Gould stated that it was 6-1. She then mentioned that #7 was Linda Mar Boulevard and it was LDR in the current General Plan and was zoned for open space residential, and they were proposing LDR with MDR along Linda Mar Boulevard.

Planning Director White reported the vote was 4-3.

Ms. Gould stated that #8 was to match the General Plan which was currently OSR and zoned for low density residential and proposed for open space residential in all three of the blue parcels.

Commissioner Brown asked clarification if that was with the yellow parcel.

Mr. Winch stated it should be open space residential.

Ms. Gould stated that they should all be green where the blue circles are.

Planning Director White reported the vote was 7-0.

Ms. Gould thought that was helpful, although it was the easier of the block. She stated that she would skip alternative A, B, C, and she didn't think it would matter, since it was about the individual sites and what they were doing. She went to Rockaway Beach and quarry. The recommendations for those sites were the three at the bottom of the slide, open space likely required, permitted use of hotel and retail also public, with residential use requiring a public vote, which was as much as they know now.

Mr. Winch added that the first slide was the quarry only, with the second slide had recommendations about Rockaway Beach District, lower Rockaway.

Ms. Gould reiterated that it was only the upper big circle, the quarry site itself.

Commissioner Gordon asked if there was any change from the existing conditions.

Mr. Winch stated that what really governed development now was the specific plan.

Ms. Gould stated that they were putting uses, open space and residential use which was clearer than the specific plan which allows them to develop the entire site.

Commissioner Leon liked this approach. He stated that they were looking at three alternatives, full development, limited development and minimal. He asked if that was what they were voting on.

Ms. Gould stated that they were making a recommendation that may not be one of the three alternatives, and they were voting to say open space is likely required, permitted uses for hotel and retail and also public use, and the residential use requires a public vote. That was all they knew at this point.

Commissioner Langille asked confirmation that they were not going by the previous map where it showed pink areas.

Ms. Gould stated that the previous map did show that, mostly green, some developable.

Commissioner Leon thought it was very confusing because they have been studying maps and voting on maps, and the public has been studying and voting on maps, and now this was different. He thought changing at this stage was not advised.

Ms. Gould asked if he wanted to take the recommendations themselves.

Commissioner Leon thought that would be the honest thing to do.

Ms. Gould stated that it was the three recommendations.

Commissioner Gordon was not clear on what they voting.

Ms. Gould stated that they were the three recommendations at the bottom of the slide.

Commissioner Leon asked what the recommendation was at the bottom.

Ms. Gould stated that they were giving data and the recommendations were the three dots below.

Mr. Winch stated that the recommendation he was asking about was residential use requires a public vote, acknowledging the existing fact.

Commissioner Leon stated that they had been studying three maps with three alternatives and he thought they should be consistent and show their preference to those three.

Ms. Gould understood his dilemma but the problem was that they didn't get one of the three.

Commissioner Gordon asked what she meant.

Ms. Gould stated that they didn't know about the side distance along the creek and the only thing that they know now is that they were going to need a lot of open space, certain uses are permitted and residential requires a public vote and that was all they know now.

Commissioner Leon stated that the alternatives that they have been looking at are not valid right now.

Ms. Gould responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Leon stated that this was the only option they have, this or no option.

Commissioner Brown understood Commissioner Leon's position, but he thought what they were trying to accomplish was to move the conversation forward to what has been discovered since those maps have come out and that was how they were at this recommendation. He thought it would be a step backwards to stick to going to the original drawing because this was a move

forward. He understood that this was pretty much the only option available to them at this point, and that didn't always sit well.

Commissioner Leon stated that he was trying to get to the point that this was, in fact, the only option and he was making his statement for the record so that anyone making decisions beyond this body will have the full context of what they were doing.

Ms. Gould stated that they heard him.

Chair Campbell stated that, if they were not interested in Alternative A and only interested in Alternative B, this option holds nothing and he would have to vote against it.

Ms. Gould stated that the recommendations were on the lower portion of the slide.

Commissioner Leon stated that, if they made no recommendation, this would still be the only recommendation.

Ms. Gould stated that there was nothing now that requires a half to two-thirds of the site to be open space.

Chair Campbell stated that they could vote on this.

Commissioner Langille thought that, as long as it is on the record, she was not voting for a combination of A and B, but as long as that is clear, she thought they should give this a different name.

Ms. Gould suggested Alternative D.

Commissioner Langille stated that she was fine with that, because she didn't want to go on record as voting for the combinations.

Ms. Gould asked that they raise their hands if in favor of Alternative D.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 7-0.

Ms. Gould stated that there were three other parts. The Rockaway Beach District was the one next to the ocean, and she asked if everyone agreed that they were retaining existing zoning, which includes commercial recreational close to the ocean.

Commissioner Leon was confused, and asked where they were in the balloon.

Planning Director White stated that they were in the middle.

Commissioner Leon asked if they were in the redevelopment area, not in the quarry.

Ms. Gould responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Leon stated that they were in Alternative D because they didn't have a combination A and B.

Ms. Gould suggested they make it Alternative E.

Commissioner Langille stated that there was a choice on revitalization of Rockaway Beach and she asked how that fits in with the area, Rockaway Beach/quarry. She asked if that was not part of this, adding that she would like to see Rockaway Beach revitalized and it was there as a choice but she didn't know how to mix it in or thought it might be on all three alternatives.

Ms. Gould stated that it would include some revitalization, but it was not tearing down, rebuilding or redoing, rather improvements.

Commissioner Langille read that it retained current zoning including commercial recreation close to ocean.

Ms. Gould added that it would include modest improvements to existing buildings.

Commissioner Leon asked if they were just dealing with the Rockaway Beach District bullet or are they also going to include lower Rockaway.

Ms. Gould stated that it was one at a time.

Commissioner Evans asked if that would include the mixed location.

Planning Director White responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans asked, if they voted for this, whether it would change any of his plans for a large redevelopment.

Planning Director White responded that it would not because it was essentially status quo.

Commissioner Evans stated that Ms. Gould was saying that it was small or minimal development.

Ms. Gould asked if they want to modify it so they all agree.

Commissioner Evans didn't want to constrain anyone who was wanting to make a major commitment to the town.

Ms. Gould suggested that they add retain current zoning including commercial recreation close to ocean and improve or replace existing buildings.

Commissioner Evans agreed with that.

Mr. Winch stated that the current zoning allowed all of that to take place and, by maintaining current zoning, it didn't mean they were maintaining the current built environment forever.

Ms. Gould stated that she has added the text.

Commissioner Evans stated that he just wanted to be clear on that.

Ms. Gould asked that everyone vote.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 7-0.

Ms. Gould stated that Alternative F was lower Rockaway, visitor commercial, allowing hotel and restaurant.

Mr. Winch stated that they were talking about the rock site and Sea Bowl site.

Ms. Gould stated that the multifamily housing was on the Fassler site. She suggested that they do the Sea Bowl and rock sites first.

Commissioner Langille asked if the rock was the prominence, whether it is buildable or not.

Ms. Gould reiterated that it was visitor commercial allowing hotel and restaurant at Sea Bowl and rock.

Commissioner Brown asked how it was currently zoned.

Mr. Winch stated that the General Plan was simply commercial because part of what they were doing was proposing a more detailed distinction between commercial areas. The zoning was C1.

Ms. Gould stated that this would be more specific to be hotel and restaurant.

Commissioner Brown asked about the housing element location.

Ms. Gould stated that they would do that separately. They were on lower Rockaway, first dot.

Commissioner Evans stated that he wanted to be clear that this would not affect any of the existing commercial sites, such as where they are putting in a brand new restaurant.

Planning Director White stated that it was consistent with that because it allows a restaurant.

Commissioner Evans stated that he did not want to change anything in the middle of the stream.

Ms. Gould reiterated that it was for a hotel and restaurant.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 6-1.

Ms. Gould stated the next was for the multi-family housing on the Fassler site which was dark brown on the north side of Fassler.

Commissioner Brown asked how it was currently zoned and in the Plan.

Mr. Winch stated that the current zoning was C1, commercial now.

Commissioner Leon stated that the intersections were notoriously overloaded. He read the revised Chapter 6 (Existing Conditions Report) traffic and we still have major traffic issues there.

Planning Director White stated that a good copy was coming.

Commissioner Leon stated that he didn't think it was a good location, depending on the density and size, but thought multi-family covered a lot of territory. He stated that they had gone through two projects which were approved and have not been built, one at 20 units and the other at 15. They went through exhaustive traffic analysis on those, and he was uncomfortable with changing that to multi-family because of the cumulative impacts to the approved projects there now and the changes exist at both Roberts Road and upper Fassler.

Chair Campbell thought Commissioner Leon made a great point.

Ms. Gould asked how many were voting affirmatively.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 0. He asked if they wanted to see if there was an alternative recommendation.

Ms. Gould asked if there was an alternative.

Chair Campbell asked if anyone wanted to entertain an alternative motion.

Ms. Gould stated the east side of Highway 1 would be service commercial with landscape frontage required and could also be retail commercial.

Chair Campbell asked what the current zoning was.

Mr. Winch stated that it was General Plan commercial and zoned C2.

Chair Campbell asked again what the change would be.

Ms. Gould stated that it was really the same thing or less.

Commissioner Langille asked whether it was not more restrictive, stating that she didn't want it to be any more restrictive for those sites.

Ms. Gould stated that it was not more restrictive in terms of use. For a new use, it would require a 5-foot landscape frontage.

Commissioner Langille thought she was saying that it would not limit the type of commercial.

Commissioner Leon asked if they were talking about highway frontage landscaping, because they already have a landscape requirement for any application, although on a commercial zoned parcel they probably have a zero setback if it is all commercial. He asked confirmation that it was a 5-foot minimum.

Ms. Gould stated that this would be Alternative G, with a 5-foot minimum landscape and the vote was 7-0. She promised that they next ones would be easier. The next was West-East Sharp Park. She stated that they could vote as a group or separately, but the idea was Palmetto was pedestrian main street. On the old wastewater treatment plant, they put open space on the ocean side and all of the uses suggested by the building Beach Boulevard property development evaluation were still included.



Commissioner Evans asked if they were saying open space park like setting for the west side of the development.

Ms. Gould responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Evans concluded that you could not build anything there.

Ms. Gould responded affirmatively. It didn't say how deep the space was, but it was correct.

Commissioner Evans stated that they were going into a big discussion on the development of that land and he was not in favor of that.

Commissioner Clifford stated that, if they were going to vote on them, he would prefer to vote on them individually because, voting together, he would vote against it because of the open space on the old wastewater treatment plant, adding that there was a lot there on which he would want to vote yes.

Ms. Gould stated that they could go one at a time.

Chair Campbell suggested that they could suggest an alternative now and vote on it, and that would be vote for everything there except that they take out the second dot about creating open space.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he would still prefer to vote on each one individually. He acknowledged that it would be more time, but he felt there was a lot there.

Ms. Gould mentioned pedestrian oriented mixed use main street.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 7-0 in favor.

Ms. Gould mentioned the open space on the ocean side of the site.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 0-7 against it.

Ms. Gould mentioned the potential uses on the third bullet.

Commissioner Leon stated that, from a planning standpoint with this bullet, it would make sense to include the library property because it was a good chance that library would relocate and it was an adjacent property. He has seen drawings in past considerations where the two were combined with a skyway connection on the second floor to join the two properties to give additional leeway for development opportunities.

Ms. Gould suggested that they vote for it as a separate bullet. The existing bullet was hotel/restaurant, etc.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 7-0 in favor.

Ms. Gould referred to Commissioner Leon's suggestion.

Commissioner Leon reiterated that they extend the same use across to the library property.

Ms. Gould stated that the vote was 4-2 in favor.

Commissioner Gordon stated that he might vote for it, but he didn't know what he was proposing.

Commissioner Leon stated that the Hilton Library was adjacent to the wastewater treatment plant, and they could join at some point with an overcross or some other design feature. He mentioned seeing such plans and it would greatly extend the use of the wastewater treatment property.

Ms. Gould asked if it was an overcrossing.

Commissioner Leon stated that they extend the use across and then let the designers design whatever they want. He thought there was a potential for pedestrian only or restricted walk use only during certain days or hours.

Ms. Gould thought they were getting to a finer level of detail.

Commissioner Leon agreed, adding that the bigger picture was to extend the potential use of the property to an adjoining city property.

Ms. Gould agreed. She stated that it was only 2 in favor. The next site was office and/or commercial along both sides of the Highway 1.

Mr. Winch stated that it would basically be like Alternative B along the avenues. He stated that it has C1 zoning.

Commissioner Leon asked if they were calling it Alternative B.

Mr. Winch stated that they were just being more specific.

Ms. Gould asked about office or commercial.

Commissioner Leon stated that he had one issue with this one because we have open space on the ocean side.

Ms. Gould stated that it was a separate vote. This was the first bullet only, office and commercial. The vote was 7 in favor. On the second bullet, possible housing at the east end of Eureka Square site.

Commissioner Leon asked if it was Alternative C.

Mr. Winch stated that the idea was to provide an opportunity for residential development in close proximity but set back from the freeway.

Chair Campbell asked how far the setbacks would be contemplated.

Ms. Gould stated that it would be a minimum of 150.

Chair Campbell asked how this was a change from what was existing.

Ms. Gould stated that it was not currently zoned for residential.

Commissioner Langille asked where this was located based on the Oceana Market.

Mr. Winch stated that it was that shopping center site.

Commissioner Langille asked if they were planning on changing the shopping center to residential.

Mr. Winch stated that the idea was to look at the site as a potential long term redevelopment site.

Commissioner Leon asked if it could be mixed use.

Mr. Winch responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Leon stated that it would have to be specifically stated mixed use.

Commissioner Langille stated that people had expressed a lot of concern that it would be residential.

Commissioner Brown asked if the proposal in front of them was stated as mixed use.

Ms. Gould thought it needed to be clarified. The proposal was mixed use on the back half because you cannot put it right next to the freeway.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 6-1 in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that, on northern Palmetto, you can either vote for leaving it industrial or vote for commercial recreation.

Commissioner Gordon suggested that they vote for their proposal first.

Ms. Gould stated that the first one was industrial business may remain.

Commissioner Gordon thought she was proposing that they change it to commercial recreation with existing uses grandfathered in.

Planning Director White thought they were voting on the third bullet first.

Ms. Gould stated that they can vote on the third bullet first. Commercial recreation is appropriate over the long term, given the risk to ocean rise, industrial uses may remain. The vote was 6-1 in favor. Vote on: northern Palmetto, adding landscaping in front.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 7-0 in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that, at the base of Milagra Ridge, on the other side, they propose retail or office frontage and housing upslope, Alternative A.

Mr. Winch stated the zoning was presently C1 on the entire property.

Commissioner Langille asked where it was from the new commercial downhill from Milagra Ridge, the Connemara.

Mr. Winch stated that it was to the south of the new commercial at Connemara.

Commissioner Leon asked if it was behind the Pacifica Flower Pavilion and behind the Chapel.

Commissioner Brown asked if that housing would be HDR.

Mr. Winch stated that it was what they had recommended.

Commissioner Leon asked what the housing was.

Commissioner Brown stated that it was HDR.

Chair Campbell stated that it was HDR housing fairly close to the highway.

Commissioner Leon stated that there was a senior housing project there.

Mr. Winch stated that it was the same idea, and they would apply the same concept.

Ms. Gould asked who was in favor.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 6-1 in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that #7 and #8 do not have a choice.

Chair Campbell thought that should make it easy.

Ms. Gould stated that, for Pacific Manor, community preferred alternative. It would improve the existing shopping center, also allowing redevelopment.

Chair Campbell stated that they were going to take a break while the station changed the tape, from 11:05 to 11:10.

Ms. Gould stated that, on Pacific Manor, they would take them one at a time, first, improving the existing shopping center.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 7-0 in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that the next was support for mixed use development which would allow housing. The vote was 7-0 in favor. The next was that residential uses should be at the west end of the site or to the ocean and shielded from the freeway. The vote was 7-0 in favor. The next was that retail could be added fronting Palmetto Avenue and Highway 1. Chair Campbell needed clarification on that.

Mr. Winch stated that the idea was that there were options for the shopping center site and they were leaving them open, explaining that they could have upgrades or permitted mixed use redevelopment. He clarified that, if they permitted mixed use redevelopment, then the housing component would be toward the ocean side and away from the freeway and there would be retail fronting Highway 1. He suggested they picture a new site and the current parking lot at Pacific Manor would have retail development.

Commissioner Langille asked if the Safeway shopping center would have it.

Mr. Winch stated that, if in the long term the whole shopping center had redevelopment, this is the kind of site planning it would be.

Ms. Gould reiterated that it would be retail along Palmetto Avenue by Highway 1.

Commissioner Leon thought it would front it, but there was no parking on Palmetto because it was the freeway off ramp coming south on Highway 1.

Ms. Gould clarified that they would be putting buildings alongside the freeway.

Commissioner Leon stated that there would be no stopping and no ingress on Palmetto.

Commissioner Evans stated that you have the two streets.

Ms. Gould stated that you could get in off of Palmetto.

Commissioner Leon stated that you can get in off of Manor or Aura Vista.

Ms. Gould added that they could get in off Palmetto, explaining that it wouldn't be all the way along necessarily.

Commissioner Leon thought that was something they could look at.

Ms. Gould stated that it was a possibility.

Commissioner Gordon was confused. He stated that, if they voted for it, how would it translate, and would it be a change in zoning.

Planning Director White stated that it would be a site design issue, such as where certain uses would be located on the site.

Ms. Gould stated that you would be taking away some parking.

Planning Director White reiterated that you might be reorienting parking. It assumes a redevelopment and it dictates where the uses might be in the future, such as commercial along the freeway frontage and residential behind it.

Chair Campbell didn't think this was something he could vote on at this late hour without more specifics.

Commissioner Langille stated that she would pass on that one.

Ms. Gould put it down as a no vote. She stated that they only had two left, but this was a hard one. First with Linda Mar on Crespi, this was a high density housing with or without retail.

Commissioner Leon asked where it was on Crespi.

Commissioner Brown stated that it was where Roberts Road was.

Commissioner Evans asked if it was on the south side of Crespi.

Commissioner Langille stated that it was across from the post office.

Commissioner Leon asked if it was behind the senior center.

Mr. Winch stated that this was thinking long term down the road for potential redevelopment of the storage parking lot and a small shopping strip mall.

Commissioner Gordon thought this was changing this from commercial to residential.

Planning Director White stated it would be mixed use.

Commissioner Leon stated that it was mixed use, with high density housing and with or without retail.

Chair Campbell went down asking each Commissioner individually, starting with Commissioner Evans going for mixed use, Commissioner Leon stated that he would go high density with retail or the same as mixed use.

Ms. Gould stated that it was mixed use on Crespi Drive.

Commissioner Leon stated that he would not vote for it with the "or" in there. It would have to be "with."

Ms. Gould stated all housing with retail.

Planning Director White stated that they then voted 7-0 in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that the second one was the current bus lot and they would be putting a building with housing above, that is, housing above retail, and accommodating parking for transit. She stated that it was wider than it looks.

Commissioner Clifford stated that it was right behind Dave and Lou's. Caltrans has a building, and it is a park and ride and the buses pull in their all the time. He has been advocating for that for years so he is voting for it.

Chair Campbell asked whether they want housing there.

Ms. Gould stated that the idea was to get a transit site and it was right next to the freeway. The vote was 6-1 in favor. The next was a small additional retail frontage in Linda Mar shopping center, and you could add some stores along Linda Mar Boulevard.

Mr. Winch stated that was essentially no change to the current situation.

Ms. Gould stated that the existing center stayed the same but you could add a little bit of retail.

Commissioner Evans asked if they were talking about the side parking lot alongside Safeway where you could add retail.

Chair Campbell thought Commissioner Leon made a good point in that all the votes have huge caveats to them because they have to be harmonized to existing zoning and parking requirements, etc., and this was very rough. He stated that was stated for the public's information.

Commissioner Langille referred to her earlier comment about senior housing, and they haven't done anything specific, and she thought about the high density housing with or without retail on Crespi, and asked about plugging in senior with retail.

Planning Director White thought it was possible.

Ms. Gould stated that they might not be able to decide this one now.

Small additional retail frontage vote 7-0 in favor.

On Pedro Point, the first piece was retail, possible hotel at the Pedro Point shopping center. She stated that if there was no consensus for bullet one, they can say that.

Commissioner Leon asked her to repeat that information.

Ms. Gould restated that it was retail and possible hotel at Pedro Point shopping center.

Commissioner Gordon asked if it was changing the existing zoning.

Ms. Gould stated that it was possible hotel, and it has no hotel now. It would require a redevelopment.

Chair Campbell stated that existing zoning was just retail and this would be a change to add a hotel. He thought they could vote but might want a second vote to have a stronger vote than just not agreeing.

Ms. Gould asked about a vote as written, acknowledging that there was no vote in favor.

Commissioner Leon stated that he could see the potential for additional retail, especially with proximity to surfing activity. He was aware that the existing surf shop had a proposal to try to develop behind the shopping center and that was a larger project with multi-uses but he thought that would be recreational retail there, visitor retail with the proximity to the beach.

Ms. Gould asked if it was just retail, not hotel.

Commissioner Leon would like to see some kind of visitor serving there because the location was the best for that. He referred to the term of boat docks and then stated that there was residential and all the docks on the water were referred to as boat docks but we have no visitor serving commercial on the boat docks. He stated that he sees surf paddlers on the ocean and he felt we could have some type of surf serving business on the water or in close proximity and this was the closest to the water that he is aware of.

Chair Campbell thought that was a good idea but they need to bring it back.

Commissioner Leon stated that he was stuck more on some kind of visitor serving retail that takes care of the recreation.

Commissioner Langille agreed with Commissioner Leon that she did not see a hotel, but did see visitor serving commercial. She would love to see a restaurant with an ocean view, but someone told her that Fresh and Easy had a difficult time with the Coastal Commission trying to get the building a certain way. She reiterated that she would like to use the ocean view, and didn't know if a second story was possible. She felt that the whole shopping center seemed to be facing the wrong way and not using the ocean view.

Ms. Gould asked if they want to have a vote on retail and restaurants.

Commissioner Gordon stated that the area had so much potential and was not being used for the reasons as mentioned by the other commissioners. He thought it was a wish list. He thought, with the right hotel, he could rally around it, as well as the right restaurant. He thought maybe the language needed to be changed to be broader and not so hotel focused. He thought it was a great area for visitor serving redevelopment.

Ms. Gould suggested that they keep going because it needs more work.

Chair Campbell would say no to a hotel. He thought the efforts for the hotel should be either at the Chamber site or the southern end of the quarry.

Ms. Gould thought it was for retail and restaurant.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 7-0 in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that, on Pedro Point, they had three things that go together, medium density residential, hotel and public park. She questioned that they will come to an answer on this.

Chair Campbell stated that he would likely abstain on this.

Commissioner Evans was not for any major building on that site, especially a hotel because he didn't think that was the correct place for a hotel. He thought low density housing and park like setting were fine, and he was even concerned about medium density.

Commissioner Leon agreed, thinking something at a lower density was appropriate, something planned out with open spaces, something with access. He stated that they have had proposals on the adjacent property. He would like to see something go in there, but he would like to leave it open, possibly a planned development so that they can have a study session with an applicant and



see what gets proposed. He felt this was one site that they would want to have a study session on to have a back and forth.

Ms. Gould agreed.

Commissioner Langille wouldn't repeat what she said before, but she wanted to clarify that it was five acres and not ten acres as was mentioned by someone.

Mr. Winch confirmed that it was about five acres.

Commissioner Langille thought low density was 3-9 units per acre, so it depends on whether there are a lot of units or not. She didn't think a hotel was appropriate, but she didn't know if they could agree on a classification for residential.

Ms. Gould thought they were just getting a sense at this point.

Commissioner Gordon stated that they had gotten correspondence from the property owner with a couple of drawings in it, and he mentioned that the Stanford development plan had a mixture of assisted senior living and single family residences, as well as a community green and park and a visitor's center and that was along the lines of what he would see as compatible.

Ms. Gould acknowledged his comments. She then suggested that they leave it at that and take it up again or send to City Council.

Commissioner Brown asked for the current zoning of that lot.

Ms. Gould stated that it was currently commercial recreation, with only hotels and stores, but no housing permitted now.

Commissioner Brown thought all of them were in favor of some housing on that lot, and asked if they could move in that direction, possibly to something that works out to around 50 houses.

Commissioner Langille thought that was too much for that site. She knows Pedro Point pretty well.

Commissioner Brown asked what the numbers were per acre.

Commissioner Langille stated that the low density residential was 3-9 per unit and very low density would be up to 5 acres per unit (5 units per acre).

Ms. Gould didn't think they would find a number now. She was hearing that all of the commissioners have some interest in housing.

Commissioner Langille thought limited residential with a neighborhood park.

Commissioner Brown thought they all have interest in housing and none of them have interest in a hotel.

Chair Campbell stated that they at least have that with a big asterisk next to limited housing.

Ms. Gould agreed, stating that they didn't know the number. She stated that #6 (at the Park Mall) was a big site but the proposal was just one mixed use of residential with small retail at the ground floor. She asked if everyone was saying yes.

Commissioner Brown asked where the senior housing assisted living facility was.

Commissioner Leon stated that it was to the south.

Planning Director White pointed out that the location on the slide.

Ms. Gould asked if everyone was in favor of #6.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 7 in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that #7 was the existing horsing lot and the idea was to maintain.

There was consensus in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that #8 was the Gypsy Hill hotel. The overall recommendation visitor commercial open space residential was Alternative A. She didn't know if they agree or not.

Commissioner Evans asked if they were splitting these up to vote.

Ms. Gould stated that the first two go together, the commercial and open space residential. She stated that it was the last three that were separate and clear, hotel and/or conference center on upper portion of Sharp Park and open space residential on adjacent downslope parcels.

Commissioner Langille asked clarification and suggested that they take out the word conference center and small hotel.

Chair Campbell thought they were going to vote up or down first and then propose alternatives.

Ms. Gould assumed the vote was 0-7 against.

Commissioner Leon moved that they vote a very low density residential on the upper in place of commercial; Chair Campbell seconded the motion.

Planning Director White stated the vote was 7-0 in favor.

Ms. Gould concluded that it was no commercial, then stated that the second portion was open space residential on the adjacent downslopes.

Commissioner Leon asked if that was the current zoning.

Mr. Winch stated that the current zoning was AB10 which was very low density.

Commissioner Leon concluded that this would be the same density.  
Planning Director White stated that the vote was 7-0 in favor.

Ms. Gould stated that they were unbelievable. She had a very good feel for changes they needed to hear where they didn't agree. She didn't think they needed to go through the other two because these were the two that were most straight forward.

Chair Campbell thanked the consultants for their patience and time. He think there may be more specific comments en route once they study the comments they heard today from the public on the finer points.

Ms. Gould asked if they would be meeting again.

Planning Director White stated that the next regular meeting was September 6, and they haven't nailed down the date for the City Council. He asked if the Commissioners were anticipating delivering comments individually.

Chair Campbell was thinking along those lines rather than having a public meeting.

Planning Director White assumed it would be for fine grain comments.

Ms. Gould asked that their fine grain comments come in within two weeks.

Chair Campbell stated that he was willing to entertain alternate suggestions.

Commissioner Leon stated that one thing they were going to decide, time permitting, was whether they were continue to have discussions to maintain a focus on the existing conditions. One thing that would be helpful would be expedited copies of the minutes of all the proceedings to have ample time. He appreciated the efforts of the transcriptionist as well as the staff.

Planning Director Campbell stated that they would do their best.

**COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Gordon moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:40 p.m.; Commissioner Leon seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina  
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

---

Planning Director White