

**CITY OF PACIFICA
GENERAL PLAN**

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Planning Process and Scope of Planning Study..... | 2 |
| Planning Area..... | 3 |
| Population and Household Estimates 1960-2000..... | 5 |
| Relationship With Other Agencies..... | 6 |
| Goals, Policies and Action Programs..... | 11 |
| Goal Statement..... | 12 |
| Circulation Element | 13 |
| Safety and Seismic Safety Element - Policies and Action Programs have been incorporated into the revised Element | |
| Scenic Highways Element..... | 15 |
| Conservation Element | 16 |
| Open Space Element..... | 17 |
| Noise Element..... | 18 |
| Housing Element - Policies and Action Programs have been incorporated into the revised Element | |
| Community Design Element..... | 20 |
| Community Facilities Element..... | 21 |
| Land Use Element..... | 22 |
| Coastal Zone Land Use Plan Policies..... | 23 |
| General Plan Land Use Definitions..... | 32 |
| Land Use Element - Description by Neighborhood..... | 35 |
| Fairmont..... | 35 |
| Westview-Pacific Highlands..... | 36 |
| East Edgemar-Pacific Manor..... | 37 |
| East Sharp Park..... | 37 |
| East Fairway Park-Vallemar-Rockaway..... | 41 |
| West Linda Mar..... | 45 |
| Linda Mar..... | 47 |
| Park Pacifica..... | 48 |
| Sphere of Influence..... | 49 |
| Coastal Neighborhoods..... | 51 |
| Fairmont West..... | 51 |
| West Edgemar-Pacific Manor..... | 57 |
| West Sharp Park..... | 64 |
| Sharp Park Municipal Golf Course-West Fairway Park- Mori Point-Rockaway Beach..... | 72 |
| The Headlands-San Pedro Beach..... | 80 |
| Pedro Point-Shelter Cove..... | 84 |
| Other General Plan Elements..... | 90 |
| Circulation Element..... | 91 |
| Scenic Highways Element..... | 94 |
| Historic Preservation Element..... | 95 |
| Community Facilities Element..... | 96 |
| Seismic Safety and Safety Element..... | 98 |
| Policies..... | 110 |
| Action Programs..... | 111 |
| Conservation Element..... | 114 |
| Noise Element..... | 119 |
| Open Space and Recreation Element..... | 121 |
| Community Design Element..... | 139 |
| Amending the General Plan..... | 142 |
| Adoption..... | 142 |
| Addendum: Housing Element. | |

**CITY OF PACIFICA
GENERAL PLAN
MAPS**

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Regional Location Map..... | 4a |
| Neighborhood Boundaries Map..... | 5a |
| Adjacent Jurisdiction Map..... | 10a |
| Fairmont Land Use Map..... | 35a |
| Westview-Pacific Highlands Land Use Map..... | 36a |
| East Edgemar-Pacific Manor Land Use Map..... | 37a |
| East Sharp Park Land Use Map..... | 40a |
| East Fairway Park-Valleymar-Rockaway Land Use Map..... | 44a |
| West Linda Mar Land Use Map..... | 46a |
| Linda Mar Land Use Map..... | 47a |
| Park Pacifica Land Use Map..... | 48a |
| Fairmont West Land Use Map..... | 56a |
| West Edgemar-Pacific Manor Land Use Map..... | 63a |
| West Sharp Park Land Use Map..... | 71a |
| Sharp Park Golf Course-West Fairway Park-Mori Point- Rockaway Beach Land Use Map..... | 74a |
| The Headlands-San Pedro Beach Land Use Map..... | 83a |
| Pedro Point-Shelter Cove Land Use Map..... | 89a |
| Select Street System Map..... | 90a |
| Circulation Map..... | 91a |
| Trails Map..... | 91b |
| Bicycle Routes Map..... | 91c |
| Scenic Highways Map..... | 94a |
| Historic Sites Map..... | 95a |
| Community Facilities Map..... | 96a |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| Water System Map..... | 96b |
| Geology-Generalized Map..... | 98a |
| Geotechnical Hazards Map..... | 98b |
| Fire Hazards Map..... | 111a |
| Fire Station Response Time Map..... | 111b |
| Noise Contours Map..... | 119a |
| Visual Characteristics Map..... | 139a |

INTRODUCTION

The 1980 General Plan for the City of Pacifica represents a major review of planning options for the City. In developing this plan, the nine mandatory elements were considered, including: land use, circulation, scenic highways, housing, noise, conservation, open space, seismic safety and safety. In addition, community facilities, history and community design also were considered. The Policy Plan contains the recommendations of each element. The Land Use Plan represents the conclusion of the interaction among these element studies. Findings of each element are included in the Plan document so that persons using the Plan are aware of the major influences of each of these subject areas.

The General Plan program in Pacifica also included preparation of a Local Coastal Land Use and Implementation Plan (LCP). Conclusions of the Coastal Land Use Plan are included in the General Plan Report as proposed land use for the area west of Highway 1, which has been designated by State law as the Coastal Zone. These land use descriptions are more detailed and oriented specifically to Coastal Act policies. Consistent with the intent of the 1976 Coastal Act, planning in the Coastal Zone includes more detailed recommendations than are required of general plans.

Requirements of the Coastal Act, including procedures for implementation, amendment and action, make it advisable to present the Coastal Plan in a separate report which will be certified by the State Coastal Commission as Pacifica's Coastal Plan. In terms of State Planning Law, the Coastal Plan may be considered a Special Area Plan as provided in Section 65450 of the State Government Code. The recommendations of the Coastal Land Use Plan are consistent with those of the 1980 General Plan and for this reason, the land use portion of the Coastal Land Use Plan is included for purposes of environmental impact review.

PLANNING PROCESS AND SCOPE OF PLANNING STUDY

Citizen participation was an integral part of the development of the 1980 Pacifica General Plan. Three public workshops, a series of public forums and joint Planning Commission-City Council study sessions were held. In addition, at least two meetings were held with each of eleven neighborhood groups. From this widespread participation evolved the first draft of the Plan which was reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council.

To help achieve broad-based, informed and representative public input into the formulation of Pacifica's 1980 General Plan, a great deal of information was accumulated, organized, analyzed and presented to City officials and the general public. This information was contained in the following documents:

- The General Plan Background Report, September 1977,
- The Coastal Plan Background Report, April 1978,
- The Coastal Plan Access Component, May 1978,
- The Coastal Plan Demonstration Area Plan: West Sharp Park, September 1978,
- The General Plan Elements:
 - Circulation, July 1978,
 - Scenic Highways, February 1978,
 - Community Facilities, February 1978,
 - Noise, March 1978,
 - Housing, March 1978,
 - Conservation, March 1978,
 - Historic, April 1978,
 - Open Space, March 1978,
 - Community Design, March 1978,
- Three Workshop Workbooks, June 1977, November 1977, June 1978,
- Three Workshop Feedback Reports, June 1977, December 1977, June 1978.

These documents were an essential part of the process. The factual information contained in them was the basis of the Plan. The conclusions, in terms of Plan designations, working policies, and objectives, will be pre-empted by the adopted Plan documents. However, these reports should be approved by the Council as an essential part of the data base and background for Pacifica's 1980 General and Coastal Plans.

PLANNING AREA

Pacifica is located on the Pacific coast side of the San Francisco Peninsula, three miles south of San Francisco in San Mateo County. The City is framed by the ridges of the Coast Range on the east and the Pacific Ocean on the west. The City is an attractive combination of secluded valleys and open hillsides set against a coastline of long beaches and rugged headlands.

Originally visited by the Portola expedition in 1769, the area remained primarily agricultural until after the San Francisco earthquake in 1906. Land speculators, stimulated by the construction of the Oceanshore Railroad, subdivided and developed a series of small coastside communities. Several of these communities and the nearby post-war housing tracts formed the community incorporated in 1957 as the City of Pacifica. The Sixties saw rapid residential development which began to wane in the Seventies.

Regional access is via Highway 1 which, in turn, connects to Interstate Highways 280, 101, 80 and 17 and State Route 35. Through the northern half of the City, Highway 1 is a four-lane freeway. South of Sharp Park Road, the highway becomes a four-lane arterial with unregulated access, climbing south of the City across Devil's Slide to the unincorporated villages of Montara and Moss Beach. Residents of these communities must go either south to Half Moon Bay, or north through Pacifica to cross the coastal ridge to San Francisco or the northern Peninsula.

Nearly 90 percent of the City's residents drive to work and over half work in San Francisco with another third working in San Mateo County. Pacifica is basically a bedroom community, but it also is attractive as a close-in recreation area. Fishing and the beach are the primary recreation attractions. On peak beach days (about ten spring and fall holidays and weekend days), the area is crowded, but use during the rest of the season is moderate. During the foggy summer months and during the winter, beach use by outsiders, except for pier fishing, falls off almost entirely.

Neighborhood integrity has special significance in Pacifica. Although recognizing their interdependence, each of the original community desires to protect those characteristics which make them unique. The Neighborhood Map shows the rather large number of neighborhoods in the City and also denotes the Coastal Zone.

In 1976, 37,300 people lived within the 12.2 square miles of Pacifica. As with most communities, the Seventies have shown a decline in the birth rate, the population has become older, the number of children declined by 34 percent, and the number of residents of working age increased. Between 1970 and 1976, the household size decreased from 3.56 to 3.06. The aging of the population and decline in birth rate account for some of this decline, but in Pacifica's case, the shift in new construction from single-family to multiple-family units, which traditionally house smaller households, is also an important factor. In 1970, 87 percent of the City's housing stock was single-family; by 1976 this had declined to 79 percent. The majority of the apartments and multiple unit structures were located in the Sharp Park and Edgemar neighborhoods.

As would be expected in a predominantly single-family community, 72 percent of the households own their housing units. In 1976, about a third of the City's housing units were over 20 years old, and in the neighborhoods of Vallemar and Pedro Point, over half the housing was older than 20 years.

Pacificans tend to think of themselves as transient. Available data indicates that in 1976, 42 percent of the households had lived in the City more than five years. The greatest turnover occurred in those areas with the most rental units. The average tenure among renters appears to be one to three years and among homeowners, five to eight years.


Housing condition data is inadequate for most areas except West Sharp Park where a detailed housing survey was undertaken as a part of coastal planning. The 1970 Census data indicates that Edgemar, Sharp Park, Vallemar and Pedro Point have about ten percent of their housing stock needing attention. In West Sharp Park, 29.6 percent of the housing stock is classified as deteriorating. This coastal community, as well as East Sharp Park, have been designated target areas for the City's Community Development Act Housing Assistance Projects.

Future population size will be determined by the number of housing units available and the size of the households occupying them. With most of the easily-developable land having been used, most of what remains are individual lots, steep slopes and ridgelines. The General Plan is directed at the future use of these areas.

A conservative¹ estimate indicates a household size of 2.88 by 1980, 2.80 in 1985, 2.77 in 1990, 2.76 in 1995 and beyond. The impact of this decline is striking when one considers that the 12,480 housing units in the City which housed 37,300 persons in 1975 will house only 32,800 in 1995. The new units added to achieve the residential development shown in the Plan will not have nearly the long-term population impact foreseen in 1969. The 2,520 to 4,520 additional residential units anticipated in the 1980 General Plan will result in a holding capacity of 41,300 to 46,800. This population could be achieved as early as 2000.

1. Based on a trend line or linear extension into the future of the recent population growth pattern.

Regional Location




**POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD ESTIMATES
1960 - 2000**

| Year | Population | Households | Population per Household |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1960 | 21,440 | 5,520 | 3.88 |
| 1961 | 22,900 | 5,880 | |
| 1962 | 24,590 | 6,320 | |
| 1963 | 26,540 | 6,820 | |
| 1964 | 29,020 | 7,480 | |
| 1965 | 31,440 | 8,160 | 3.85 |
| 1966 | 32,780 | 8,620 | |
| 1967 | 34,130 | 9,030 | |
| 1968 | 35,400 | 9,510 | |
| 1969 | 35,790 | 9,710 | |
| 1970 | 36,020 | 9,890 | 3.64 |
| 1975 | 37,300 | 12,480 | 3.15 |
| 1980 | 38,000-39,000 | 13,200-13,500 | 2.88 |
| 1990 | 39,500-42,500 | 14,300-15,300 | 2.77 |
| 2000 | 41,300-46,800 | 15,000-17,000 | 2.75 |

Source: John Cone.
Ironsides and Associates, 1977.

PACIFICA NEIGHBORHOOD BOUNDARIES



 Ironside & Associates
Planning Consultants

RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER AGENCIES

Pacifica interacts with a number of other agencies on a regular basis. This section reviews the influence of those agencies on the City and the relationship of the General Plan to those agencies.

Daly City

Daly City is Pacifica's municipal neighbor to the north. Most of the area adjacent to the shared City boundary is developed compatibly with single-family land uses. In a major earthquake along the San Andreas Fault, the local streets connecting these two cities, Palmetto and Westline, would become the only evacuation route for residents of the coastal neighborhoods of Daly City.

The two cities are working on an Automatic Response Agreement between their Fire Departments. This arrangement would allow Pacifica's Fairmont Station to respond directly to fires in the Westlake Palisades-Terraces Neighborhood of Daly City and Daly City personnel to respond directly to fires in Pacifica's Westview and Pacific Highlands areas. Implementation of an Automatic Response Agreement requires action by both City Councils.

The two cities share detention facilities located in Daly City's Civic Center. The future of this arrangement is dependent upon the adopted 1978-79 budgets of both cities. Should this shared facility be closed, both jurisdictions would use the North County detention facilities in South San Francisco.

Daly City has a surface drainage line which parallels Westline Drive and surfaces in Pacifica on its way to the ocean. This line is owned and maintained by Daly City.

City of South San Francisco

Pacifica's impact on South San Francisco is primarily from traffic. Sharp Park Road, the major east-west roadway in Pacifica, connects to Skyline Boulevard opposite Westborough Boulevard, a major east-west connector in South San Francisco. Besides being a major arterial, Westborough connects to Highway 280, offering Pacificans access to the south Peninsula.

Vacant land in South San Francisco along Westborough Boulevard, between Skyline and 280, is zoned for commercial and multiple-family residential use. Recently, the area has experienced substantial new development which, when completed, will have a significant impact on the volume of traffic on the roadway. Planning in South San Francisco should consider the amount of through traffic. CalTrans is currently evaluating non-freeway alternatives to the Route 380 freeway. Improvement of Sharp Park Road is one of the alternatives under review. After the road is improved, the volume of through traffic is likely to increase.

City of San Bruno

San Bruno and Pacifica share a boundary along Sharp Park Road and at Skyline Boulevard. The City and County of San Francisco watershed and jail property intervenes between the two jurisdictions just west of Sweeney Ridge. The only existing road to the ridge, Sneath Lane, comes through San Bruno and the watershed property.

Three potential points of interaction exist between Pacifica and San Bruno. One is along Sharp Park Road, another is access to Sweeney Ridge and the third is the definition of the Sphere of Influence of each jurisdiction.

A portion of the Sharp Park Road frontage in San Bruno is being developed with single-family homes. This development is designed to discourage through traffic from the adjacent undeveloped area in Pacifica. As a result, when the Pacifica property is developed, its access may have to come from Skyline Boulevard. Because CalTrans owns all access rights to Route 35 in this area, developing access to Skyline from Pacifica property in this area would require approval from the California Transportation Commission.

Because of adjacent single-family residential development, San Bruno would not like to see Sneath Lane become an east-west arterial for Pacifica. San Bruno has reservations about development of Sweeney Ridge.

Pacifica and San Bruno are waiting for the San Mateo County Local Formation Agency (LAFCO) to propose the appropriate division of the unincorporated area. (See section on LAFCO).

City and County of San Francisco

The City and County of San Francisco's watershed for Crystal Springs Reservoir, the terminus of the Hetch-Hetchy system, extends into Pacifica along the eastern slope of Sweeney Ridge. The San Francisco Water Department is deeply interested in proposals for the future use of the ridge because of potential drainage problems in the watershed. The Water Department would prefer low density residential development, carefully designed to protect the watershed. The Water Department indicated that if the area were developed as the proposed park, extensive policing would be required and they have no funds for additional policing. Substantially increased fire hazard and maintenance needs would also be a concern. In the past, they have experienced fires from adjacent residential areas in other parts of the watershed; however, because of early detection by people living in the area, these fires have been more limited than in areas adjacent to parks. Representatives of the Water Department expressed interest in possible acquisition of the valley at the south end of Sweeney Ridge as this area drains directly into the watershed.

The watershed¹ land west of the lake is operated by the U. S. Department of the Interior. Even the City and County of San Francisco must appeal to

¹ The result of an agreement made by the City and County of San Francisco at the time the 280 Highway right-of-way was being discussed.

the Department of the Interior for operational and management changes. For this reason, it is unlikely that any substantial change in the future use of this area will occur.

The City and County of San Francisco also owns and operates the Sharp Park Golf Course and Park within the City of Pacifica. This 420 acre park includes two areas of important wildlife habitat. Since the existing public recreation use of the entire area is established by a deed restriction, the future use of the area is secure. However, recent budget problems in the City and County of San Francisco have resulted in the City re-evaluating its golf course. One alternative being considered is having a concessionaire operate the City's golf courses.

Continued public use of the area ensures the basic land use. However, failure to irrigate the golf course or changes in use of fertilizers and pesticides would seriously affect the San Francisco garter snake habitat in Laguna Salada. Since this is determined to be the largest or second largest known garter snake habitat, the future use of the area should consider this rare and endangered species. The State Department of Fish and Game is interested in participating in measures to protect the snake. Pacifica (through coastal permit authority), San Francisco and the Department of Fish and Game should work together to consider the effects of changes in recreational uses in the golf course area and management of the lagoon itself.

San Mateo County

Pacifica shares its southern boundary with lands under San Mateo County's jurisdiction. The small communities in this area are located on a coastal plain separated from Pacifica by Montara and Pedro Point Ridges. The future use on the north face of Montara Ridge, the impact of future development in the area between Half Moon Bay and Pacifica, the level of use on Highway 1 south of Pacifica, and the proposed bypass of Devil's Slide will have the greatest impact on Pacifica. The proposed San Mateo County Ridgeline Trail along Pacifica's coastal ridge will connect eventually to Big Basin State Park, expanding the recreation resources available for City residents and visitors.

Much of the north face of Montara Ridge is occupied by the San Pedro Valley County Park now being developed. Nearly one-half of this park, including its auto access off Rosita Road, is in Pacifica. It is anticipated that one-quarter of its users will walk to the park, primarily from the Ridgeline Trail which begins at the northern Daly City limit, parallels Skyline Road to Mussel Rock, and then follows Pacifica City streets to Milagra Ridge. The trail connects Milagra Ridge County Park, the Portola Discovery Site and the San Pedro Valley County Park.

Except for the Ridgeline Trail and parks, most of the County area which may affect Pacifica is in the Coastal Zone and thus subject to special coastal planning. Since this planning is now underway, it is important to anticipate areas where conflict might exist. Although the capacity of the four-lane arterial portion of Highway 1 in Pacifica is now limited during commute hours, the future service levels of the road depends upon the level

of development south of the City¹ permitted by the County.

The ability of Highway 1 to carry beach users through Pacifica to their destinations south of the City has been determined by MTC to be adequate to 1990, assuming existing levels of beach parking. However, the State Department of Parks and Recreation recently revised its policy for beach access and parking in San Mateo County, advocating expanding beach access and parking at the beaches between Half Moon Bay and Pacifica. This policy could have a substantial effect on the recreational use and capacity of Highway 1 through Pacifica, since the MTC/ABAG² Study concludes that available parking is the primary factor determining the level of beach use in San Mateo County.

Conflict over the proper alignment of the Devil's Slide bypass south of Montara Ridge has resulted in a delay in construction of this roadway. It now looks as if construction is at least a decade in the future unless the existing roadway fails altogether, and can no longer be repaired. When the new road is developed, CalTrans will convey the existing right-of-way to the County which proposes to use it as a trail between Pacifica and Montara.

1 Consideration of the expansion of the capacity of this highway has been deferred by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission until after 1990. See MTC/ABAG San Mateo County Coastal Corridor Study, 1975.

2 MTC/ABAG San Mateo County Coastal Corridor Study, 1975.

Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)

Pacifica's Sphere of Influence has not been formally defined by LAFCO. A recent LAFCO study suggested that the southern boundary of Pacifica's Sphere of Influence runs roughly along the Montara and Pedro Point Ridgelines. The study also suggested that Shamrock Ranch be included in Pacifica's Urban Service Area. Since the Sphere of Influence designation is intended to be applied to areas expected to be urbanized, LAFCO does not feel that any of the San Francisco Watershed should be included in either Pacifica's or San Bruno's Sphere of Influence.

The San Francisco jail property, located in the disputed area between San Bruno and Pacifica, remains a bone of contention. LAFCO has not acted on this property because San Francisco currently is not considering terminating the jail use although relocation has been considered in recent years. Resolution of the Sphere question on the jail property could have a substantial impact on the future east-west access issue in Pacifica since this site is located in a valley east of Sweeney Ridge and along a logical route for an east-west road.

California Coastal Commission

The California Coastal Commission, through its regional body, the Central Coastal Commission, has the authority to approve or disapprove building permits issued by the City for the area west of Highway 1. The State Coastal Commission provides funds to develop a local coastal plan and appropriate implementation measures. When both plan and implementing measures are certified by the Coastal Commission, the City will take over responsibility for issuing permits within the Coastal Zone. Within the Coastal Appeal Zone, citizens or developers will be able to appeal City permit decisions to the State Coastal Commission. The land use portion of the General Plan is the same as Pacifica's Coastal Plan.


Other Agencies

Because of its Bay Area and coastal location, Pacifica's actions are subject to review by a number of State, Regional and even Federal agencies. These agencies are generally regulatory and their impact is on City actions. These agencies are not directly impacted by the City's planning. Their activities have been summarized in the General Plan and Local Coastal Plan Background Reports.

PACIFICA

ADJACENT JURISDICTIONS

- Unincorporated San Mateo County



one mile

 Ironside & Associates
Planning Consultants

GOALS, POLICIES AND ACTION PROGRAMS

The goals, policies and action programs provide the framework of the Pacifica General Plan. These statements guide the City toward the implementation of the land uses designated on the Plan Map and in the day-to-day decision facing City officials. They are statements of desire which are intended to be pursued within the limits of the fiscal constraints of the City.

The Goals Statement provides the broad parameters for future physical development in Pacifica. A policy is a specific statement aimed at achieving a goal. Policies are designed to guide City action in specific areas, such as environmental protection, and are used at all levels of government in response to identified issues. It is impossible to anticipate total need for policies since issues change; old ones are resolved and new ones emerge. Policies should be reviewed periodically and revised as necessary to respond to the current range of issues. Action programs are specific programs related to carrying out the policies.

This section contains a goals statement and the policies and action programs related to each of the Plan elements. Additional information about each element may be found in the General Plan Element Summaries, a part of the 1980 General Plan. Because the elements of a general plan are all inter-related, a policy or action program may apply to more than one element. To clearly show which elements are affected, abbreviations of elements follow each policy and action program indicating its relationship to the various elements.

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS OF ELEMENT TITLES

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------------------------|
| C | - | Circulation Element |
| SS | - | Seismic Safety and Safety Element |
| SH | - | Scenic Highways Element |
| CN | - | Conservation Element |
| OS | - | Open Space |
| N | - | Noise Element |
| H | - | Housing Element |
| CD | - | Community Design Element |
| HS | - | Historic Element |
| CF | - | Community Facilities Element |
| LU | - | Land Use Element |
| CT | - | Coastal Element |
| * | - | Dependent upon availability of funds |

GOAL STATEMENT

The goal of the planning in Pacifica is to provide a rational guide to public decision-making and private development which will conserve the unique qualities of Pacifica as a coastal community while making the City the best possible place in which to live, work and play. To achieve this end, the City will strive to provide a decent home and satisfying environment for each resident, the optimum mix of community services, a clear understanding of the rights and responsibilities of ownership and the maximum protection of the public's health and safety within the financial limitations of the City and its taxpayers.

Its coastal location and natural environment are superb assets. The City's goal includes conserving the natural environment, keeping noise to acceptable levels, protecting residents from natural hazards, protecting the visual quality of the City, and conserving the sense of openness which is an essential quality of the City.

Fundamental to the City's character are the traditional neighborhoods. It is a goal of the City to protect the social mix, variety and fundamental character which now exist in each of these neighborhoods by providing for necessary community services and facilities, and for the safety and welfare of all residents equally, but with a sensitivity for the individual neighborhood.

CIRCULATION ELEMENT

Policies

1. Encourage development of a more efficient and safe east-west lateral road. (SS)
2. Encourage residents to use SamTrans.
3. Encourage off-street parking of oversized vehicles and provide convenient parking areas for such vehicles. (LU)
4. Provide access which is safe and consistent with the level of development. (SS) (LU)
5. The City shall place a priority on parking enforcement and signing of public visitor parking areas.
6. Encourage alternatives to motor vehicle transportation. (CF)
7. Encourage SamTrans and other public transportation to provide improved transit and street maintenance of their routes. (CF)
8. Encourage CalTrans to provide a safe alternative to the Devil's Slide route. (LU)
9. Develop safe and efficient bicycle, hiking, equestrian and pedestrian access within Pacifica and to local points of interest. (HS) (LU)
- *10. Provide recreational access in keeping with the recreational area's natural environment and the quality of the recreational experience offered. (OS)
11. Safety shall be a primary objective in street planning and traffic regulations. (SS) (LU)
12. Employ individualized street improvement standards without violating the safety or character of the existing neighborhood. (SS) (CD) (LU)
13. Maintain and upgrade local streets. (SS)
14. Ensure adequate off-street parking in all development. (LU)
15. Promote orderly growth in land uses and circulation. (LU)

Action Programs

- Short Term

1. Encourage CalTrans to make operational and safety improvements on Sharp Park Road as soon as possible. (SS)
2. Safety and operational improvement plans should include either improving the San Pedro Avenue-Highway 1 access or realignment of the Linda Mar intersection to include access to Pedro Point.
3. Encourage subsidized regional bus service to beaches in Pacifica and elsewhere along the San Mateo Coast.
4. Encourage funding agencies, such as MTC, to provide bus shelters along Pacifica's north-south pedestrian/bicycle routes for inter-modal use.
- *5. Seek financial assistance to rebuild streets damaged by intensive mass transit use.
6. Complete the City's proposed north-south pedestrian/bicycle access. Seek out participation in this program from MTC and San Mateo County, as well as appropriate Federal and State programs.
7. Encourage CalTrans to provide a separated pedestrian/bicycle pathway along Highway 1 from Sharp Park Golf Course to the southern City boundary. (OS)

8. Encourage CalTrans to include in plans for Sharp Park Road a separated pedestrian/bicycle facility. (OS)
9. Encourage the Chamber of Commerce or other local group to publish a trail system and beach access map.
- *10. Develop parking at City recreation facilities where safe access and adequate operation and maintenance can be provided. (CF)
- *11. Develop a directional signing program for recreational access points and commuter parking. (LU)
- *12. Seek funding from the State Department of Fish and Game for fishermen access parking. (CT)
13. Require reverse frontage and/or limited access in future development along arterial streets. (LU)
14. Encourage CalTrans to make necessary intersection studies and improvements to increase safe travel along Highway 1, south of Sharp Park Golf Course.
- *15. Improve intersection, mid-block sightline and other physical problems in areas where accident rates are high. (SS) (CF)
- *16. Revise the City Zoning Ordinance to require a Use Permit for development on lots with unimproved streets. (LU)
17. Require developers to incorporate emergency access needs as necessary in their developments. (SS) (CF)
18. Require that all new streets be developed to modern neighborhood standards as part of development.
- *19. Encourage CalTrans to develop its properties on Linda Mar Boulevard and Crespi Drive for free commuter-beach parking.
20. A Citywide program should be undertaken for posting and enforcing parking time limits in areas heavily used by recreationists.
21. A Citywide program for signing public visitor-serving parking should be undertaken.

- Long Term

1. Request MTC to re-evaluate the impact of recreation traffic on Highway 1 resulting from planning which concentrates beach recreation activities on North San Mateo Coast beaches between Pacifica and Half Moon Bay. Determine the phasing of beach facility development, and project in-season daily use and peak day use. Determine if the capacity of the four-lane portion of Highway 1 in Pacifica will be exceeded before MTC is ready to reconsider its current planning decision in 1990. (LU)
- *2. Develop a system of internal pedestrian/bicycle pathways connecting all neighborhoods to the City's north-south pathway.
- *3. Use Community Redevelopment Act powers to replat and provide public improvements in previously poorly subdivided areas. (LU)
- *4. Undertake a neighborhood-by-neighborhood study of parking to determine the off-street parking necessary to protect the safety and character of the area. (SS) (CD)

SAFETY AND SEISMIC SAFETY ELEMENT - See new Element for amended policies and programs.

SCENIC HIGHWAYS ELEMENT

Policies

1. Encourage the designation and protection of scenic corridors which are essential links in the State and County highway systems. (CD)
2. Encourage the designation and protection of scenic corridors which provide access to locations of significant scenic quality, recreation, historic and cultural importance in Pacifica. (CD)
3. Ensure that proposed roads or modification to existing roads which traverse ridgelines and other scenic areas are reviewed for their potential as official scenic highways or local scenic routes. (C) (CD)
4. Encourage appropriate multiple recreational and transportation uses along scenic highways and routes other than auto. (C) (OS) (CD)

Action Programs

- Short Term

- *1. The City should establish a review procedure for all proposed roads or modification to existing roads which traverse scenic areas. Where possible, the physical form of structures, grading and alignment should be integrated into the natural setting. Views to and from ridges should be protected. (CD) (LU)
- *2. Promote hiking, riding, and biking trails along roadway with State, County, or local scenic highway/route designation. (C)

- Long Term

- *1. The City should work with the State and County to develop acceptable scenic corridor plans for the Cabrillo (Coast) Highway (Route 1), Sharp Park Road, Skyline Boulevard (State Route 35) and Fassler from Coast Highway to Skyline.
- *2. The City should work closely with citizens to establish a Local Scenic Route, such as the Linda Mar Boulevard - Oddstad Boulevard - Terra Nova Boulevard - Fassler Avenue route described in the Scenic Highways Element.
- *3. A program should be developed to enhance the visual quality of the scenic corridor by establishing landscaped screens for unsightly areas within the corridors, but outside the public rights-of-way and undergrounding utility lines. (CD) (CF)
- *4. Scenic easements should be obtained wherever necessary to protect views and vista points along scenic roads.
- *5. Pacifica should develop a program for defining permanent scenic corridors.
- *6. Scenic turnouts, rest stops, picnic areas, access to parks, beaches and other recreation areas should be provided in appropriate locations and properly signed. (CD)
7. Where possible, when locating or relocating overhead utility lines within scenic corridors, lines should be placed underground or located so they do not break the viewline of a roadway vista, i.e., utility poles and lines should be located opposite the view side of the road and should not zigzag above the roadway. To keep the visual impact of utilities to a minimum, poles and other structures should be finished to blend with the surrounding environment. (CD) (LU)

CONSERVATION ELEMENT

Policies

1. Conserve trees and encourage native forestation. (OS) (CD)
2. Require the protection and conservation of indigenous rare and endangered species. (LU)
3. Protect significant trees of neighborhood or area importance and encourage planting of appropriate trees and vegetation. (CD) (LU)
4. Protect and conserve the coastal environment, sand dunes, habitats, unique and endangered species and other natural resources and features which contribute to the coastal character. (OS) (CD)
5. Local year-round creeks and their riparian habitats shall be protected. (CF) (LU)
6. Develop policies and ordinances directed to energy conservation. (CD)
7. Promote the conservation of all water, soil, wildlife, vegetation, energy, minerals and other natural resources. (OS)

Action Programs

- Short Term

- *1. Seek outside assistance to study and correct the infiltration problem in the Linda Mar sewage collection system. (CD)
- *2. Develop regulations which will protect watershed areas and control erosion. (OS)
- *3. Cooperate with the City and County of San Francisco in protecting the San Andreas Lake watershed. (OS) (LU)
4. Request the Regional Air Quality Control Office to establish a simple method of regularly monitoring air quality in Pacifica.
- *5. Evaluate the volunteer recycling program. Work with the volunteers to expand this effort communitywide. (CF)
- *6. Amend the Uniform Building Code to include appropriate energy-saving building requirements.
- *7. Continue the life-cost cycle method of determining what equipment to purchase for City operation. (CF)
- *8. Develop a tree planting plan and a practical tree ordinance which preserves the forested character of the neighborhoods now planted, identifies moderate height species, and encourages forestation. Provide City assistance where possible.

- Long Term

- *1. Identify and meet, to the extent possible, the community indoor recreation needs. (CF)
- *2. Evaluate the overall energy-saving effectiveness of the existing City programs, particularly those identified in the Conservation Element. Decrease energy consumption where possible.
- *3. Review the Subdivision Ordinance to consider modification of street standards and require as many lots as possible to have direct north-south orientations.
- *4. Study the problems and costs of using solar heating in Pacifica and develop incentives to encourage its use.
- *5. Encourage citizen input into City decisions affecting consumption and conservation.

OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

Policies

1. Retain open space which preserves natural resources, protects visual amenities, prevents inappropriate development, provides for the managed use of resources, and protects the public health and safety. (SS) (CN) (OS) (CD) (LU)
2. Provide outdoor recreation in local parks, open space, and school playgrounds in keeping with the need, scale and character of the City and of each neighborhood. (CF) (LU)
3. Encourage development plans which protect or provide generous open space appropriately landscaped. Balance open space, development and public safety, particularly in the hillside areas. (SS) (CD) (LU)
4. Promote communitywide links to open space and recreation facilities which do not abuse the open space resource or threaten public safety. (C) (SS) (CD) (LU)
5. Seek financial assistance to acquire land for permanent open space within financial constraints of the City. (CF) (LU)
6. Where open space is a condition of development, the City should require that it be clearly designated as permanent open space.

Action Programs

- Short Term

- *1. Where natural environment would benefit, develop controlled points of public access to various open spaces, beaches, hillsides, and ridgelines. (CT) (LU) (CN)
- *2. The City should continue to seek funding for the acquisition of all beach frontage within the City. In the interim, regulations should be developed to assure that suitable public access is provided by all who own and develop in the coastal area. (LU) (CT)
3. Views of open space are as important as access to open space. Viewsheds should be identified (See Community Design Element, Scenic Highways Element) and protected. (SH) (CD)
- *4. Establish priorities for developing new recreation facilities, focusing on the specific needs of each neighborhood. (CF)
- *5. Local business and neighborhood associations should be encouraged to provide landscaping. Native vegetation which requires little maintenance, little water, makes good wildlife habitat, and is fire resistant should be emphasized.
- *6. City ordinances should restrict off-road vehicles to designated areas and prohibit and severely penalize their use elsewhere. (CF)
7. Development regulations should encourage density-open space trade offs, such as clustering development, transferring development rights from sensitive to less sensitive land, and dedication of open space. (LU) (CN)
- *8. Work out an agreement and program with the school district to ensure that neighborhood recreation facilities located on school grounds continue to be available, or are suitably relocated should the educational use of the school be discontinued. (CF) (LU)
9. Investigate use of utility rights-of-way and easements for trails for hiking and riding. (LU) (CN) (CT)

- Long Term

- *1. Areas of particular concern are the steep, barren hillsides remaining after the rapid residential development of the native vegetation which offers wildlife cover. The City should develop a program of providing plants to individuals or groups who have an interest in planting such areas. (LU)
- *2. Develop and implement revegetation and reforestation programs on the City's greenbelts to reduce erosion potential and enhance the visual quality of these areas for adjacent neighborhoods. Local volunteer or community service organizations might assist the City with this program. (CN) (SH)
- *3. Promote bicycle-pedestrian trails as links between open spaces. Each valley neighborhood should be connected to the linking trail system to make open space and recreation facilities available to all. (C) (CF)

NOISE ELEMENT

Policies

- 1. Work with other agencies, airports and jurisdictions to reduce noise levels in Pacifica created by their operations. (CN)
- 2. Establish and enforce noise emission standards for Pacifica which are consistent with the residential character of the City and environmental, health and safety needs of the residents. (SS) (CN)

Action Programs

- Short Term

- 1. Encourage SamTrans to try and reduce noise generated by its rolling stock. Bus stops should be located 150 feet or more beyond noise sensitive locations, such as schools, convalescent homes, etc. (LU) (C)
- *2. City should encourage the airport to cooperate in requiring stricter noise mitigation in aircraft, and discourage use of equipment or measures which would increase the noise levels from flights over Pacifica. (CF)
- 3. Encourage CalTrans to build noise barriers along Highway 1 and Route 35 (Skyline Boulevard) in Pacifica in locations where excessive noise levels affect noise sensitive land uses. (LU) (CN)
- *4. Develop noise criteria for new equipment purchased by the City. Criteria should also be established to be used in determining when equipment needs replacement. (CF)
- 5. The noise impact on land uses should be considered when development plans are reviewed and approved. Where existing ambient noise levels are high, or where the proposed use will create additional noise, the builder should be required to mitigate the noise. (LU)
- *6. To reduce noise levels and promote health and safety, truck traffic should be kept off local and collector residential streets. The City should designate truck routes for internal service and for through traffic. Permits should be required for use of streets other than those designated. (C) (SS)

- Long Term

- *1. One City department should be assigned to coordinate and oversee an overall noise control effort throughout the City. Departments involved in noise control would be Engineering, Planning, Police and Building. (CF)
- *2. Establish a Noise Abatement Unit made up of members of the police and other departments to enforce the noise regulations of the Motor Vehicle Code and City Noise Ordinance. (CF)
- *3. Adopt a noise ordinance which would establish acceptable community noise levels and provide authority for issuing permits to temporary activities which would exceed these established levels. This ordinance should include items, such as required setbacks in noisy areas, defining truck routes, criteria for requiring structural noise buffers, and noise criteria for City vehicles. (C) (CN) (LU) (CF)
- *4. A City staff person should be trained to periodically survey the noise environment of the City, particularly in noise sensitive areas, where noise is a cause of public nuisance, or complaint, or where noise levels violate the established standards for the City. This staff person should keep abreast of effective noise abatement techniques and changes in the State noise control guidelines. (SS)
- *5. Adopt an insulation ordinance which would require builders in noise sensitive areas of the City to adequately insulate their buildings to reduce noise to acceptable levels. (CN)
- *6. Local building regulations should provide for noise-generating appliances serving apartment buildings to be located or adequately insulated to protect residents from the noise. (LU) (CN)

HOUSING ELEMENT - See new goals and policies in Housing Element, adopted January 1987.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT

Policies

- 1. Conserve historic and cultural sites and structures which define the past and present character of Pacifica. (CD) (LU)
- 2. Consider creative alternatives, which may include uses other than the original use, to protect and preserve historic sites and structures. (LU) (CT)
- 3. Public awareness and education programs shall be considered essential for historic conservation.
- 4. Encourage all public agencies to continue and increase their support for local historic sites of County, State and National significance in Pacifica.

Action Programs

- Short Term

- *1. City Council should adopt a Historic Preservation Ordinance and appoint a Pacifica Historic Sites Advisory Committee for its implementation. (CN) (CT)
- *2. The City should publish the results of the preliminary survey and developmental history to promote a sense of community identity and

pride and to promote citizen involvement in historic preservation in Pacifica.

- *3. The Pacifica Historic Sites Advisory Committee should be encouraged to conduct a demonstration program (such as acquiring, restoring, and establishing a historic site for public use, etc.). (CD)
- *4. Continue to public and/or conduct historic tours, public education programs, and develop more special events for recreating and commemorating past events. (CF)

- Long Term

- *1. To ensure adequate protection and/or as a requirement to obtain funding for preservation, a detailed comprehensive survey should be conducted for specific historic or cultural sites and structures. (CN)
- *2. The City should examine its development policies and regulations to ensure that the use and development of nearby property will not have an adverse effect on a historic site or structures.
- *3. The Pacifica Historic Sites Advisory Committee should develop criteria for reviewing use or reuse of historic sites and structures.

COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

Policies

1. Preserve the unique qualities of the City's neighborhoods. (LU) (CT) (SH)
2. Encourage the upgrading and maintenance of existing neighborhoods. (LU) (CT)
3. Protect the City's irreplaceable scenic and visual amenities. (LU) (CT)
4. Establish development standards that would keep open the steep slopes and visually prominent ridgelines. (LU) (CT) (SH)
5. Require underground utilities in all new development. (F) (SH)
6. Establish design review standards to be employed early in the planning process. (LU)
7. When determining level of development, the City shall consider views of the ridgelines from the Bay side of the Peninsula, as well as from the Pacifica side. (LU)

Action Programs

- Short Term

1. Designate formal planning districts within the City and design criteria which will preserve the character of each. (LU) (HS)
2. Promote the preservation of open space and natural landforms which define the City's residential and commercial areas. (OS) (LU) (CN)
- *3. Develop special standards and review procedures for all areas of the City which present unique design problems. (CN) (CT)
- *4. Establish planning and design criteria for use in conjunction with existing building codes to ensure the compatibility of new multi-family residential, commercial, and planned unit development. (LU) (CT)
- *5. Encourage commercial vitalization in older, but potentially viable, commercial districts. (LU) (CT)
- *6. Coordinate with CalTrans in an effort to ensure that future changes to the Coast Highway will also upgrade the appearance of the right-of-way. (C) (SH) (CN) (CT)

- *7. Develop standards for the location and size of local commercial signing and outdoor advertising structures. (CT)
- *8. Review existing hillside building regulations and review procedures to ensure the appropriateness of the planning criteria and regulatory procedures. (CT) (LU)

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ELEMENT

Polices

- 1. Maintain and improve the present level of City services.
- 2. Provide recreational activities and facilities consistent with user financial and environmental constraints. (LU) (CN)
- 3. Encourage San Mateo County and other agencies to expand, upgrade, and evaluate the quality of the services they provide in Pacifica, particularly public transportation. (C) (CT)
- 4. Meet basic social needs of City residents, such as transportation, housing, health, information and referral services, and safety, consistent with financial constraints. (C) (SS) (H)

Action Programs

- Short Term

- *1. Maintain a file of estimated wastewater generated so decision-makers are aware of the impacts on the treatment plant. Publish the estimates in the treatment plant's annual report. (CN)
- 2. Support the North Coast County Water District in its efforts to provide adequate emergency water storage in Pacifica.
- 3. Continue to seek cost effective ways to provide least cost garbage collection and disposal. (CN)
- *4. Review the criteria and priorities for underground wiring in Pacifica to ensure that they support current planning; review at least every five years. (CN) (SH)
- *5. Be sure all companies providing utilities in Pacifica have reviewed their plans for re-establishing service in the event of a major seismic event within the City. (SS)
- *6. Develop a corporation yard which meets criteria for economic operation and is large enough to meet the future storage and service needs of the City. (SS)
- 7. Encourage the San Francisco Water Department to anticipate the need for expanding the Hetch Hetchy System before water becomes a critical regional problem. (CN)
- 8. Encourage the school districts to find alternative uses for unused facilities which are compatible with existing neighborhoods, continue neighborhood accessibility to recreation facilities located on school grounds, and maintain at least its current level of staffing, programming and cooperation with the City. Future expansion of services to meet changing needs should also be encouraged. (LU)
- *9. Encourage Seton Medical Center (formerly Mary's Help Hospital) in its efforts to provide an outpatient clinic in Pacifica. Promulgate services through the City's information and referral service. (SS)
- *10. Continue to support the Youth Service Bureau in their work; and assist them where possible in seeking funding.
- *11. Continue to support the varied activities of the Parks, Beach and Recreation Department. Periodically review their activities to ensure that programs are meeting public needs. (CN)

- *12. Use available Federal HCDA and other funding to maintain and enhance community services, particularly Oddstad Senior Center and the Pomo Park Neighborhood facility. All other City facilities and structures should be evaluated to schedule rehabilitation and other developmental needs; and funding programs identified to assist the City in meeting these needs within the appropriate time frame. (CN)
- 13. Require all new development to be connected to the City's sewer system. (CN) (LU)

- Long Term

- *1. Develop a new Civic Center location which meets the site requirements of the Civic Center Study and allows adequate space for future expansion. (LU)
- *2. Develop plans and find a suitable location for adequate space for the Police Department. (LU)
- 3. Encourage the U.S. Postal Service to maintain its current level of service and expand it wherever possible. (LU)
- 4. Encourage San Mateo County to continue to provide subsidized paramedic service to Pacifica residents. (SS)

LAND USE ELEMENT

Policies

- 1. The Pacifica General Plan Map and text shall establish a land use classification for the entire City and its Sphere of Influence.
- 2. The Zoning Ordinance shall apply Zoned District status to all land within the City consistent with the General Plan policies.
- 3. The City shall continue broad-based citizen participation in the planning process. (CF) (CT)
- 4. Continue to cooperate with other public agencies and utilities in applying compatible uses for their lands, rights-of-way and easements. (CF)
- 5. Ridgelines designated as visually prominent shall be protected from residential and commercial development. (C) (OS) (CD)
- 6. Local access roads and trails may be allowed on visually prominent ridgelines provided they follow contours, minimize grading, and are unobtrusive in their design. (C) (OS) (CD)
- 7. Development shall maximize beach and open space access and be oriented as much as possible to the carrying capacity of each particular coastal environment in use, design, and intensity. (CD) (CT)
- 8. Land use and development shall protect and enhance the individual character of each neighborhood. (CD)

Action Programs

- Short Term

- 1. Encourage continuation of the quarry operation as long as it is economically feasible, but ensure the site will be properly graded for future use. (CN) (CT)

COASTAL ZONE LAND USE PLAN POLICIES

The California Coastal Act of 1976 included 35 coastal policies which were intended to form the parameters for planning the State's Coastal Zone. Unlike the General Plan where the policies evolved from the public input (primarily workshops) and then formed the basis for land use decisions, in coastal planning the policies are given. These policies are used to justify the various proposed land uses (See Local Coastal Land Use Plan Description). The coastal policies are included here.

It is important to note that these policies are binding on the coastal portion of Pacifica's Plan; and can be amended only with the State Coastal Commission's approval. However, although they supplement the mandatory elements of the General Plan, the policies are not binding on the portion of the City outside the 1979 Coastal Zone (the area east of Highway 1).

Most of the coastal policies are applicable to particular General Plan elements. Where appropriate, references to the elements are noted. Listed below is a key to the symbols used.

SYMBOLS

- C - Circulation Element
- SS - Seismic Safety and Safety Element
- SH - Scenic Highways Element
- CN - Conservation Element
- OS - Open Space Element
- N - Noise Element
- H - Housing Element
- CD - Community Design Element
- HS - Historic Element
- CF - Community Facilities Element
- LU - Land Use Element

Coastal Act Policies

1. Maximum access shall be conspicuously posted and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse. (C) (SS) (CN) (OS)
2. Development shall not interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through use of legislative authorization, including, but not limited to, the use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches to the first line of terrestrial vegetation. (LU)
3. Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources; (2) adequate access exists nearby, or; (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. Dedicated accessways shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the accessway: (SS) (LU)
4. Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area. (CN) (CF) (LU)
5. Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities and housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income shall be protected, encouraged, and where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. New housing in the Coastal Zone shall be developed in conformity with the standards, policies, and goals of the local housing elements adopted in accordance with the requirements of Subdivision (c) of Section 65302 of the Government Code. (H) (LU)
6. Coastal areas suited for water-oriented recreational activities that cannot readily be provided at inland water areas shall be protected for such uses.
7. Oceanfront land suitable for recreational use shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for in the area. (LU)
8. The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry. (H) (LU)

9. Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible. (LU)
10. Increased recreational boating use of coastal waters shall be encouraged, in accordance with this subdivision, by developing dry storage areas, increasing public launching facilities, providing additional berthing space in existing harbors, limiting non-water-dependent land uses that congest access corridors and preclude boating support facilities in natural harbors, new protected water area, and in areas dredged from dry land. (CF) (LU)
11. Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.
12. The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of wastewater discharge and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface waterflow, encouraging wastewater reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams. (CN) (CF) (LU)
13. Protection against the spillage of crude oil, gas, petroleum products, or hazardous substances shall be provided in relation to any development of transportation of such materials. Effective containment and cleanup facilities and procedures shall be provided for accidental spills that do occur.
14. The diking, filling or dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes shall be permitted in accordance with other applicable provisions of this policy, where there is no feasible, less environmentally damaging, alternative and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, and shall be limited to the following:
 - (a) New or expanded port, energy and coastal-dependent industrial facilities, including commercial fishing facilities.
 - (b) Maintaining existing, or restoring previously dredged, depths in existing navigational channels, turning basins, vessel berthing and mooring areas, and boat launching ramps.
 - (c) In wetland areas only, entrance channels for new or expanded boating facilities; and in a degraded wetland, identified by the Department of Fish and Game for boating facilities if, in conjunction with such boating facilities, a substantial portion of degraded wetland is restored and maintained as a biologically productive wetland; provided, however, that in no event shall the

size of the wetland area be used for such boating facility, including berthing space, turning basins, necessary navigational channels, and any necessary support service facilities, be greater than 25 percent of the total wetland area to be restored.

(d) In open coastal waters, other than wetlands, including streams, estuaries and lakes, new or expanded boating facilities.

(e) Incidental public services purposes, including, but not limited to, burying cables and pipes or inspection of piers and maintenance of existing intake and outfall lines.

(f) Mineral extraction, including sand for restoring beaches, except in environmentally sensitive areas.

(g) Restoration purposes.

(h) Nature study, aquaculture, or similar resource-dependent activities.

(1) Dredging and spoils disposal shall be planned and carried out to avoid significant disruption to marine and wildlife habitats and water circulation. Dredge spoils suitable for beach replenishment should be transported for such purposes to appropriate beaches, or into suitable longshore current systems.

(2) In addition to the other provisions of this section, diking, filling, or dredging in existing estuaries and wetlands shall maintain or enhance the functional capacity of the wetland or estuary. Any alteration of coastal wetlands identified by the Department of Fish and Game shall be limited to very minor incidental public facilities, restorative measures and nature study. (CN) (CF) (OS) (LU)

15. Facilities serving the commercial fishing and recreational boating industries shall be protected and, where feasible, upgraded. Existing commercial fishing and recreational boating harbor space shall not be reduced unless the demand for those facilities no longer exists or adequate substitute space has been provided. Proposed recreational boating facilities shall, where feasible, be designed and located in such a fashion as not to interfere with the needs of the commercial fish industry.

16. Revetments, breakwaters, groins, harbor channels, seawalls, cliff retaining walls, and other such construction that alters natural shoreline processes shall be permitted when required to serve coastal-dependent uses or to protect existing structures or public beaches in danger from erosion and when designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse impacts on local shoreline sand supply. Existing marine structures causing water stagnation contributing to pollution problems and fishkills should be phased out or upgraded where feasible. (SS) (CF) (LU)

17. Channelizations, dams, or other substantial alterations of rivers and streams shall incorporate the best mitigation measures feasible, and be limited to: (1) necessary water supply projects; (2) flood control

projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the flood plain is feasible and where such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development, or; (3) developments where the primary function is the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat. (SS) (CN) (N) (CF) (LU)

18. Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on such resources shall be allowed within such areas. Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas. (CN) (OS) (CD) (LU)
19. The maximum amount of prime agricultural land shall be maintained in agricultural production to assure the protection of the areas' agricultural economy, and conflicts shall be minimized between agricultural and urban land uses through the following:
 - (a) By establishing stable boundaries separating urban and rural areas, including, where necessary, clearly defined buffer areas to minimize conflicts between agricultural and urban land uses.
 - (b) By limiting conversions of agricultural lands around the periphery of urban areas to the land where the viability of existing agricultural use is already severely limited by conflicts with urban uses and where the conversion of the lands would complete a logical and viable neighborhood and contribute to the establishment of a stable limit to urban development.
 - (c) By developing available lands not suited for agriculture prior to the conversion of agricultural lands.
 - (d) By assuring that public service and facility expansions and non-agricultural development do not impair agricultural viability, either through increased assessment costs or degraded air and water quality.
 - (e) By assuring that all divisions of prime agricultural lands and all development adjacent to prime agricultural lands shall not diminish the productivity of such prime agricultural lands. (CN) (CF) (LU)
20. All other lands suitable for agricultural use shall not be converted to non-agricultural use unless: (1) continued or renewed agricultural use is not feasible, or; (2) such conversion would preserve prime agricultural land or concentrate development consistent with Policy 23. Any such permitted conversion shall be compatible with continued agricultural use on surrounding lands. (LU)
21. The long-term productivity of soils and timberlands shall be protected, and conversions of coastal commercial timberlands in units of commercial size to other uses of their division into units of noncommercial size shall be limited to providing for necessary timber processing and related facilities. (CN)

22. Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required. (OS) (HS)
23. New development, except as otherwise provided in this policy, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, outside existing developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels. Where feasible, new hazardous industrial development shall be located away from existing developed areas. Visitor-serving facilities that cannot feasibly be located in existing developed areas shall be located in existing isolated developments or at selected points of attraction for visitors. (LU)
24. The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to, and along, the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural landforms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas, such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan, prepared by the California Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government, shall be subordinate to the character of its setting. (CN) (OS) (CD) (LU)
25. The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by: (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit services; (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development, or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads; (3) providing non-automobile circulation within the development; (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation; (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses, such as high-rise office buildings, and by; (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of on-site recreational facilities to serve the new development. (C) (LU)
26. New development shall:
 - (a) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood and fire hazard.
 - (b) Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding areas or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.

- (c) Be consistent with requirements imposed by an air pollution control district or the State Air Resources Control Board as to each particular development.
 - (d) Minimize energy consumption and vehicle miles traveled.
 - (e) Where appropriate, protect special communities and neighborhoods which, because of their unique characteristics, are popular visitor destination points for recreational uses. (C) (SS) (CN) (CD) (LU)
27. New or expanded public works facilities shall be designed and limited to accommodate needs generated by development or uses permitted consistent with the provisions of this policy; provided, however, that it is the intent of the Legislature that State Highway Route 1 in rural areas of the Coastal Zone remain a scenic two-lane road. Special districts shall not be formed or expanded except where assessment for, and provision of, the service would not induce new development inconsistent with this policy. Where existing or planned public works facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to coastal-dependent land use, essential public services and basic industries vital to the economic health of the region, State or Nation, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development. (C) (SH) (CF) (LU)
28. Coastal-dependent developments shall have priority over other developments on or near the shoreline. Except as provided elsewhere in this policy, coastal-dependent developments shall not be sited in a wetland. (LU)
29. Coastal-dependent industrial facilities shall be encouraged to locate or expand within existing sites and shall be permitted reasonable long-term growth where consistent with this policy. However, where new or expanded coastal-dependent industrial facilities cannot feasibly be accommodated consistent with other policies of this policy, they may nonetheless be permitted in accordance with this section if:
- (1) alternative locations are infeasible or more environmentally damaging;
 - (2) to do otherwise would adversely affect the public welfare, and;
 - (3) adverse environmental effects are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. (LU)
30. Multi-company use of existing and new tanker facilities shall be encouraged to the maximum extent feasible and legally permissible, except where to do so would result in increased tanker operations and associated on-shore development incompatible with the land use and environmental goals for the area. New tanker terminals outside of existing terminal areas shall be situated as to avoid risk to environmentally sensitive areas and shall use a monobuoy system, unless an alternative type of system can be shown to be environmentally preferable for a specific site. Tanker facilities shall be designed to: (1) minimize the total volume of oil spilled; (2) minimize the risk of collision from movement of other vessels; (3) have ready access to the most effective feasible containment and recovery equipment for oil spills, and; (4) have on-shore deballasting facilities to receive any fouled ballast water from tankers where operationally or legally required.

Only one liquefied natural gas terminal shall be permitted in the Coastal Zone until engineering and operational practices can eliminate any significant risk to life due to accident or until guaranteed supplies of liquefied natural gas and distribution system dependence on liquefied natural gas are substantial enough that an interruption of service from a single liquefied natural gas facility would cause substantial public harm. Until the risks inherent in liquefied natural gas terminal operations can be sufficiently identified and overcome, and such terminals are found to be consistent with the health and safety of nearby human populations, terminals shall be built only at sites remote from human population concentrations. Other unregulated development in the vicinity of a liquefied natural gas terminal site which is remote from human population concentrations shall be prohibited. At such time as liquefied natural gas marine terminal operations are found consistent with public safety, terminal sites only in developed or industrialized port areas may be approved.

31. Oil and gas development shall be permitted in accordance with Policy 29, if the following conditions are met:
- (a) The development is performed safely and is consistent with the geologic conditions of the well site.
 - (b) New or expanded facilities relation to such development are consolidated to the maximum extent feasible and legally permissible, unless consolidation will have adverse environmental consequences and will not significantly reduce the number of producing wells, support facilities, or sites required to produce the reservoir economically and with minimal environmental impacts.
 - (c) Environmentally safe and feasible sub-sea completions are used when drilling platforms or islands would substantially degrade coastal visual qualities unless use of such structures will result in substantially less environmental risks.
 - (d) Platforms or islands will not be sited where a substantial hazard to vessel traffic might result from the facility or related operations, determined in consultation with the United States Coast Guard and the Army Corps of Engineers.
 - (e) Such development will not cause or contribute to subsidence hazards unless it is determined that adequate measures will be undertaken to prevent damage from such subsidence.
 - (f) With respect to new facilities, all oil field brines are reinjected into oil producing zones unless the Division of Oil and Gas of the Department of Conservation determines to do so would adversely affect production of the reservoirs and unless injection into other subsurface zones will reduce environmental risks. Exceptions to reinjections will be granted consistent with the Ocean Waters Discharge Plan of the State Water Resources Control Board and where adequate provision is made for the elimination of petroleum odors and water quality problems. Where appropriate, monitoring programs to record land surface and near shore ocean floor movements shall be initiated in locations of new large-scale fluid extraction on land or near shore before operations begin and shall continue until surface conditions have stabilized. Costs of

monitoring and mitigation programs shall be borne by the liquid and gas extraction operators.

32. New or expanded refineries or petrochemical facilities not otherwise consistent with the provisions of this policy shall be permitted if: (1) alternative locations are not feasible or are more environmentally damaging; (2) adverse environmental effects are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible; (3) it is found that not permitting such development would adversely affect the public welfare; (4) the facility is not located in a highly scenic or seismically hazardous area, on any of the Channel Islands, or within or contiguous to environmentally sensitive areas, and; (5) the facility is sited so as to provide a sufficient buffer area to minimize adverse impacts on surrounding property.
33. In addition to meeting all applicable air quality standards, new or expanded refineries or petrochemical facilities shall be permitted in areas designated as air quality maintenance areas by the State Air Resources Board and in areas where coastal resources would be adversely affected only if the negative impacts of the project upon air quality are offset by reductions in gaseous emissions in the area by the users of fuels, or in the case of an expansion of an existing site, total site emission levels, and site levels for each emission type for which national or State ambient air quality standards have been established, do not increase.
34. New or expanded refineries or petrochemical facilities shall minimize the need for once-through cooling by using air cooling to the maximum extent feasible and by using treated wastewaters from implant processes where feasible.
35. New or expanded thermal electric generating plants may be constructed in the Coastal Zone if the proposed coastal site has been determined by the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission to have greater relative merit pursuant to the established standard than available alternative sites and related facilities for an applicant's service area which has been determined to be acceptable pursuant to the established regulations.

GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DEFINITIONS

The Local (Coastal) Land Use (LUP) Map shows the general location of the public and private land uses proposed for the future in Pacifica. The Map is not detailed or specific. The intent is to show the predominant use intended for an area. The Map illustrates the thrust of development expected within the City in the next 20 years. The categories of uses shown on the Map are described below:

Open Space Residential - Indicates residential, agriculture, and recreation uses are allowed if consistent with objectives stated within the General Plan for specific sites. In the Coastal Zone, only residential and very low intensity, non-structural recreational uses are allowed if consistent with objectives stated in the LUP for specific sites. Residential development densities are designated at an average density of more than five acres for each residential unit. The exact site area per unit will be determined by the existing conditions on the site, such as slope, geology, soils, access, availability of utilities, availability of adequate sewage and highway capacity, public safety, visibility, and environmental sensitivity.

Very Low Density Residential - Indicates residential development which averages one-half to five acres per dwelling unit. The number of units per site will be determined by the physical conditions of the site, including slope, geology, soils, access, availability of utilities, availability of adequate sewage and highway capacity, public safety, visibility, and environmental sensitivity.

Low Density Residential - Indicates an average of 3 to 9 dwelling units to the acre. The specific density and type of units will be determined by site conditions, including slope, geology, soils, access, availability of utilities, public safety, visibility, and environmental sensitivity.

Medium Density Residential - Indicates an average of 10 to 15 dwelling units per acre. Site conditions will determine specific density and building type. Site conditions include slope, geology, soils, access, availability of utilities, public safety, visibility, and environmental sensitivity.

High Density Residential - Designates an average of 16 to 21 dwelling units to the acre. The precise density, distribution and type of unit will be determined by physical constraints, including slope, geology, soils, availability of utilities, availability of adequate sewage and highway capacity, public safety, visibility, and environmental sensitivity.

Density Bonus - A program which allows projects providing rental units and affordable housing to exceed the maximum density designation of a site in accordance with the following standards:

1. The following maximum increase in density is permitted:
 - (a) 15 percent for market rate rental units;
 - (b) 25-50 percent for affordable units;

- (c) 50 percent for elderly or handicapped units.
2. The bonus program is not applicable to the following geographic areas in the Coastal Zone:
 - (a) Land designated Open Space Residential;
 - (b) Land designated Special Area.

Commercial - Indicates the variety of potential commercial uses the City might attract, including visitor-serving commercial, retail commercial, office, heavy commercial and light industrial. The type of commercial use recommended for a site is stated in the General Plan Land Use Description. Mixed residential and commercial uses are allowed when the dwelling units are located above the commercial uses. Intensity of residential development shall be regulated with a minimum of 2,000 sq. ft. of lot area per unit.

Beach and Commuter Parking - Designated areas where the priority use is public parking. Underlying zoning of these areas will be consistent with adjacent land uses. Priority will be placed on the City seeking funding to implement use.

Public and Semi-Public - Indicates uses such as public or private schools, or privately-operated services. In the case of public schools shown on the Map, should the existing use be discontinued, the proposed use should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhood residents and the existing playground facilities should remain available to neighborhood residents. Should the School District decide to discontinue educational use and sell the property, the land use of the site will be the designation consistent and compatible with the adjacent existing uses, and provision should be made to continue to make available a suitable neighborhood playground area as a part of the future use and development.

Parks - Designates publicly-owned areas, either now developed for recreation use or intended for future recreation development.

Greenbelts - Publicly-owned or privately-owned open areas not intended for development. These areas may include:

1. Land which is physically unsuitable for development due to geotechnical hazards, excessive steepness, or other environmental constraints.
2. Areas to remain undeveloped as a result of density transfer or trade off.
3. Areas covered by open space, recreational, or scenic easements.
4. Open areas providing a physical and visual buffer between developed or open areas.
5. Open space required as mitigation for environmental impacts.

Prominent Ridgelines - A designation assigned to the most scenic of the City's ridges in order to protect their visual importance. The intent is to limit development on these ridges as much as possible. Zoning

would require owners to focus development on suitable portions of their property off the ridges. Where there is no suitable property off the ridge itself, then carefully designed and regulated development could be permitted on the ridge. Such ridgeline development would be required to use creative grading and structural design to make the resulting residential units as inconspicuous as possible to those viewing them from a distance. Roadways would be permitted on prominent ridgelines provided they are graded into the contours of the hillside.

Agriculture - A designation for lands which are under cultivation or intensively used for agricultural use.

Proposed Roadways - The symbol indicates the general location of new roadways discussed in the Circulation Element of the General Plan and proposed in the land use description.

Utilities - A designation indicating the location of the existing public utilities, such as water tanks, serving the City.

Special Area - An area, as described in the text, within which special physical or economic problems exist and for which more than one use would be acceptable, based on the land use designation in the Plan description and the findings of the Environmental Impact Report, site plan, and other required evaluation.

Neighborhood Boundary - Boundaries as shown on neighborhood maps and as described in the Plan text were based on 1970 Census Tract boundaries to simplify future data correlation and applicability. In some cases, these boundaries are not consistent with commonly recognized neighborhood boundaries.

Hazardous/Protective Open Space - Land determined by geotechnical study or by previous ground failure to be unsuitable for structural development, and therefore a threat to the public health, safety and welfare. After appropriate study and public hearing, such land should be designated protective open space.

Net Developable Area - The portion of a site determined by a geologist to remain usable throughout the design life of the project and determined to be adequate to withstand a 100-year hazard event.

Design Life - The time span during which the designer expects the development to safely exist, generally 100 years.

Transfer of Development Rights - A program which allows the residential density permitted on a site (sender site) to be transferred to a different site (receiver site). Upon completion of the transfer, all development rights on the sender site are retired.

LAND USE ELEMENT: DESCRIPTION BY NEIGHBORHOOD

Transfer of Development Rights - The policies of the Land Use, Housing, and Open Space Elements of this General Plan call for the establishment of a Transfer of Development Rights Program which will help implement those elements.

The purpose of the Transfer of Development Rights Program is to provide a mechanism to relocate potential development from areas where environmental or land use impacts could be severe to other areas more appropriate for development, to preserve significant open space resource areas within the City, to encourage protection of natural, scenic, recreational and agricultural values of open space lands, and to control development and minimize damage in potentially hazardous and flood prone areas by the transfer of rights to development from properties in such areas to qualified properties in other parts of the City, while still granting appropriate residential development rights to each property.

Such a program is consistent with the purposes of this Land Use Element and furthers the goals of the Housing, Land Use, Open Space and Recreation, and Seismic Safety and Safety Elements of this General Plan.

A "receiver" site developed under an approved Transfer of Development Rights Program may exceed the maximum density established herein if the excess density is a result of units transferred from a "sender" site so that there is no net increase in overall density. Except for the quarry, no property within the Coastal Zone designated Special Area or Open Space Residential may be a receiver site. The quarry may be approved as a receiver site due to its already disturbed condition. Such prohibition shall not prohibit intra-site transfers within such areas.




INLAND AREAS


Inland Areas include the established neighborhoods and vacant lands between Highway 1 and Skyline Boulevard. These neighborhoods include: Fairmont, Westview-Pacific Highlands, East Edgemar-Pacific Manor, East Sharp Park, East Fairway Park-Valleamar-Rockaway Beach, West Linda Mar, Linda Mar and Park Pacifica.

FAIRMONT

Much of the Fairmont neighborhood is hilly and was developed during the post-war building boom. Two City-owned greenbelts protect the steeper slopes adjacent to Highway 1. Fairmont Elementary School and Fairmont Park and Community Center provide community focal points and developed play areas. The San Andreas Fault and its study zone cross the midsection of this neighborhood.

The predominant land use is single-family residential; however, north of Hickey Boulevard multiple-family units have been developed and a neighborhood shopping center is on the northwest corner of Skyline and Hickey Boulevards. This center is patronized by Pacifica and Daly City residents. Improved maintenance of the center would greatly add to its appeal and value as a neighborhood shopping center.

-  LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  COMMERCIAL
-  GREENBELT
-  PARK



FAIRMONT LAND USE PLAN

The pattern of development and automobile circulation in the Fairmont neighborhood is well developed and adequate to meet the needs of the minor infilling which will occur.

WESTVIEW-PACIFIC HIGHLANDS

This large, predominantly single-family neighborhood is served by two elementary schools, San Andreas and Westview. Imperial Park and Horizon Garden provide open space. The San Andreas Fault crosses the northern half of the neighborhood. Water tanks located on the hill above Imperial Drive are a potential hazard to the homes below should they rupture during an earthquake.

Except for a large multiple-family development on the south side of Hickey at Skyline, the dominant land use is single-family residential. Low density residential use is designated for the vacant site at the southernmost tip of the neighborhood near Skyline and Sharp Park Road. Part of this southernmost site contains a superficial landslide which indicates the need for sensitive design and proper engineering for the proposed development and access. The corner of Skyline and Sharp Park Road should be developed in high density residential uses.


A gently sloping area off Miller Avenue is suitable for low density residential development. Because of its orientation, the residential area off Miller should be included in the adjacent East Edgemar-Pacific Manor neighborhood. The existing neighborhood boundary line is based on the 1970 Census Tract boundary. For current data analysis reasons, it is valuable to keep the area in the Westview-Pacific Highlands neighborhood. This should be re-evaluated when the boundaries are drawn for the subsequent Censuses. Detailed geologic and soils evaluation should also be required for this site.

On the southwestern boundary of the neighborhood, defined by Milagra Ridge County Park, the large vacant area is designated Open Space Residential. While this land is generally quite steep, detailed evaluation of soils, geology, slope and access could identify some buildable locations.

A large steep area along Monterey Road and Norfolk Place, between Norfolk and the rear of the single-family lots on Heathcliff, has been planned and zoned for low density residential development. Each site proposed for development should have a thorough geotechnical investigation. In recognition of the high visibility of the area, innovative design solutions should be proposed which minimize height, building mass, and retaining walls to the extent feasible. Buildings should be separated wherever possible in order to break up building mass, and adequate and appropriate landscaping should be used to soften the appearance of buildings.

A variety of types of housing are appropriate for the area, including apartments, condominiums, or other types of clustered housing. Provision of usable open space for play areas for children should be included in project design as much as possible. One major vacant parcel exists in this neighborhood, the Fairmont III School site. The site should be reserved for medium density residential land use with access limited to Skyline Boulevard.

The existing pattern of arterial and collector streets is well established in this neighborhood. Capacities are adequate to handle the proposed development which would essentially build-out this area. Access for



OPEN SPACE RESIDENTIAL

LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

COMMERCIAL

MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

PARK

UTILITIES

Rev; 9/22/97

WESTVIEW - PACIFIC HIGHLANDS LAND USE PLAN

bot Ave

developments on the site at the southern tip should be carefully reviewed with a view to possible access to Skyline Boulevard.

EAST EDGEMAR-PACIFIC MANOR

The East Edgemar-Pacific Manor neighborhood was once a part of the coastal neighborhoods to the west, but construction of Highway 1 as a freeway cut this area off from its coastal orientation. Housing on the steeper slopes, however, commands spectacular ocean views.

This neighborhood, one of the original beach communities, is one of the oldest in the City. The neighborhood is served by Pacific Manor Elementary School and its playground, as well as a small City park on the edge of the undeveloped Edgemar School site. The predominant land use in this neighborhood is low density single-family residential. Marginal commercial development, mixed with poorly maintained residential units and vacant lots, exists along the Monterey frontage, between Waterford and Winwood, and along the Waterford frontage to Clifton. This area would better support the neighborhood character if it were encouraged to shift into well-designed high density residential development.


The Edgemar School site, declared surplus by the School District, should be developed in low density residential use. The site, bounded by Winwood and Waterford, is at the bottom of a bowl, and highly visible. Therefore, development should be designed with this location in mind. The City park should be continued as a neighborhood facility.

The East Edgemar-Pacific Manor neighborhood has good northbound access to Highway 1. Residents going south must cross the freeway into the West Sharp Park Neighborhood. Existing internal circulation is adequate to handle proposed development.

EAST SHARP PARK

Like its neighbor to the north, East Sharp Park was originally a beach development severed from its coastal orientation by the improvement of Highway 1 to a freeway. Although the basic character of this neighborhood is established, there are parcels which could have a significant impact on the City when developed.

East Sharp Park is served by Oceana High School and its extensive playing fields, and Milagra Ridge County Park, currently proposed to remain relatively undeveloped, but an important link in the ridgeline equestrian/pedestrian trail system. Pomo Park and the Pomo Park Quonset provide a developed play area for neighborhood children and a City-owned community center, recently used for a nursery school and adult education. Eureka Square serves as a neighborhood shopping center, as well as attracting customers from other neighborhoods. Because it is transitional, the frontage along Oceana Boulevard in this neighborhood is particularly important. At the north end, between Paloma and Carmel, the frontage should be commercial. From there, medium density residential uses should extend along the frontage south to Eureka Square Shopping Center. South of the shopping center to Clarendon, the frontage should be developed in medium density residential uses. Project design should be planned to be compatible with the adjacent Low Density Residential area, including form, bulk, materials, and access to sunlight. No more than two stories of height



should be allowed to ensure compatibility with the adjacent one-story neighborhood.

Several major vacant parcels are included within the boundaries of this neighborhood. Two of these parcels are immediately adjacent to the existing residential neighborhood, on the lower undeveloped slopes of Milagra Ridge and Gypsy Hill. One of these areas is at the back of the valley; the other is located south of Moana Way and east of Eastlake Avenue. Both are the remains of old subdivisions, and should be replatted based on geotechnical considerations, emergency equipment access and other public safety considerations. Although low density residential use is proposed, consistent with existing development, the specific density should be determined by studies describing the condition of the land and public safety.

Milagra Ridge is the dominant land form near the north end of the neighborhood. A portion of this ridge was graded when it was used as a coast artillery site, and later as a Nike missile base. The bulk of the property was turned over to San Mateo County for a park and has since been transferred to the National Park Service. However, the highly visible western portion of the ridge is in private ownership. A mixture of uses is recommended.

The front few acres, easily accessible from Oceana Boulevard, could be developed with commercial uses which should tie in, if possible, with the adjacent commercially designated area. The entire Oceana frontage in this section of East Sharp Park, between Milagra Drive and Oceana High School, is designated Commercial. Included in the Commercial area is a triangular parcel which has access from San Diego Court. Development of each parcel should be compatible with other proposed commercial development. Design should blend in with existing topography to the maximum extent feasible. The visual characteristics of the property are categorized in the Community Design Element as including ridgeline and hillside land forms which are prominently viewed from the highway. Guidelines for development of hillside property stress consideration of the effect of development on visually significant slopes, open space, topography, and existing vegetation.

The ridgeline is highly visible and is one of the first views of Pacifica seen by motorists travelling south on Highway 1. The site is a link between the Pacific Oceana and coastal trails and major open space properties to the east.

The General Plan contains numerous goals and policies intended to control development on hillsides and ridgelines in order to protect the visual resources of the City to promote geotechnically stable development, and ensure appropriate scale and density of development on hillsides. These policies include protection of natural land forms which define areas, especially ridgelines, and fitting development to the topography and building on the less prominent portions of ridgelines.

To respond to the goals and policies contained in the Seismic and Safety, Community Design and Open Space Elements, and to the sensitivity of the site, Milagra Ridge should be planned as a unit. In this way, the City can comprehensively review access, landscaping, development location, height, and design. Phasing of development and infrastructure can then also be appropriately planned. The coverage controls contained in the Hillside Preservation District overlay zone provide additional regulations to address the sensitivity of the site and the above goals.

The Milagra Ridge site is geographically divided into three areas and could be developed with a mixture of uses provided that development proposals conform to the City's policies and goals. The front plateau is designated "Commercial". The area has already been graded and, thus, commercial development could easily be accommodated. The property has outstanding ocean views and a variety of commercial uses would be appropriate, including, but not limited to, an inn, restaurant, recreational use, research and development, office, or convalescent hospital.

The middle slopes and the northern extension of the property, above Conchita Court, are designated Very Low Density Residential. The increased slope and visibility of these portions of the site require that project design be planned to minimize grading and be as visually unobtrusive as possible with single-family detached homes as the preferred housing type. Development in this area must be carefully designed to avoid impacts on the Mission Blue Butterfly habitat. Consideration should also be given to possible impacts on the San Bruno Elfin Butterfly.

Project design should minimize the mass of any proposed buildings through ample landscaping, provision of an adequate setback from the plateau edge, and appropriate roof height and design. Building design should conform to the topography of the site and suggest the original ridgeline. In addition, development design should de-emphasize the linear aspect of the site by avoiding a linear building layout. Because of the high visibility of the site, conformance with the above-cited goals and policies is essential to ensure appropriate development of the site. Development should be concentrated on the front plateau with density decreasing on the middle slopes to provide a smooth transition into the greenbelt designated upper slopes and the GGNRA beyond, and to avoid an adverse impact on the Mission Blue Butterfly habitat.

Between the areas where development is proposed and the western limit of the area owned by the County is the most visible portion on the lower ridge. Where necessary, this area should be revegetated as a required off-site improvement and left undeveloped. This open area should be considered for dedication to the GGNRA. Milagra Ridge is suitable for inclusion within GGNRA boundaries and the National Park Service should be encouraged to consider acquisition of the ridge if feasible.

The County Ridgeline Trail traverses this area. The trail should be incorporated into the design of future development.

At the south end of East Sharp Park is Gypsy Hill. A few single-family homes on large lots now dot this area.

This steep hill is one of the prominent features of the City. Its visual characteristics are categorized in the Community Design Element as including ridgeline and hillside land forms which are prominently viewed from the highway. The potentially significant effect of hillside development is pointed out, as is the importance of developing guidelines to protect visually significant slopes, open space, and natural grade. It is stated that development be directed toward less prominent portions of property and that significant slopes and ridgelines be preserved as much as possible. The policies encourage minimization of grading and fitting development to the topography to lessen the impact of hillside development on the terrain.


In response to the topography and the visual importance of the property, Gypsy Hill is divided into three land use categories. The eastern lot, with direct access to Sharp Park Road is designated Commercial. The Commercial designation recognizes the value of the view from the property as an incentive for visitor-serving development. A variety of commercial uses are appropriate, including, but not limited to, hotel and/or conference center, research and development, offices, or convalescent hospital. All commercial uses should be integrated. The proposed land use intensity and design should be appropriate for the site, given the property's high visibility and slope. Careful design is critical to achieve consistency with applicable goals and policies of the Community Design, Seismic and Safety, and Open Space Elements. To that end, design components, such as height, roof treatment, landscaping, exterior materials, and building arrangement should further General Plan goals and integrate development into the hillside as much as possible. Due to potential traffic impacts, through traffic from Sharp Park Road to the East Sharp Park area should not be permitted.









The upper and middle slopes west of the commercial area are the most visually prominent portion of the property and are, therefore, designated Open Space Residential. The density limitations buffer and offset the more intense land use permitted on the adjacent commercial property, as well as furthering the policies described above. A minimum lot size of more than five acres is permitted. Density should not be transferred from the lower area to the upper slopes. The existing underlying subdivision pattern does not correspond to the topography or to the Open Space Residential designation and the property should be resubdivided prior to development. Design and circulation should be planned to be responsive to the special characteristics of the property. Access shall be planned to Sharp Park Road, with no through access to the East Sharp Park area.

The lower portion of Gypsy Hill could blend into the developed area of East Sharp Park. Access should be planned to Clarendon Road and other East Sharp Park streets. The area is designated Low Density Residential, however, projects should be planned toward the low end of the range to be compatible with surrounding development and to minimize the effect on traffic, drainage, and grading.

Gypsy Hill is also regulated by the Hillside Preservation District (HPD) coverage limitations and processing requirements. Given the difference between the commercial and residential development concepts, it may be advantageous to both the City and the property owner to plan development for the two types of land uses separately. However, each phase of development must recognize potential future land uses, especially in regard to access and circulation.

The East Sharp Park neighborhood gains access to Highway 1 from Oceana Boulevard on the south end of the neighborhood at Sharp Park Road and on the north through the East Edgemar-Pacific Manor Neighborhood. Paloma Avenue provides access across Highway 1 to West Sharp Park and the coastal area north of Mori Point. Sharp Park Road, which forms the southern boundary of this neighborhood, is the major east-west connection in the City, and the first east-west connection north of Route 92 in Half Moon Bay. This heavily travelled road is considered to be very dangerous by residents. In their 1975 Coastal Corridor Study, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) proposed operational and safety improvements be made to the Sharp Park Road. This project was included in MTC's six-year capital improvements program.



-  VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  COMMERCIAL
-  PARKS
-  GREENBELTS
-  OPEN SPACE RESIDENTIAL

EAST SHARP PARK LAND USE

CalTrans is evaluating improvement alternatives. Two of these alternatives include: either widening the existing roadway to four lanes with a center divider, or using the existing roadway and adding two lanes on the north side of Gypsy Hill. The latter alternative would complicate access to the future residential development on Gypsy Hill, as well as create a difficult intersection at the west end of the roadway. A pedestrian-bicycle trail should be included in the safety and operational improvements.

Although many streets are substandard, local access within the East Sharp Park residential neighborhood is adequate for public safety and lends a desirable rustic character to the neighborhood. For this reason, the existing local road standards should be continued in this area as long as the neighborhood residents are satisfied.

EAST FAIRWAY PARK-VALLEMAR-ROCKAWAY

Despite the diversity in topography, the residential character of the East Fairway Park, Vallemar and Rockaway Valley communities is very similar - low density single-family uses are predominant. Sharp Park and Sharp Park Gold Course, owned and operated by the City and County of San Francisco, provide residents of this neighborhood, and of the entire City, with access to golf and views of wide, well-maintained open spaces. The East Fairway Park subdivision is served by ball diamonds and developed on an unused school site; Vallemar is served by Vallemar School and its playground; and Rockaway has no developed recreation area. The School District's administrative offices are also located in Vallemar. The highly visible and undeveloped east-west lateral ridges currently provide residents of this neighborhood access for hiking, exploring and horseback riding. Owners of these areas have now limited access and the adjacent City and County of San Francisco Watershed issues permits to equestrians.

Each of these communities is almost fully developed, with only a few difficult to develop sites left vacant. A vacant site off Sharp Park Road and the future use of the highly visible Sharp Park Road frontage and the east-west ridges which bracket the existing communities are major issues. Steep slopes and unstable ground compound the future development in this entire neighborhood.

At the north end of this neighborhood, at the southwest corner of Sharp Park Road and College Drive, is a large site once used as a quarry, consequently, it was altered from its natural state. Appropriate uses for this site would include a mix of medium density residential, low density residential and church uses. Medium density residential uses may be developed on up to two-thirds of the westerly developable area of the site, and low density residential uses may be developed on the easterly one-third of the developed area of the site, if deemed appropriate and compatible with the neighborhood.

Development should be located far enough away from the edge of the slope to reduce visual impact. Development plans should also include easement provisions for the future County-wide Ridge Trail. Location of the trail easement should be coordinated with San Mateo County Ridge Trail Committee and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

(Last Amended: GPA-75-00)

The south side of Sharp Park Road should be designated Open Space Residential. Between the quarry and Sharp Park is an area in private ownership now used as a rifle range and farm. The future use of this area is important because of its potential impact on the City and County of San Francisco's Sharp Park and on the views from Sharp Park Road. The frontage on Sharp Park Road is proposed for open space residential uses. The area now being farmed is proposed for agricultural uses.

A major vacant parcel is in East Fairway Park, on the east side of existing development on the lower slopes of the ridge dividing the area from Vallemar. Potential geotechnical problems, slope, visibility, a limited amount of flat area, and the provisions of the Hillside Preservation District overlay zone restrict the development potential of this parcel. Very low density residential development would be compatible with the neighborhood and consistent with the constraints of the property. Because the property serves as a highly visible transition area between existing development and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, development should be clustered on the lower, flatter areas with density decreasing as the slope increases and moves farther from existing development. The upper slopes should remain undeveloped in order to maintain the continuity of the slope and open space. Access could be at Ridgeway Drive and the ball diamonds should remain to serve the recreation needs of this area and the community.

Only three areas with slopes less than 35 percent remain in Vallemar. One of these is at the front of the valley on the north side, above Vallemar School. Problems of access, slope, visibility, and the limitations of the Hillside Preservation District overlay zone indicate that development in the lower quarter of the Very Low Density Residential range is most appropriate. The transitional nature of the area requires that development be concentrated in the lower, flatter areas of the site with density decreasing as the slope increases. Development must be sensitive to potential physical and visual impacts, and must be carefully designed to avoid over-impacting neighborhood streets.

At the back of Vallemar are two fingers of the valley which still contain some developable land less than 35 percent slope. Because they are a part of the very steep unstable and highly visible face of the coastal ridge, these sites have been included in the coastal ridges Special Area designation on the Land Use Map. For a detailed discussion of their use see Park Pacifica Neighborhood description section on Coastal Ridge Special Area.

At the front of Vallemar is an open green area now occupied by a motel composed of a number of small cottages. This area is partially in the Calera Creek flood plain. A popular stopping place in the 1920s, this site should continue in its highway oriented commercial use. Appearance and recognition of the flood plain should be considered in any future reuse of the site.

There is vacant land in the southwest portion of Vallemar on Franz Court. The property contains a limited amount of flat area and it is backed by steep slopes. Visibility from Highway 1 should be considered during project review. Parking is limited on the cul-de-sac. Due to these constraints, future projects should only be submitted at the Very Low Density Residential range.

On the east side of Highway 1, between the Vallemar and Rockaway Valleys, there is a flat parcel backed by a steeper slope with highway frontage. The future widening of Highway 1 in this area may have some impact on the amount of land available for development. A frontage road between Rockaway and Vallemar is planned, however, the timing for the anticipated improvements is not certain. Retail commercial uses are suggested for the flat highway frontage if enough remains, and low density residential use for the moderate slopes behind. In order to minimize grading and the use of retaining walls, and because of geotechnical safety, access, and visibility concerns, development should be confined to the lower area of the site, leaving the prominent ridge and steep slopes open. Problems of access and geotechnical conditions, along with the constraints of the Hillside Preservation District, indicate that development should be within the lowest quarter of the Low Density Residential range. Design should be a prime consideration since this location will be highly visible from Highway 1 and the future proposed visitor-oriented commercial development at the quarry. A GGNRA access trail should be incorporated into the design of future development.

On both the north and south sides of the Rockaway Valley are undeveloped areas under 35 percent slope. In some cases, they were previously subdivided, based on standards no longer acceptable. Because of soils and geologic problems, visual impacts, as well as public safety hazards, such as limited emergency access and high potential for grass fires, very low density residential development is recommended for these remaining hillside areas. Again, the sizes of lots or number of units should be determined on a site-by-site basis.

At the end of Rockaway is a box canyon which is part of a larger, topographically complex parcel in single ownership. This parcel should be considered as a unit for development purposes. Access via Fassler Avenue or Estella Drive is discouraged due to potential traffic impacts on Fassler Avenue and the extensive cut and fill required. Access will, therefore, be limited to Rockaway Beach Avenue. Due to the narrowness of the street and potential traffic impacts, the box canyon area is best suited for Very Low Density Residential development. Development of the entire parcel will also be limited by Hillside Preservation District zoning and the potential for visual, geotechnical, and hydrological impacts. In order to minimize these potential impacts, development should be concentrated in the flat areas to the maximum extent possible. As called for in the Open Space and Recreation Element of the General Plan, a park designed to meet the needs of the Rockaway Beach neighborhood should be established on the flat area at the front of the box canyon area to serve as a buffer between new development and the existing neighborhood. In addition, a secondary access to Sweeney Ridge should be provided at the end of Fassler Avenue. The access should include a trail head and signage. An appropriate location for parking should be determined after receiving input from the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Public purchase of the entire parcel for inclusion in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area is encouraged by the National Park Service.

Between the Rockaway Beach neighborhood and the box canyon is just over an acre of relatively flat vacant land. This area is designated Low Density Residential and should be developed with single-family detached dwellings which are consistent with the developing pattern of the neighborhood.

Much of the acreage of the Rockaway area includes steep, unbuildable slopes of the coastal ridges. However, there are locations where slope, soil

conditions, geology and access makes possible a house or a small cluster of houses unobtrusively placed on the hillside, or in a hidden valley. Because this area requires special treatment and necessarily very low residential densities, if they are possible at all, it has been designated Open Space Residential on the Land Use Map. The minimum lot size here would have to be more than five acres and, given the constraints of the difficult terrain, may be substantially more.

The most scenic of the City's east-west ridges are also located in this neighborhood. Because of their visual importance to the City, these ridges have been specially designated "Prominent Ridgelines". The intention of this designation is to limit development on these ridges as much as possible. Owners are encouraged to focus development on suitable portions of their property off these ridges.

The north side of Fassler Ridge, including the vacant land fronting on Fassler Avenue, is also within this neighborhood. This long, narrow area should be carefully developed with low density residential use with limited access to Fassler Avenue in order to minimize conflicts with this heavily-travelled arterial. Immediately west of the low density residential area is a narrow vacant area with a limited amount of flat land. Potential traffic impacts on Fassler Avenue, possible geotechnical problems, and the limitations of the Hillside Preservation District overlay zone indicate that Open Space Residential is the most appropriate use of this area.

On the south side of Fassler, between Fassler Avenue and Coast Lane is a vacant hill which, because of its location and adjacent uses, is suitable for highway-oriented, visitor-serving commercial uses, such as a motel, restaurant, etc. Preparation of this site for any use will require substantial grading, and site development plans should include erosion control, revegetation of graded areas with native or low-maintenance materials and landscaping.

Roadways providing access to the north-south ridge (see Park Pacifica section) could be permitted to traverse the prominent ridgelines. These roadways should be as inconspicuous as possible when viewed from the north. The ridgeline areas fronting these roadways should be free from development to the extent possible.

Circulation within the East Fairway-Valleymar-Rockaway Neighborhood presents some serious problems. Each neighborhood depends on access from Highway 1 which, at this point, is a four-lane arterial. During peak commute hours, Highway 1 reaches its capacity delaying motorists and presenting access problems for emergency equipment. For this reason, each neighborhood should have a second access, preferably other than Highway 1. The proposed frontage road on the west side of Highway 1 (see West Fairway Park-Rockaway Beach section in the Local Coastal Neighborhood Descriptions) would relieve the problem. Nonetheless, a frontage road on the east side, if possible, after improvements to Highway 1 would also facilitate emergency access.

Access to the ridgelines areas of Pacifica is a critical issue. The ridges make a major contribution to the basic visual character of the City. Whether the primary north-south ridge, known as Sweeney Ridge, becomes a park or low density residential use (see section on Park Pacifica), there will be a need for public access by automobile. To maintain visual quality, it will be necessary to restrict development adjacent to the east-west ridge-top roads. The character of the access roadway would depend upon the



0 100 200
OPEN SPACE
RESIDENTIAL



MIXED USE



VERY LOW DENSITY
RESIDENTIAL



LOW DENSITY
RESIDENTIAL



HIGH DENSITY
RESIDENTIAL



COMMERCIAL



*
PARK



PROMINENT
RIDGE LINE



SPECIAL
AREA



U
UTILITY



MORNING
WAY

AGRICULTURE

SHARP PARK CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.

FAIRWAY
DR

SPECIAL
AREA

WALLER
SCHOOL
MORNING
DR

FAIRWAY
SCHOOL
5300

EAST FAIRWAY PK. - VALLEMAR -

use of Sweeney Ridge. Should the ridge be purchased for park use, a two-lane road along the ridge between East Fairway Park and Vallemar would be adequate. Should residential development occur on Sweeney Ridge, then both the suggested park access road and an additional road from the end of Fassler to Sweeney Ridge would be preferable. The roadway on the ridge between East Fairway Park and Vallemar presents a particular access problem at Highway 1. Because of high traffic volumes, limited capacity, and the characters of the existing four-lane road, CalTrans is reluctant to permit additional access to Highway 1. Several possible alternatives should receive detailed study before an intersection decision is made.

WEST LINDA MAR

Although West Linda Mar has access to considerable beach frontage, its orientation is clearly inland. Residents of the neighborhood are served by Pedro Valley and Linda Mar Schools and their playgrounds. A branch post office is located at the Linda Mar Shopping Center. The primary land use is Low Density Residential. The southeast corner of Linda Mar Boulevard and Highway 1 is the site of Linda Mar Shopping Center which serves both the neighborhood and the entire community. A SamTrans commuter bus stop is on the north side of Linda Mar Boulevard, opposite the shopping center. Commercial uses interspersed with homes and vacant land are also located between Highway 1 and Cabrillo School on the north side of Crespi Drive. A convalescent home is located in the neighborhood adjacent to the San Pedro Creek floodplain.

Since this area was developed at about the same time, the existing residential uses in this area should be the subject of housing conservation in order to avoid mass deterioration. The programs might include voluntary inspection, clean-up, paint-up and planting of street trees.

There are several major vacant parcels in this area. Properties on Highway 1, south of Crespi, and on the north side of Linda Mar Boulevard (opposite the Linda Mar Shopping Center and adjacent to the commuter bus stop), are ideally suited for parking to serve both commuters and beach users. Both parcels are owned by CalTrans. The Linda Mar site was acquired years ago and was never developed. The Crespi site was purchased when CalTrans anticipated converting the southern half of Highway 1 to a freeway. CalTrans is working with SamTrans to develop the Linda Mar site for commuter-beach parking. SamTrans will maintain the lot. Part of the Crespi site will be used for proposed improvements to Highway 1. These improvements will also correct drainage problems on the site and make the remaining land better suited for parking. Unless the State provides additional funding for beach and/or commuter parking, the City will have to seek funding to develop and maintain this lot.

Vacant land opposite Roberts Road on Crespi is recommended for commercial uses to strengthen the existing commercial uses in the area. This is an appropriate location for a variety of general commercial uses.


In the southwest corner of the neighborhood, two large vacant parcels are almost completely within the designated San Pedro Creek flood plain. Future use of these sites also would be affected by the Highway 1/Devil's Slide bypass. HUD's flood zone requirements and the environmental impact on the San Pedro Creek habitat should be factors to consider with development

proposals. Of particular sensitivity is the riparian habitat which protects resident steelhead trout. An undisturbed riparian setback is suggested for the entire length of the creek to the diversion dam on the middle fork and to the San Pedro Valley Park on the south fork. High Density Residential land use is appropriate in the flood plain area so long as development meets the constraints of the area and the appropriate level of public safety and access is provided. Low density residential use, with density limited to the low end of the range, is appropriate for the southern parcel provided that no development should be approved without adequate protection from flooding. Flood control improvements should be designed to protect the subject property and the surrounding area to withstand a minimum of a 100-year flood.

Low density residential use, with density limited to the low end of the range, is appropriate for the southern parcel provided that no development should be approved without adequate protection from flooding. Flood control improvements should be designed to protect the subject property and the surrounding area to withstand a minimum of a 100-year flood.

Adobe Drive, in the southern portion of the neighborhood south of Higgins Way, is a cul-de-sac. Properties immediately adjacent to Adobe Drive, south of Higgins Way, form a peninsula surrounded on three sides by unincorporated lands within the City's sphere of influence. The majority of properties in this area are undeveloped hillside areas with slopes ranging from 22% - 50%+. Gently sloping, vacant property on the west side of the cul-de-sac should be developed with very low density residential land uses in order to provide the greatest flexibility in site design sufficient to minimize the effect of development on adjacent, existing agricultural uses and maintain adequate access to southerly County recreation areas. Developers of this property should provide an adequate buffer between developable areas within the City boundary and adjacent agricultural uses within unincorporated lands and the City's sphere of influence. The density of development should decrease as it approaches the City's southern boundary to provide a transition to the undeveloped unincorporated lands. Access to unincorporated County recreation areas to the south should be maintained. Based on proper geotechnical studies, other properties adjacent to the Adobe Drive cul-de-sac could be developed at very low residential densities. In order to assure compatibility with surrounding lower density land uses, development in this area should be undertaken in a manner which is subordinate to existing topography and the general character of the setting. To achieve this end and to provide an additional buffer area between developed incorporated and undeveloped, unincorporated recreation areas, developers should be encouraged to establish and dedicate a conservation easement over those portions of any property in this area containing an existing tree planting easement.

Internal circulation in West Linda Mar is adequate for existing and proposed development. Recent improvements to the Linda Mar and Crespi intersections have facilitated local access to and from Highway 1, but the peak hour capacity of the highway will continue to be a factor in the level of service to this neighborhood.



WEST LINDA MAR

LINDA MAR


The Linda Mar neighborhood includes the central portion of the San Pedro Valley and includes development on the south side of Fassler Avenue. The neighborhood is served by five elementary schools: Cabrillo, Crespi, Alma Heights, Sanchez and Ortega and their playgrounds. Oddstad Park and Recreation Center, which also houses the City's Senior Citizen Center, and the historic Sanchez Adobe also are in this neighborhood. The predominant land use in the area is single-family residential developed at low density. A few parcels in agricultural land use remain in the area. Those which are economically viable should be encouraged to remain.








Park Pacifica Shopping Center is located on the eastern edge of this neighborhood, at the intersection of Oddstad and Terra Nova. A new County branch library, the Sanchez Branch, is proposed adjacent to this shopping center, although budgetary problems may delay its development.

Most of the major parcels in the Linda Mar neighborhood are located adjacent to Fassler Avenue. The portion of this frontage west of Roberts Road is the highly visible extension of the Headlands Ridge and should be designated as a Prominent Ridgeline. The constraints of access, potential traffic impacts, the high visibility of the area, geotechnical concerns, and the limitations of the Hillside Preservation District overlay zone indicate that the large vacant area fronting on Fassler Avenue from Roberts Road to Crespi School should be designated for Open Space Residential use. The area should be planned as a unit and given the potential for traffic problems on Fassler Avenue, access to the site should be provided from Roberts Road. If access to the eastern portion of the site is not feasible from Roberts Road, access should be focused at a single location off Fassler Avenue for the purposes of traffic safety, and curb cuts should be kept to a minimum.

A small ridge extends south from the Fassler Ridge east of Roberts Road. The upper slopes of this ridge should be designated as Prominent Ridgeline and left open. The lower portion of this area is less steep, but the constraints of access, potential traffic impacts, the high visibility of the area, geotechnical concerns, and the limitations of the Hillside Preservation District overlay zone indicate that development within the Very Low Density Residential range is appropriate. The area can also be considered as a "receiver site" for density transfers, in which case the Commission would consider increasing density to the low end of the Low Density Residential range.

East of the small lateral ridge served by Roberts Road is another small ridge extending south from the Fassler Ridge. This area forms the backdrop for an existing residential area. The portions of the site immediately adjacent to the existing residential area served by Corona Drive are topographically complex and subject to the provisions of the Hillside Preservation District overlay zone. Geotechnical and access problems may also limit development in the area. For these reasons, the area should be



-  OPEN SPACE RESIDENTIAL
-  VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  COMMERCIAL
-  GREENBELTS
-  PARK
-  UTILITIES
-  AGRICULTURE
-  CHURCH
-  FIRE STATION

LINDA MAR LAND USE PLAN

developed at Very Low Density Residential density. The upper, more visible portion of the ridge should be designated Prominent and protected from obtrusive development.

The remaining vacant parcels on the north side of San Pedro Valley, with slopes less than 35 percent, are designated Low Density Residential compatible with the existing housing in the area. As in other neighborhoods, there may be locations where site conditions make possible some development on the steeper slopes. These areas, including the lower slopes of Montara Ridge, are designated Open Space Residential.

On the southern edge of this neighborhood, off Rosita Road, is some vacant School District property known as Pitto Ranch. This area is now being used as an outdoor classroom by all the schools in the district. Because of its steep and possibly unstable slopes, this area, if not developed as a school in the future, should be developed in open space residential uses.

Adjacent to the shopping center at Terra Nova and Oddstad is a vacant parcel designated for commercial development compatible with the shopping center.

At the southern portion of this neighborhood are two parcels, one at the end of Perez Drive and the other at the end of Higgins Way (a County road). The optimum use of these parcels is Very Low Density Residential. A connection between Higgins Way and Perez extended would relieve potential traffic congestion. The precise number of units and lot sizes in both areas should be determined by geologic and soils conditions, as well as the slope of the land.

PARK PACIFICA


The predominant existing land use in Park Pacifica is low density residential, interspersed with greenbelts. Oddstad Elementary School and Terra Nova High School serve residents of the neighborhood. Jointly funded playground, tennis courts and swimming pool facilities at these schools provide residents with a variety of recreation activities. Frontierland Community Park and San Pedro Valley County Park are also located here, facilitating access to the ridges and, with permission, the watershed.

Very little infill potential remains in the back of San Pedro Valley. One vacant parcel is located on Oddstad, opposite the Park Pacifica Shopping Center. This site is designated for high density residential development. A second area is the Picardo Ranch, east of Terra Nova High School. Limited access restricts the potential of this secluded valley to very low density residential use. Riding stable uses might also be appropriate here.

The remaining vacant land in the neighborhood consists of the steep western slopes of the coastal ridge and the flatter area on the top of Sweeney Ridge. The eastern side of Sweeney Ridge is part of the City and County of San Francisco watershed.

Sweeney Ridge, the lateral east-west ridge, and adjacent steep slopes have been designated a Special Area. One proposal for the area is a planned residential development, mainly on the north-south ridge and adjacent slopes. As an alternative, a group of residents is urging public acquisition of the area for a national park. The City Council has requested

-  OPEN SPACE RESIDENTIAL
-  VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  COMMERCIAL
-  GREENBELT
-  UTILITIES
-  PARK
-  PROMINENT RIDGELINE



**PARK
PACIFICA**
LAND USE PLAN
 rev: 1/19/93

a federally funded feasibility study of park designation and property owners are studying development alternatives.

It is clear that additional information and study of the area is in order, including geologic and soils conditions, viable access, financial impact, public service requirements, off-site improvement costs, and impact on other jurisdictions. The impact of recent changes in the property tax should be studied in terms of the City's ability over the years to maintain the public facilities necessary to support development of this area. The impact on the City of national park development also should be evaluated. In short, the Special Area designation indicates that the future use, or uses, in this area should be based on the best information available at the time.

Alternative uses in the Special Area to be considered include: public acquisition for park use, very low density residential clustered mainly on the north-south ridge and southern valley, and agricultural use which conforms with the existing zoning. The Special Area should be planned and developed as a unit with whichever (agricultural, residential, and/or park) use is determined to be most feasible and desirable.

The valley portion of Park Pacifica is served by an internal loop collector, Oddstad-Everglades, which connects to Terra Nova, part of the Linda Mar-Oddstad-Terra Nova-Fassler arterial loop. Although local residents complain about the level of traffic on Terra Nova at certain times of the day, the roadway appears adequate. Since the back of the valley is virtually built-out and family sizes are rapidly declining, traffic volume should be expected to level off.

Use at San Pedro Valley County Park will not exceed 400 persons at any one time, a quarter of whom will walk in. The entrance is off Rosita Road, just west of the intersection of Linda Mar, Oddstad and Rosita. Park generated traffic is expected to split about equally between Linda Mar and Oddstad-Terra Nova. By 1990, on the 50 peak use days, the traffic generated by the Park -- half of which will be those turned away for lack of space -- should result in a nine percent increase over existing traffic levels on Terra Nova-Oddstad and three percent increases on Linda Mar. Since this peak flow will be weekend visitors and will occur at off-peak commuter hours, the existing capacities of the affected roadways will be adequate.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

A Sphere of Influence is an unincorporated area adjacent to a City with a potential for future urban development and assigned by the Local Agency Formation Commission as a potential annexation to a City. Within a Sphere of Influence, a City defines an Urban Service Area which it anticipates will annex within the next five years.

Between Pacifica and Half Moon Bay lie several small unincorporated communities. They gain access to San Francisco and north San Mateo County, as well as access to the County library and various social services, through Pacifica. However, the mass of Montara Ridge and Devil's Slide creates an effective barrier. Therefore, in the absence of a recommendation by LAFCO, the General Plan defines Pacifica's southern Sphere of Influence as being the crest of Montara and Pedro Point Ridges.

The area within Pacifica's Sphere of Influence on the south is a combination of open, vegetated mountain slopes and ridgelines. Because of the variable steepness of the area and the highly visible ridgelines, the entire land area has been designated Open Space Residential and Prominent Ridgeline. These designations would allow development on buildable sites providing access was possible and public safety needs met. Ridgeline development would be subject to design review.

Within the Sphere of Influence lies Shamrock Ranch. This area has been defined as Pacifica's Urban Service Area. This designation indicates that this area now has the greatest likelihood of being annexed within the next five years. The developable portion of Shamrock Ranch will be affected by the final design and route of the Devil's Slide bypass. Because the highway will cut across the higher slopes of the area, access to Shamrock Ranch will continue to be from Peralta, a local residential street in West Linda Mar. The ranch also has potential geologic and soil hazards. Therefore, very low density use is recommended for this area. Precise residential densities should be established by slope, traffic, soils and geologic studies.

Beyond Shamrock Ranch to the Sphere of Influence boundary, the ridge tops are designated Prominent Ridgeline and the slopes Open Space Residential. The limitations of these uses should provide for sensitive development of these areas in the future. Low-intensity commercial uses compatible with proposed very low density residential uses, such as riding stables or a small dude ranch, might also be appropriate within the Shamrock Ranch area.

Between Pacifica and San Bruno lies unincorporated land owned by the City and County of San Francisco. One potentially developable parcel houses the City and County of San Francisco's jail. The other property is a part of the 23,000 acre watershed for the Crystal Springs Reservoir. Several years ago, there was a move to get San Francisco to discontinue its jail facility. Recently, there has been little discussion of this and, with current budget constraints, future action is uncertain. At the time of the construction of Highway 280, San Francisco conveyed the 19,000 acres on the west side of the reservoir to the U. S. Department of the Interior. Now, even if the Water Department desires changes in the area, they must get approval from Washington, D.C. Thus, the development of this area is not anticipated.

Since development of the jail facility site would probably gain access and services from San Bruno and the watershed is not likely to be developed, it seems reasonable to draw the eastern boundary of the City's Sphere of Influence at the existing City line. LAFCO should undertake a detailed study to recommend the appropriate Spheres of Influence for San Bruno and Pacifica in this area.

COASTAL NEIGHBORHOODS

Pacifica's Coastal Zone extends from the eastern edge of Highway 1 to the Pacific Ocean. There are six coastal neighborhoods. Together, they represent a wide variety of land uses, including intensely used public recreation areas, substantial quantities of low and moderate-income housing, visitor-serving and neighborhood commercial development, and highly sensitive wildlife habitats. The Fairmont West, West Edgemar-Pacific Manor and West Sharp Park neighborhoods are predominantly low and moderate income residential areas. The Rockaway Beach neighborhood is developed with visitor-oriented uses and some general commercial and residential uses. The Headlands-San Pedro Beach is scenic and undeveloped. Pedro Point-Shelter Cove, the remaining neighborhood, is a mix of visitor and neighborhood commercial uses and has a strong residential base.

Before examining the detail of the individual neighborhoods, it is important to recognize the diverse pattern of development along the coast in Pacifica. The varied types of development of each coastal neighborhood and their geographic relationships are an inherent and vital part of the character of the City. Thus, the intent of the Local Coastal Land Use Plan will designate land uses and intensities which are suitable to the unique circumstances of each coastal neighborhood, will adequately meet the needs of the City's residents and visitors, and will be consistent with State Coastal Act policies.

Though the Coastal Act gives priority to specific land uses of undeveloped ocean front parcels, the need for additional housing in Pacifica's Coastal Zone, the potential incompatibility of mixing public and private uses, and the adequacy of existing and proposed visitor-serving uses in other parts of the City's coastline indicate that it may be desirable and consistent with the Act to develop certain remaining vacant ocean front lots in residential uses. In other areas, in order to reinforce coastal recreation uses and assist the City's economic base, it is important to set aside land for coastally-dependent and visitor-oriented commercial development. The goal is to ensure that the Local Coastal Land Use Plan for Pacifica's Coastal Zone will, as a whole, meet the intent of the Coastal Act while allowing the various neighborhoods to retain their individual characteristics and provide for realistic development consistent with existing land use patterns and geographic constraints of the City. The Neighborhood Land Use Descriptions and Maps included here represent both the City's approved General Plan, as well as its certified Local Coastal Land Use Plan.

FAIRMONT WEST

The Fairmont West neighborhood is an established residential area located in the northwestern portion of Pacifica between the Daly City boundary and the "Dollar Radio" site. Highway One and the Pacific Ocean form the east and west boundaries of this coastal neighborhood.

The City of Pacifica participated in the Bureau of the Census 1980 Neighborhood Statistics Program. Fairmont West is identified as

"Neighborhood 1" and detailed census analysis is available for the neighborhood. Selected data is described below.

Of the City's population, 2.7% resides in Fairmont West. Ethnic characteristics can be described as 60% White, 24% Asian, 11% Hispanic, and 9% Black. Among the 999 persons in the neighborhood, 24.7%, or 247, were under 15 years old and 2.9%, or 29, were 65 years and over; 320 children aged 3 and over were enrolled in school with 21 in nursery school, 194 in kindergarten through 8th grade, and 57 in high school.

Household size and marital status are indicators of family life and changing patterns. 17.6% of the neighborhood households consisted of one person and 4.5% had 6 or more persons. Non-family households composed of householders who lived alone, or only with unrelated persons, represented 26.1% of all the households. The neighborhood has 284 families, of which 87.3% were maintained by a married couple, 10.2% by a female householder with no husband present, and 2.5% by a male householder with no wife present. Of the neighborhood's 186 families with own children under 18 years, 9.1% were one-parent families maintained by the mother.

The median household income is \$26,500. Households with incomes less than \$7,500 were 6.3% of all households in the neighborhood, while households with incomes of \$25,000 or more constituted 55.1% of the household. The poverty threshold for a four-person family was \$7,412 in 1979. There was a total of 55 persons below the poverty level in 1979 in the neighborhood, or 5.2% of all persons for whom poverty status was determined. Of the 14 families below the poverty level in the neighborhood, 64% had a female householder with no husband present. The land here in Fairmont West is almost fully developed with single- and multi-family units, predominantly with detached, single-family dwellings. There are 353 housing units in the neighborhood. 78% of the units are owner-occupied, with a median value of \$108,000. The median rent was \$433.

Road access, via Palmetto Avenue, to this bluff-top residential neighborhood is not readily apparent to the casual visitor. Improved signing will be needed to allow visitor-serving commercial uses that could be located on the currently developed sites in this neighborhood to compete with those that now exist or may be developed in the more visually and physically accessible areas of Pacifica's shoreline.

Although much of Fairmont West is already developed, five large parcels of land remain vacant. Three of these are contiguous bluff-top properties west of Palmetto Avenue, extending from the Daly City boundary, south to the "Dollar Radio Station" residence and totaling approximately 28 acres, including bluff-top and beach-front property. The primary issues of concern regarding these properties are:

1. The extent of geotechnical problems associated with the bluffs and how these will affect the type, intensity, and density of their use.
2. The value of these lands as open space for preservation of scenic and on-site natural resources and the methods used for such protection.
3. The type and location of public access relative to other nearby accessways and potential on-site development.

Geology

It is recognized that the bluff-top and dune area seaward of Palmetto Avenue is subject to a high erosion rate. A 1972 study by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers estimates the average erosion rate in this area to be approximately 2 feet per year. The study also recognizes that the erosion usually occurs on a sporadic basis. Poor drainage, combined with wave undercutting and the nature of the area's geologic substructure, have produced both minor and major bluff failures. Therefore, bluff erosion and bluff stability, in addition to potential seismic activity, are problems to be addressed through detailed geotechnical analysis prior to consideration of proposals for bluff development. Detailed geotechnical background is available for the southern site, however, further analysis will be necessary for any new development proposed in the area.

The City's Seismic Safety and Safety Element requires the bluff setback to be adequate to accommodate a minimum 100-year event, whether caused by seismic, geotechnical, or storm conditions. The setback should be adequate to protect the structure for its design life. The appropriate setback for each site will be determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on the site specific circumstances and hazards.

A Seismic Safety and Safety Element policy prohibits the approval of new developments which require seawalls as a mitigation measure. The policy also states that projects should not be approved which eventually will need seawalls for the safety of the structures and residents.

The vacant land in Fairmont West is located approximately 1/2 mile from the Alquist-Priolo Study Zone boundary. The purpose of the Study Zone is to require geology reports for new development which is proposed in close proximity to an active fault. The width of the special study area is 1/2 mile on each side of the fault.

The Seal Cove Fault is considered potentially active and is located offshore, approximately five miles from the northern coastline. A potentially active fault is one which has not been proved to have moved within the last 11,000 years, but which has moved in the last 2-3 million years. Although the maximum intensity of movement on the Seal Cove Fault is expected to be less than on the San Andreas, a severe earthquake on either fault would subject the area to violent shaking.

The Seismic Safety and Safety Element suggests that development be prohibited in hazardous areas, unless detailed site investigations indicate that risks can be reduced to an acceptable level. A short-term action program was adopted to restrict development in areas particularly prone to seismic shaking or other hazards.

Calculation of density based on the "net developable" area is used to limit the development and density to the area of the site that can realistically support development. This is necessary because certain land areas shown on parcel maps for the bluff-top no longer exist due to surface erosion and landsliding into the sea. The "net developable" area may be smaller than would be indicated by an Assessor's parcel map. The "net developable" area along the bluff top can be determined by detailed geotechnical studies which would indicate the stable portions of the site and establish "hazard" setbacks to protect the structures for their design life, generally assumed to be 100 years. The appropriate land use designation for a site will be

applied only to the established net developable area. In the event the net developable area for parcels in existence on the date of the adoption of these amendments is determined to be less than the minimum area per unit allowed in the designation, one residential unit per parcel shall be permitted so long as the property conforms to all geotechnical standards and is determined to be developable pursuant to geotechnical review.

Scenic Resources

The entire bluff-top area is currently undeveloped and below the grade of Palmetto Avenue. Southbound passersby are offered an open, highly scenic view of the entire length of Pacifica's coastline south to Pedro Point. This is one of the few areas in Pacifica where such views may be gained by pedestrian, as well as vehicular, traffic. The bluff top, and indeed much of the Fairmont West neighborhood, is also visible from Highway 1, which in this area is elevated many feet above the neighborhood.

This area lies in an important coastal view corridor. Coastal resources and their ability to attract visitors play an important role in Pacifica's economy. Pacifica's attractiveness and potential for commercial growth is based on its open hills, views and coasts. In addition, residential densities should be lowered as the City boundaries are approached. Particularly when the City bounds on areas of important national, scenic or recreational value, densities should be lowered in order to consolidate urban development and to preserve City character and scenic resources.

The southern end of the bluff top, next to and north of, the "Dollar Radio Station" residence contains one of the few remaining rolling sandy foredunes in Pacifica. It also contains northern coastal scrub vegetation. The habitat value of the vegetation and the foredune has not been established. The area is presently used by local dirt bike riders and is disturbed through their activities and the site's previous use as a right-of-way for the old Ocean Shore Railroad.

Traffic

Vehicular access to Fairmont West is gained in the following ways:

1. Southbound Highway One to Palmetto Avenue.
2. From northbound Highway One to Palmetto Avenue via Oceana Boulevard and the Manor Drive overpass.

Northbound vehicles exiting the neighborhood and the City use Oceana Boulevard via Palmetto Avenue and the Manor Drive overpass. Southbound exiting vehicles use Palmetto Avenue and must pass through its intersection with Manor Drive. All local traffic to and from the neighborhood and northbound traffic must use the combined intersections of Palmetto Avenue/Manor Drive/Oceana Boulevard.

Streets within Fairmont West are adequate to accommodate traffic generated by additional commercial and residential development. However, due to capacity problems of the Palmetto Avenue/Manor Drive/Oceana Boulevard intersection, any significant increase in the number of vehicles resulting from intensified commercial or additional residential development in the vicinity of Manor Drive, or along Palmetto Avenue, should be accompanied by traffic studies which anticipate peak hour traffic impacts on the

intersection. In order to accommodate and encourage expanded access opportunities and related visitor-serving land uses in the neighborhood to the south, residential development in Fairmont West shall not occur without resolution of traffic impacts which could adversely affect the viability of access related and visitor-serving commercial development in the area. However, street widening may not be easy to implement because of elimination of on-street parking and limited right-of-way. Decreasing densities on residential sites may alleviate traffic impacts, especially at peak hours, when flow is unstable and queues develop.

Land Use Policies

The vacant land west of Palmetto Avenue is designated Low Density Residential (3-9 dwelling units per acre). Density is calculated based on the net developable area because of the sensitivity of the site. Considering the extent of apparent and documented geotechnical hazards in the area, the uniqueness of the bluff tops with the City for the views they offer visitors, as well as their value for passive recreation and nature study, the density of any proposed development should be planned at the low end (3 dwelling units per acre) of the Low Density range. To protect public views and preserve the unique land form, the height, design and siting of the structures on this land should be regulated to minimize impact on the dunes, and maximize views over and between the buildings to the shoreline and the sea.

Given the development criteria outlined above, Low Density Residential use of this bluff top is consistent with the following policies of the Coastal Act: 30212 (Public Access), 30250 (Concentration of Scenic Resources), 30251 (Scenic and Visual Qualities), 30253 (Minimize Risks to Life and Property). Because of the availability of more suitable, accessible shoreline sites within the City, which are adequate to accommodate existing and future coastal dependent and visitor-serving commercial development needs, it is not necessary to retain the bluff-top land in the Fairmont West residential neighborhood for these purposes.

The other vacant land (+5 acres) in this neighborhood is on the east side of Palmetto Avenue, south of the existing condominiums. This land is moderately sloping to level, and is partially covered with bluff scrub vegetation, a portion of which has been disturbed by excessive foot and bike traffic, resulting in some erosion. Geologically, the land is much more stable than the bluff area across Palmetto to the west, and it is also significantly below the grade of Coast Highway. Proper drainage improvements and prompt revegetation of exposed areas will be necessary should this land be developed in order to prevent erosion of the neighboring condominiums. Medium Density Residential use is recommended for this land and will contribute to the medium price housing stock in the neighborhood. The proposed land use designation and planning criteria for development of the site are consistent with Sections 30253(2) (Geologic Stability), and 30250 (Concentrate Development).

The instability of the vacant land west of Palmetto Avenue and its coastal resource value suggest the potential use of density transfer techniques to preserve the land as open space. The eastern vacant land, which is more stable and located adjacent to existing high density housing, may be suitable for the higher residential densities. Density could be transferred from the westerly site of this or other identified sites by mutual agreement of the property owners. After the density transfer has been completed,

bluff-top donor site(s) shall be designated for Open Space/Public Access use. To encourage this, the City should allow the maximum number of units to be transferred. The maximum number of units allowed on the western site could be transferred to the eastern site or another site, assuming zoning development standards could be met.

A cooperative development agreement between the owner of this property and the City should be established to protect the owner's and the City's interests during transactions for public or private purchase or use of lands to the west. The agreement would stipulate that the City would accept a development proposal, including the transfer of density and specify the actions of the City, the owner of parcels involved, and the developer regarding future use and maintenance of lands to remain undeveloped. The proposed land use designation and planning criteria for development of the site (see Plan Conclusion) are consistent with Sections 30253(2) (Geologic Stability), and 30251 (Scenic and Visual Qualities).

There is a small amount of excess City right-of-way along Westline Drive and Palmetto Avenue. If site planning studies demonstrate that the land can support development, some of the land along Westline Drive could be used as a density transfer receiving site or as a site for affordable housing. Use of the public right-of-way for such a purpose would be acceptable, provided that the proposed project served a public purpose and was in the best interest of the City.

The remainder of this coastal neighborhood is virtually built-out. The land use designation shown on the maps for this area recognizes and maintains the existing single and multi-family uses.

Coastal Access

The predominant use of the long, privately owned beach in the Fairmont West neighborhood is walking and fishing. This beach offers a unique, isolated beach experience minutes from San Francisco. Both the beach and access have been used by the public for this purpose for many years.

Currently, there is no beach access in this area other than that available to persons willing to traverse the steep bluff faces. Narrow beaches, inundation at high tide, and high unstable bluffs, all indicate that the present isolated beach experience should be maintained. More intense recreational uses should be located in other areas where access already exists or is more feasible and can be oriented to existing or potential development.


Vertical public access to the beach is not proposed in the Fairmont West neighborhood because the high cliffs are subject to erosion and such access would not be consistent with public safety or the protection of fragile coastal resources (Coastal Act Policy 30212). Informal trail access over and through the bluff-top properties shall replace requirements for beach access. The City proposes a north-south pedestrian path beginning at the Daly City-Pacifica boundary, along Palmetto Avenue and through bluff-top lands at locations determined safe by geologic studies. Should these properties become developed, bluff-top trail access easements should be located on the west side of the structures within an open space easement.

Hikers will eventually be able to follow this trail from Pacifica through Daly City to Mussel Rock and eventually link up with the County Trail System

VIEW TO OCEAN FROM PALMETTO AVE.


- * DONOR SITES
- Receiver sites

VIEW TO OCEAN COASTLINE FROM PALMETTO.



FAIRMONT WEST LAND USE PLAN

- MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- NORTH-SOUTH CITY TRAIL



which, upon completion, will connect to the inland ridgeline trail which traverses the length of Santa Cruz County. When the City portion of this trail system is complete, it will be adequately signed to promote its use. Portions of the trail behind units should be developed to provide separation between private and public open space, using fencing, landscaping, and signing. Along with other improvements to enhance and preserve bluff-top open spaces, the City shall implement a plan to control surface runoff over the bluffs from adjacent developed areas in order to minimize accelerated erosion and bluff sloughage.

If density transfer techniques are used and bluff-top properties remain undeveloped, they should become part of a privately held open space access, and/or conservation easement. Grant funds should be sought for their improvement for public use. Improvements should be limited to effective barriers against dirt bike and other off-road vehicle use, reclamation of disturbed areas with native scrub vegetation, security precautions, and establishment of informal paths and/or a vista point.

WEST EDGEMAR-PACIFIC MANOR

Like its neighbor to the north, West Edgemar-Pacific Manor is an established residential area, extending from the "Dollar Radio" site on the north to Milagra Creek on the south. Highway One and the Pacific Ocean mark the east and west boundaries of this neighborhood. Except for a few bluff-top parcels, land in this neighborhood is almost fully developed.

West Edgemar-Pacific Manor is identified as "Neighborhood 3" in the Census Neighborhood Statistics Program. 3.5% of the City's population resides in the neighborhood. Ethnic characteristics can be described as 81% White, 10% Hispanic, 5% Asian, and 5% Black. Among the 1,300 persons in the neighborhood, 11.3%, or 154, were under 15 years old and 7.5%, or 97, were 65 years and over. 381 children aged 3 and over were enrolled in school. They included 8 in nursery schools, 86 in kindergarten through eighth grade, and 55 in high school.

Household size and marital status are indicators of family life and changing patterns. 47.6% of the neighborhood households consisted of 1 person and .9 had 6 or more persons. Non-family households composed of householders who lived alone or only with unrelated persons represented 60.7% of all the households. The neighborhood has 303 families, of which 68.6% were maintained by a married couple, 22.4% by a female householder with no husband present, and 8.9% by a male householder with no wife present. Of the neighborhood's 141 families with own children under 18 years, 48.2% were one-parent families maintained by the mother. The median household income is \$16,088. Households with incomes less than \$7,000 were 15.8% of all households in the neighborhood, while households with incomes of \$25,000 or more constituted 25% of the households. The poverty threshold for a four-person family was \$7,412 in 1979 in the neighborhood, or 12.9% of all persons for whom poverty status was determined. Of the 35 families below the poverty level in the neighborhood, 62.9% had a female householder with no husband present.

The land in West Edgemar-Pacific Manor is developed with single and multi-family units, as well as commercial development. There are 700 housing units in the neighborhood, 7% of which are owner occupied and 93% of

which are rental units. The median house value is \$76,700 and the median rent is \$324.

Residents in this area and adjacent neighborhoods are served by an older neighborhood shopping center located on Palmetto Avenue and side streets Manor Drive and Aura Vista Drive. The existing commercial area is physically oriented to Palmetto Avenue and one-half block removed from the coast. Improvement of the appearance of the shopping center, the addition of more varied visitor-related uses, and promotion of its coastal proximity would be most likely to benefit the shopping center.

Bluffs in this area are 60 to 80 feet high and highly erosive. The predominant use of the beach is walking and fishing. Beach ownership is about evenly divided between private and public. Like the beach to the north, this beach offers an isolated beach experience close to San Francisco, and has been used by the public for this purpose for years.

Geology

As with bluff-top lands to the north of the "Dollar Radio Station" residence, coastal bluffs in this area are subject to a high rate of wave erosion. This average rate is exceeded during winter storm conditions when high wave run up and heavy rains are present. During these periods, sloughage of the face of bluffs occurs typically in the form of vertical slabs.

The City's Seismic Safety and Safety Element requires the bluff setback to be adequate to accommodate a minimum 100-year event, whether caused by seismic, geotechnical, or storm conditions. The setback should be adequate to protect the structure for its design life. The appropriate setback for each site will be determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on the site specific circumstances and hazards.

A Seismic Safety and Safety Element policy prohibits the approval of projects which require seawalls as a mitigation measure. The policy also states that projects should not be approved which eventually will need seawalls for the safety of the structures and residents.

The vacant land in Pacific Manor/West Edgemar is located approximately 3/4 mile from the Alquist-Priolo Study Zone boundary. The purpose of the Study Zone is to require geology reports for new development which is proposed in close proximity to an active fault. The width of the special study area is 1/4 mile on each side of the fault.

The Seal Cove Fault is considered potentially active and is located off shore, approximately five miles from the northern coastline. A potentially active fault is one which has not been proved to have moved within the last 11,000 years but which has moved in the last 2-3 million years. Although the maximum intensity of movement on the Seal Cove Fault is expected to be less than on the San Andreas, a severe earthquake on either fault would subject the area to violent shaking.

The Seismic Safety and Safety Element suggests that development be prohibited in hazardous areas, unless detailed site investigations indicate that risks can be reduced to an acceptable level. A short-term action program was adopted to restrict development in areas particularly prone to seismic shaking or other hazards.

In 1982 and 1983, severe erosion caused loss of backyards and threatened the single-family dwellings on Esplanade. A seawall was constructed in 1984 to prevent continued erosion and to protect the homes. Extensive geotechnical information is available for several of the sites in the area. Wave-induced erosion has, to date, been most severe for the southernmost sites in the West Manor area. As with all bluff-top sites, establishment of net developable area must be based on detailed studies of the geology and hydrology of individual sites given environmental conditions, including potential seismic activity.

Coastal Issues

The major coastal planning issues in this neighborhood are:

1. The effect of geologic conditions on the use of undeveloped property along the bluffs.
2. Maintaining the mix of low and moderate-income residential uses.
3. Improving, strengthening and orienting the existing commercial uses so they are attractive to visitors and continue to meet their neighborhood function.
4. The extent and nature of public access improvements and the City's role in developing new and maintaining existing public access and parking facilities.

Land Use Policies

Most of the West Edgemar-Pacific Manor neighborhood is developed and the land use designations reflect the existing uses. Currently, only two parcels located on the west side of Esplanade, between Aura Vista and Manor Drive, remain vacant. A protective sand fence now blocks the view from the public roadway. The undeveloped area totals approximately 3.5 acres.

The vacant area is suitable for Medium Density Residential development consistent with existing and adjacent uses and with the character of the neighborhood. Medium density development will serve as a transition between the surrounding high density and commercial development. The density calculations shall be based on the net developable area, exclusive of the area deemed appropriate for bluff setback. The setback shall be sufficient to protect the developed portion of the site assuming erosion resulting from a 100-year recurrent seismic or storm event (see Seismic Safety and Safety Element). Development on the northern property shall be designed to provide view corridors over at least one-third of the site from the intersection of Aura Vista and along Esplanade Avenue; views from the southern property shall be protected to the maximum extent feasible. The size of the parcel, setback requirements, net developable area, and view corridor requirement all contribute to decreasing the potential density of the site.

City and Coastal Commission approvals for conversion or new construction on other northern properties in this neighborhood contain conditions which require installation and/or dedication of bluff-top pathways west of the developed areas. Such trails are used to increase recreational opportunities where few exist and to mitigate the partial loss of ocean views from the street. In the case of the one acre northern bluff-top site, adequate public access exists or is proposed nearby

and, because the site is located at the end of one of the main cross streets in Pacific Manor, structures should be sited and designed to provide unobstructed views over one-third of the site. The majority of ocean views shall be preserved from Aura Vista at the intersection of Esplanade Avenue. To replace requirements for on-site provision for public access, the developer should be required to pay an in-lieu fee to contribute to the cost of construction of access on the adjacent south parcel or elsewhere in the City (see access recommendation #4).

As with all bluff-top properties, detailed geologic studies shall be performed and cross sections prepared to determine the developable area of the site. The remaining land shall then be placed in an open space easement to prohibit future development.

Given the criteria listed above, Medium Density Residential use of this bluff-top land is consistent with the following policies of the Coastal Act: 30212 (Public Access), 30250 (Concentration of Development), and 30253 (Geologic Stability). Because of the availability of more visible shoreline sites within the City which are adequate to accommodate future coastal-dependent and visitor-serving commercial needs, and the desire to protect and conserve the mixed income opportunities of the older residential neighborhoods expressed in the Housing Element, it is not necessary to retain all of the bluff-top land in the West Edgemar-Pacific Manor residential area for these purposes.

Two sites in the neighborhood are presently committed for development. Both projects will likely be complete by the Winter of 1984. The first of these is immediately south of the "Dollar Radio Station". A portion of this property consists of a former sanitary land fill. The site has been regraded for residential development and a rock rip-rap seawall installed at the toe of the bluff below the fill portion of the site. The wall will protect facilities proposed to be dedicated for public access and buildings both on-site and to the south. Maintenance of the rip-rap wall is essential to protect the on-site drainage system. Should the wall need to be extended, either north or south, to prevent wave undercutting the bluff-top and ultimately undermining the wall in its present location, extensions shall be designed concurrent with bluff-top drainage improvements and in a manner which minimizes the need for future extensions to maintain the existing wall.

The other property committed for development is the largest, currently vacant bluff-top property, located north of the auto wrecking yard and south of existing residences along Esplanade Avenue. This 0.11 acre site has been approved for development of a full-service recreational vehicle park. Protective setbacks will protect improvements during the park's economic life; in this case, because of the minimal level of site work required for installation of utilities, paving and drainage, the estimated economic life is quite low, approximately 15 years.

Public beach access and parking should be maintained on-site by the developer until such facilities have been accepted for dedication by a public agency. Conditions of project approval require the owner to maintain the bluff-top path and stairway, if necessary, at the expense of RV spaces.

Access improvements to the beach shall serve the dual function of providing permanent beach access and access to the beaches for seawall repair and beach maintenance. Therefore, the access which is constructed shall be sufficient in width and design to provide pedestrian and vehicle access. Should the access become damaged through such usage, it shall be repaired by the owner. The site should

continue to be used for visitor-serving commercial uses, including visitor accommodations. Appropriate uses can serve to encourage further visitor-related coastal development on Palmetto Avenue and in the Pacific Manor Shopping Center and in the Esplanade area. Future development should continue to provide public off-street parking (20 spaces) and public views across the site to the ocean should be protected.

Given the criteria listed above, the visitor-oriented commercial use proposed for this site is consistent with the following policies of the Coastal Act: 30213 (Lower Cost Visitor and Recreation Facilities), 30253 (Geologic Stability), 30222 (Priority of Coastal Development), 30221 (Reserve Coastal Areas), 30255 (Coastal Dependent Development), 30210 (Maximize Public Access), 30211 (Public Access), and 30250 (Concentration of Development).

Geologic stability and coastal erosion are critical problems along portions of the West Edgemar-Pacific Manor Neighborhood bluff-top developed before 1970. Should it become necessary in the future to remove some of this development, a protective open space district should be applied. Under this district, public access or view points should be permitted if geotechnical studies show they can be accomplished without aggravating the existing stability problems. The criteria indicated are consistent with Coastal Act policies 30212 (New Development Shall Provide Public Access) and 30253 (Geologic Stability).

The portion of this coastal neighborhood west of Palmetto is developed in residential and commercial uses. The residential portion north of Manor Drive is developed in high density residential uses; south of Manor low density residential uses predominate. The land use designations for these residential areas recognize and propose to maintain the existing character. (See General Plan Housing Element). Criteria for infilling in the existing residential areas should include: 1) design and scale compatible with the surroundings; 2) protection of the economic mix or housing opportunities; 3) assurance of geologic stability; and 4) minimal tree removal and replacement plantings as necessary. (Amended October 24, 1984, #1-84).

As previously noted, the Pacific Manor Shopping Center has been allowed to decline in appearance and has a limited coastal orientation. To continue to provide neighborhood and visitor-serving commercial facilities, this commercial area should be encouraged to reorganize and revitalize. The existing visitor-serving activities could be expanded by placing more emphasis in theme and appearance on the area's coastal proximity. Commercial development on Esplanade may help promote the existing area's commercial coastal orientation. Physical design ties to the developed beach accesses, such as signs and boardwalks, should also reinforce this relationship. Improved landscaping and a uniform sign program would increase the center's appearance considerably. Methods to implement improvements include formation of an economic development corporation and use of Community Development Block Grant and/or Coastal Conservancy funds.

These proposals are consistent with Coastal Act Policy 30213 (Protect Lower Cost Visitor Facilities) and 30250 (Concentration of Development).

Seawalls

As stated previously, two seawalls have been constructed in the West Edgemar-Pacific Manor neighborhood. In September 1983, the City Council passed Resolution No. 68-83 endorsing a Master Plan for seawall construction between the southern end of Shoreview Avenue and the area south of the Manor Drive/Esplanade intersection in the West Edgemar-Pacific Manor neighborhood. Seawalls have been constructed at both ends of the area in need of protection. The resolution recognizes the need for integrated shoreline protection for the endangered areas.

In the future, property owners may want to construct protective structures which are more resistant to wave action. Should property owners desire a more substantive seawall, the cumulative effect on beach sand replenishment should be determined. Because beaches in this area are extremely narrow and exist only during low tide, seawall structures should be designed to minimize beach scour in the area as much as possible. Preferred structures would be those which provide the maximum amount of effective protection with a minimum reduction in beach sand. The preferred structure to achieve this

result will likely be rock rip-rap rather than a concrete wall. Seawalls shall not extend beyond the mean high tide line.

Coastal Access


Three beach access points are existing or proposed to be developed and maintained in this area. The first is an existing wooden stairway down the face of the bluffs near the Points West Apartments. This structure is located within an easement for public access. However, the stairway itself is currently privately maintained. The approach to the stairs from Esplanade is connected to a private bluff-top trail behind that portion of Points West Apartments along Palmetto Avenue. Conditions of approval for the condominium conversion required dedication and maintenance of the stairway and the bluff-top path by the Homeowner's Association, in addition to dedication of the beach. Documents have been recorded irrevocably offering to dedicate the easements to a public agency. The bluff-top trail connects to a trail located behind the adjacent condominium project.

In the past, the apartment management has been diligent in ensuring that the turf area of this bluff top has been well irrigated. This has resulted in an attractive, well landscaped area which is routinely used by the public for active and passive recreation. However, irrigation of the bluff has resulted in sloughage of the bluff face along the path and adjacent to the stairs. As a result, in 1980, the City installed rock rip-rap next to the stairs in order to protect the City's drain outfall.




Improvements within the open space area and the stairs have also been subjected to repeated vandalism. The beach below the access is often strewn with litter, debris and broken glass. This vandalism is encouraged by the lack of vandal-resistant construction, low beach usage by the general public and the isolated nature of the stairway and the beach. Vandal-resistant improvements and routine maintenance should be encouraged to assure the safety and attractiveness of this access and the beach. On-street parking is currently adequate along Palmetto and Esplanade Avenues for the current level of beach use.

The second beach access is proposed to be developed at Manor Drive and Esplanade Avenue. This property should be acquired and maintained by a public agency, if possible, in conjunction with the adjacent City-owned beach to the west. The stairway access shall not be constructed without attendant off-street parking. If publicly funded, at least 40 spaces should be provided; if privately funded, 20 public parking spaces should be developed.

The RV Park will also provide access opportunities when completed, including parking, a bluff-top trail and stairs to the beach.



VIEW TO OCEAN FROM ESPLANADE

-  LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  COMMERCIAL
-  NORTH-SOUTH CITY TRAIL
-  MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL



WEST EDGEMAR PACIFIC MANOR LAND USE PLAN

The City also has the opportunity to develop a system of bluff-top trails in the neighborhood extending from the Daly City boundary to the Points West stairway. The trail would begin at the view point at the north City boundary, traverse portions of the bluff tops to a point north of the "Dollar Radio Station" residence, proceed around this property along Palmetto Avenue a short distance, loop behind condominium units adjacent and south of the residence and continue west of the Points West Apartments to Esplanade Avenue and the stairway. Except for the coastal neighborhood north of this area, easements have been offered for dedication to the City to complete the trail connections. Most of the improvements are, or will, soon be in place. This will perhaps be the only area in the City where this type of coastal bluff trail is desirable or possible. Improved trails in this neighborhood will form a promenade connected to beach access and unimproved trails within the bluff area to the north. This will provide a variety of access facilities unique in Pacifica and capable of serving diverse coastal recreation needs.

These access proposals are consistent with the following Coastal Act Policies: 30210 (Maximize Public Access), 30212 (New Development Shall Provide Public Access), 30212.5 (Distribute Public Facilities) and 30211 (Public Access).

Vehicular access is via an off-ramp at Monterey from Highway One. Highway One access to the south is gained within the neighborhood at Milagra Creek; northbound traffic must cross the freeway to gain access. The elevated highway provides a panoramic coastal view which should be considered in future development. Internal vehicular circulation is adequate to support present and proposed development.

WEST SHARP PARK

West Sharp Park is an established low and moderate income residential neighborhood. Single-family and multiple-family dwelling units are intermixed and heavy commercial uses are at the north end of the neighborhood on Palmetto. Retail commercial uses are scattered among the homes and apartments along Palmetto from Paloma to Clarendon. Francisco Boulevard, adjacent to the depressed section of Highway 1, is also occupied by a mixture of commercial, public and semi-public uses and dwellings. The school playground at the north end of the neighborhood and a tot lot at the south provide the only neighborhood public recreation facilities. The Municipal Fishing Pier and beaches also provide neighborhood recreation shared with visitors. The only developed section of the City's north-south pedestrian-bicycle pathway extends along the west side of Beach Boulevard.

The northern portion of the beach frontage is in private ownership; the beach frontage adjacent to the Ocean Park Manor Subdivision is owned by the City; and the remainder is Sharp Park State Beach which is designated by the State Department of Fish and Game as a fishing access point. The primary beach use is surf and pier fishing. Other uses include walking and beach for three miles north and south. The bluffs to the north are totally developed, steep and unstable, making beach access almost impossible. The bluffs decline to about 15 feet at the north end of Sharp Park. Access is possible but difficult and substantially increases erosion of the bluff face. South of the fishing pier the bluffs are only about six feet high, making access easy. Although declared a fishing access point, the State has

provided no facilities for fishermen. Fifty-eight spaces for visitor parking are now provided on-street on Beach Boulevard; considerable illegal bluff-top parking also occurs, substantially increasing erosion. The illegal parking indicates the lack of suitable parking. Since the parking area is usually vacant when the bluff area is being illegally used, it indicates that the available parking is not meeting the particular needs of the visitors. (See LCP Background Report, Parking).

Sharp Park houses many public facilities. The neighborhood contains the County's Branch Library, the Youth Service Bureau, the Pacifica Resources Center, City Hall, the Police Station, the City Council Chambers, the Emergency Operations Center, the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant, the sanitation company's garage, and the North Coast County Water District's Headquarters.

Because of its importance to Pacifica's coastal image, its unique social mix and the residents' active concern with coastal issues, West Sharp Park was designated a Demonstration Planning Area. As a result, the issues of this area were examined in greater detail than in other coastal neighborhoods. (See Demonstration Area Plan Report). The primary coastal issues in West Sharp Park include:

1. Protect and continue the low and moderate income housing which provides the unique character and social mix of the neighborhood;
2. The level of beach access and appropriate numbers of parking spaces effectively located to reduce the existing serious resident-visitor parking conflict. Key to this issue are creative solutions which do not result in wholesale paving or removal of existing homes;
3. Sufficient new commercial activities attractive to fishermen and other visitors to provide support for the area while continuing the essential neighborhood commercial activities which need to be close at hand in a lower income area; and
4. The future of the area as a government operations center.

Discussion of existing and proposed land uses for this neighborhood is divided into: the northern commercial area north of Sharp Park School and Ocean Park Manor Subdivision; Ocean Park Manor Subdivision and Sharp Park School; Sharp Park School and Ocean Park Manor Subdivision south to the north side of Montecito; and south side of Montecito to Sharp Park Municipal Golf Course.

Northern Commercial Area

The bluff-top portion of the northern commercial area is one of the few remaining areas available for service commercial uses. Existing development in the area includes light industrial and auto-related uses. In order to be consistent with the existing development pattern and meet an important community need, service commercial uses are appropriate for this area.

New uses in the area should include such things as warehouse and storage facilities, welding and machine shops, auto-related uses and other light industrial uses. Visitor-serving uses are also appropriate for the area and can complement the nearby RV park. Uses, such as a restaurant, sports shop,

small grocery store, or RV-related uses, should be encouraged. Compatibility between service commercial and visitor-serving commercial uses can be ensured through site specific review.

High rates of coastal erosion and geologic stability problems associated with this bluff top indicate that no new development should occur without geotechnical studies adequate to determine the "net developable" area. Within this developable area, setbacks should be established to protect new structures from loss during their design life, generally assumed to be 100 years. The area determined to be too hazardous to develop should be zoned open space to protect it from future development. Beach access and view points will be allowed in this district if geotechnical studies indicate their safety. Beach access will be provided at the RV park and additional access is not needed in this area. Instead, the cost of developing access should be used to provide additional visitor parking available to users of the developed access at the north bank of Milagra Creek. (See West Edgemar-Pacific Manor Neighborhood Description).

This area is highly visible from both Highway 1 and the closest public street, Palmetto. Future development should be based on consideration of the view of the site from the roadway, the need to establish and protect view corridors to the ocean, and the need for landscaping as sites are developing.

Between the established commercial area and the Ocean Park Manor Subdivision is an existing mobile home park with a designation of medium density residential. The mobile home park should be preserved as an important source of low and moderate income housing.

The development pattern of the east side of Palmetto in the northern area also has heavy commercial, storage and auto-related use. The commercial uses are interspersed with homes. This area, as with the coastline, is highly visible from the highway and is important in establishing the visual image of Pacifica for southbound visitors. In order to maximize its good highway access, reinforce its coastal views, promote service commercial activities, and meet an important community need, this entire area on the east side of Palmetto should be developed in service commercial uses. As with the bluff-top portion of the area to the west, visitor-serving commercial uses which are compatible with existing development are appropriate. The visual impact of development in this area should be a prime consideration in its approval.

Attention should be given to upgrading of the streetscape on both sides of Palmetto Avenue in the northern commercial area. Such upgrading should include the planting of appropriate street trees and other landscaping as an accompaniment to the development of new uses and the expansion and remodeling of existing uses in the area.

With the criteria above, proposed use of this area would be consistent with the following policies of the Coastal Act: 30255 (Coastal-Dependent Development), 30251 (Scenic Resources), 30250 (Concentration of Development), 30212 (New Development Shall Provide Public Access), and 30210 (Maximize Public Access). Lack of fiscal resources will require that the City rely on private developers to undertake the vitalization and reuse of this area.

Sharp Park School and Ocean Park Manor Subdivision

The Ocean Park Manor Subdivision of detached moderate and middle-income single-family homes dominates the coastal bluff top. High rates of erosion, averaging one to three feet per year, and provision of public access are serious coastal problems in this area. (See LCP Background Report, Geology and Access Component Report, Environment). For public safety and to protect the existing bluff area from use which would further aggravate erosion by disturbing bluff vegetative habitat (See LCP Access Component Report, Environment), it is proposed to keep the beach access easement in this area unimproved until its use will have no negative effect on existing development. Since developed public beach accesses are provided \pm 2,300 feet to the north at Milagra Creek and \pm 1,000 feet to the south at Beach Boulevard and Paloma, the public will not be denied access to the beach. A protective open space zone should be applied to this area, should existing residential uses no longer be present, in order that the remaining land will be protected from future development. This protective zoning would allow development to the beach of a public access on the City's easement, or elsewhere, if geotechnical studies indicate that it is feasible and safe to do so. Future use should also re-establish coastal views from Shoreview, the adjacent public street.

The criteria applied to the development of beach access in this developed residential area is consistent with the following Coastal Act policies: 30210 (Maximize Public Access), 30212.5 (Distribute Public Facilities), 30253 (Geologic Stability), and 30251 (Scenic Resources).

East of Palmetto in this area is Sharp Park School. Because it provides the only developed playground area in the neighborhood, its continued availability to neighborhood residents is important. Decline in elementary school enrollments provides an incentive for some school facilities to be temporarily or permanently discontinued. Should Sharp Park School become one of the school facilities to be discontinued, public use of the playground should be retained.

Sharp Park School - Ocean Park Manor Subdivision South to the North Side of Montecito

The pattern of development in this area is fairly well established with commercial uses tending to concentrate along Palmetto and Francisco. Various densities of residential uses lie between these areas to the beach frontage. Bluff erosion, which could affect shoreline accessibility, and steep bluffs limiting public beach access are the primary coastal problems in this area. Structures are mainly on the east side of Beach Boulevard. However, wave erosion compounded by drainage from the inland area, human scrambling and illegal bluff-top parking, have aggravated bluff erosion along this part of the beach to the point where Beach Boulevard and the parallel pedestrian-bicycle pathway are increasingly subject to damage. In the case of the street, it is badly in need of repair. (See LCP Access Component Report, Environment; LCP Background Report, Geology; Demonstration Area Plan, Public Works and Implementation). To control erosion and ensure continuation of the public roadway and coastal access and views it provides, the City should seek funds from the Coastal Conservancy and other public agencies to plan and develop needed improvements.

To provide needed public access down the steep bluffs and reduce erosion by controlling access, a developed beach access is proposed opposite Paloma on Beach Boulevard. To protect the appearance and continued availability of the existing low and moderate income residential uses, the few vacant lots fronting on the east side of Beach Boulevard, and in the area east to Palmetto, should in-fill with residential uses similar to existing adjacent uses. The need for public beach parking at the north end of Beach Boulevard is recognized. This parking need should be considered along with future development in close proximity to the north end of Beach Boulevard. Proposals for intensification and vitalization of the best located commercial areas, to provide additional visitor-serving activities, meets coastal requirements without increasing pressure on this low and moderate income area. (See West Sharp Park Neighborhood Land Use Map).

The criteria given above for development of the area from the shoreline west to the properties fronting on Palmetto are consistent with the following Coastal Act policies: 30210 (Maximize Public Access), 30212.5 (Distribute Public Facilities), 30213 (Low and Moderate Income Housing), 30212 (Reserve Coastal Areas), 30250 (Concentration of Development), 30251 (Scenic Resources), 30252 (Parking), and 30253 (Geologic Stability).

The existing commercial uses fronting on Palmetto are the results of strip-development dating back to when Palmetto was the Coast Highway. Commercial uses in the neighborhood can be strengthened by consolidation to stimulate foot traffic and visitor-serving uses, and by encouraging neighborhood convenience services to meet the needs of fishermen, other coastal visitors and local residents. It is proposed to confine the visitor-serving, neighborhood retail commercial uses to the frontage of Francisco and Palmetto from Paloma to Brighton. Within this area, to stimulate foot traffic and encourage low and moderate income housing, the frontage along Palmetto should be mixed with commercial and high density residential uses.

To intensify visitor-serving uses and attractions and provide for beach/commercial parking, the remainder of the Palmetto frontage in this area is proposed for retail and service uses, emphasizing those oriented to the beach visitor. Commercial activity should encourage beach-oriented uses, such as carry-out food, sports shops, places to browse, bait shops, etc. The appearance of commercial uses at Santa Rosa and Palmetto are particularly important since this is the main access to the Municipal Fishing Pier, one block west. (See Plan Conclusion). The appearance of the fishing pier should also be visually enhanced to attract visitors in the commercial area.

Integral to the successful implementation of a vibrant commercial Palmetto strip is the creation of a visually attractive streetscape. New development and renovations should include street trees and interesting landscape designs as part of the site plan. A more ambitious street plan, possibly to include diagonal parking, may provide room for innovative landscaping and sidewalk plans while creating additional parking for area businesses. Innovative resolution of the parking issue will continue to be a pressing concern to ensure that the increase in commercial activity on Palmetto does not result in "overflow" congestion into the adjacent residential neighborhood. Consolidation of these plans may best be accomplished within the context of a Specific Plan targeted specifically for Palmetto Avenue and key connecting roadways, such as Clarendon and Santa Rosa.

Visitor-supporting commercial uses should be encouraged on the Francisco Boulevard frontage between Paloma and Montecito. Such use recognizes existing uses and the value of proximity of the area to Highway 1. Additional visitor-related uses will fortify uses along Palmetto one block to the west and will entice those passing by to the coast.

The existing City Hall is located on Santa Maria Avenue. Existing facilities are inadequate but fiscal constraints delay relocation.

To be compatible with the low and moderate income housing and the unique beach community character, existing residential areas between the designated commercial development should be in-filled at residential densities compatible with those existing. (See Neighborhood Land Use Map). Criteria for in-fill development within existing residential areas should include:

1. Design and scale compatible with surrounding development.
2. Protection of the economic mix of housing opportunities.
3. Assurance of geologic stability, and
4. Minimal tree removal and replacement plantings as needed.

Special attention should be given to the design character of the old bungalow style of housing; small one-story structures, wood siding, incorporation of small porches, and the intimate detailing of window trim, planter boxes, fencing and landscaping. Structures in these areas should be limited to two stories to preserve intimacy and the appropriate scale of development.

Given the criteria discussed above for each type of land use, these proposals are consistent with the following Coastal Act policies: 30213 (Low and Moderate Income Housing), 30222 (Priority of Coastal Development), 30250 (Concentration of Development), and 30252 (Parking).

South Side of Montecito, South to Sharp Park Municipal Golf Course

South of Montecito the predominant land use is low and moderate income residential. Four public facilities dominate the area: the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant, the Scavenger Company's garage, the County Branch Library and the headquarters of the North Coast County Water District. The residential character of the area is well established, but vacant land and the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant mark the beach frontage. Although 58 on-street parking spaces are provided, the bluff-top area west of Beach Boulevard is illegally used for beach parking. To protect the view from the public roadway, promote public beach access, and control bluff erosion, public acquisition and development in low intensity recreational uses is recommended for the $\pm 1\frac{1}{2}$ acre bluff-top area. However, if public purchase and development is not successful, then low intensity visitor-serving uses which provide their own off-street parking, do not obstruct views of the sea, and provide for retention of existing low and moderate income housing within the neighborhood at the time of development, shall be permitted.

The on-street parking area should be retained along Beach Boulevard between the Wastewater Treatment Plant and the existing residential units at Clarendon. The area on the east side of Beach Boulevard should be in-filled

with medium density residential uses. Residential site development should provide adequate parking for itself, and include 30 public beach parking spaces to reduce the obvious parking problems in the area.

To protect the existing low and moderate income residential units and promote their continuation, the remaining in-filling in this neighborhood is proposed for residential uses compatible with adjacent existing residential development. (See West Sharp Park Land Use Map).

To protect the residential character of the area, the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant and the scavenger company's garage, should be discouraged from expanding their sites.

The undeveloped bluff areas are not a problem in this area. However, inland portions of the Coastal Zone contain steep land. This land should be developed only after geotechnical studies which indicate that the intended development is consistent with public safety.

The criteria for development proposed here are consistent with the following policies of the Coastal Act: 30211 (Public Access), 30212.5 (Distribute Parking), 30213 (Low and Moderate Income Housing), 30221 (Reserve Coastal Areas), 30250 (Concentration of Development), 30251 (Scenic Resources), 30252 (Non-Automobile Transit), 30253 (Geologic Stability), and 30254 (Public Works Facilities).

Coastal Access

As indicated earlier, coastal access is uninterrupted in West Sharp Park, from Palmetto south, although 15 foot bluffs at the north end of this public beach, intimidate many users. For reasons cited in the preceding description, access, although close at hand, is not proposed within the northern portion of the neighborhood where the bluff-tops are fully developed and very subject to erosion. To protect the public's safety, control erosion, and facilitate and focus public beach access, developed beach access, including signing on local access roads and at access locations, is proposed at three locations: Beach Boulevard and Santa Maria, Beach Boulevard just south of the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant, and Beach Boulevard at Clarendon. Parking is a critical problem for visitors to this area. These beach accesses should be supported by adequate parking. On the east side of Beach Boulevard, opposite the access area adjacent to the sewer treatment plant, there should be 30 public parking spaces and existing on-street parking should be retained.

Additional short-term beach parking needs total 35 spaces. This parking should be combined with the commercial parking along Palmetto Avenue, one block east of the beach. This combined parking should be carefully signed and denoted by boardwalks, landscaping, etc., to tie into the beach activities. (See Demonstration Area Plan, Parking, Implementation and Design Criteria; LCP Access Component Report; and Local Coastal Land Use Access Component).

Trail access is provided by the City's north-south pedestrian-bicycle pathway (see Neighborhood Plan Map) which will, when completed, link the entire City through the Coastal Zone. Inland connections from this pathway exist at the Paloma and Sharp Park Road freeway overpasses. These inland links provide access to the inland historical sites, San Mateo County


ridgeline parks and the pedestrian/equestrian Ridgeline Trail. (See Circulation Element of the General Plan).






As described in each sub-area discussion above, parking is a critical neighborhood problem, particularly in the southern half of West Sharp Park where beach and visitor parking demands overlap with the needs of older residential areas built prior to modern off-street parking requirements. A concerted effort to reduce bluff erosion by removing illegal bluff-top parking will further compound the parking problem. Overall, in planning the entire Coastal Zone, more parking is proposed, particularly that which is suitable for surf-fishermen. An important consideration is to distribute along the coast the demand for beach overlook parking. (see Coastal Access Report, Parking). The parking areas outside the West Sharp Park neighborhood suitable for beach overlook parking include a 40-space (if publicly owned, otherwise 20 space) lot on Esplanade and 20 spaces at the south bank of Milagra Creek, to be supplemented by parking at the commercial area (See West Edgemar-Pacific Manor neighborhood description).


Within West Sharp Park additional spaces have been proposed with attention to distribution: 30 spaces at the south end of the State Beach; 15 improved spaces at the west end of Clarendon; 35 spaces within a parking district along Palmetto when the district is created; and a number of spaces in the commercial area on the north bank of Milagra Creek. It is also proposed that creative solutions, such as cooperative block public parking areas in residential locations, shared residential-commercial-visitor lots, etc., be created for the residential uses to alleviate the dependence of residents on the available on-street parking. This will reduce the potential peak use parking conflicts. Beach parking lots within residential areas of West Sharp Park shall be designed and landscaped to minimize impact of this use on adjacent residential uses. To protect residential neighbors, off-street beach parking lots along the beach frontage should be closed for night-time parking. (See Demonstration Area Plan, Parking and Implementation). To conserve and promote the low and moderate income housing in West Sharp Park, protect the appearance and existing character of the existing neighborhood and encourage a balanced community, visitor public parking needs were based on average in-season beach use estimates. Neighborhood residents should recognize the fact that this assumption means that on peak days there will still be a conflict between beach users and residents. However, the split beach season, limited number of in-season holidays and weekends which are peak days, and the average frequency in a season of bass runs coinciding with the other beach users peak days, seems such that it is worth the occasional inconvenience to protect other neighborhood assets from being removed for more parking lots.

Vehicular access to the West Sharp Park neighborhood is from Highway 1 (the Coast Highway). The local collector streets are Paloma, Clarendon, Palmetto, Francisco and Beach Boulevard. These roads are considered adequate to handle the additional traffic which will result from proposed development. Creative design along Palmetto, which is oversized because of its past role as the Coast Highway, could improve the commercial image of the area and encourage pedestrian flow without reducing the efficiency of the roadway as a local collector.

Local streets serving the residential area are, because of their narrow width, constricted by towering Monterey Cypress, designated alternately one-way. This circulation pattern will adequately meet the access needs of local residents and visitors.



-  LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  MIXED USE: HIGH DENSITY/COMM.
-  COMMERCIAL
-  GENERAL COMMERCIAL
-  P PROPOSED PARKING
-  * NEIGHBORHOOD PARK
-  ← DEVELOPED & PROPOSED BEACH ACCESS
-  NORTH-SOUTH CITY TRAIL
-  PF PUBLIC FACILITY



**SHARP PARK MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE - WEST FAIRWAY PARK -
MORI POINT - ROCKAWAY BEACH**

One of the most varied in Pacifica, this neighborhood extends from the north edge of Sharp Park Municipal Golf Course to the south edge of Rockaway Beach where it meets the steep slopes of the Headlands. Within this area is the largest undeveloped area in the Coastal Zone, Mori Point, including Rockaway Quarry, and the most intensively developed visitor-destination area, Rockaway Beach. Single-family residential uses mark West Fairway Park, between the golf course and the open slopes of Mori Point. Sharp Park Municipal Golf Course, owned and operated by the City and County of San Francisco, provides residents and passersby with views of a well-manicured foreground and the ocean beyond. Laguna Salada and its marsh, located on the western side of the golf course, provide an important habitat area for the San Francisco garter snake.

Mori Point, which dominates the coastal landscape in this neighborhood, is covered with moderately sensitive coastal vegetation. This area was identified in the California Coastal Plan as an "immediate acquisition point".

Informal beach access to the privately owned beaches of this neighborhood exist at several points: on Clarendon in West Sharp Park, on the top of Mori Point, at the mouth of Calera Creek, and at the south end of Rockaway Beach. Developed beach access is located only at the west end of Rockaway Beach Avenue, across an existing seawall. North of Mori Point, the primary beach use is surf-fishing. Rock-fishing and limited tide-pooling occur along the coastline off Mori Point. Rockaway Beach is popular for surfing, sunbathing, walking, picnicking and surf-fishing.

The public road access is Highway 1. Just south of the golf course, Highway 1 changes from a freeway to a four-lane arterial. CalTrans recognizes that, at peak commute hours, this portion of the highway is at capacity. Fortunately, peak beach-use periods in Pacifica rarely coincide with commuter peaks. Therefore, the highway is almost never at capacity now for coastal visitors.

Primary coastal issues of concern in this neighborhood are:

1. The identification and protection of the highly sensitive San Francisco garter snake habitat, the coastal vegetative habitat, which is very sensitive to human trampling, and the inter-tidal zone. Each of these environments presents its own planning and management problems which will be discussed with each affected land use;
2. The future use of the Mori Point area, including the prominent ridge line, and the ±90 acres of the quarry site;
3. Associated with the future use of the quarry is the potential of a marina in Pacifica;

4. The future role of low and moderate income housing also is an issue in both the residential portion of this neighborhood and in the future uses of the Rockaway Beach commercial area;
5. The issue of roadway access, both north and south and east and west, is important to the future of this neighborhood and will be discussed in relation to coastal access. The neighborhood has been divided into the following sub-areas:

Sharp Park Municipal Golf Course

A deed restriction ensures continued public ownership of the highly scenic golf course, designed and built under the direction of John McLaren. The golf course and entire Sharp Park area, including the portion to the east, drains into what remains of the old Laguna Salada, now a freshwater marsh. A 50 foot berm protects the golf course and marsh from intrusion of salt water and humans, and ensures perpetuation of the freshwater marsh habitat which supports one of the largest known San Francisco garter snake habitats. This is also one of the few snake habitats located on public property. The San Francisco garter snake is on Federal and State Endangered Species lists. Its protection is the responsibility of the California Department of Fish and Game.

The outlet of the marsh is on the south end of the golf course and is currently crossed by surf fishermen wishing to use the adjacent beach frontage. In the past, the City and County of San Francisco regularly dredged the marsh to maintain its depth to protect the golf course from flooding. Since about 1940 this practice has been discontinued on a regular basis and the marsh has been silting. Poorly timed dredging could be hazardous to the garter snake.

Because of the sensitivity of the habitat, the need for dredging and berm protection, and the need to protect the snake population, the California Department of Fish and Game should undertake management of the garter snake habitat. Alterations in the operations of the golf course should be consistent with the requirements of the Department of Fish and Game. The criteria identified for the protection of the garter snake and its habitat and the continuation of the golf course use are consistent with the following policies of the Coastal Act: 30210 (Maximum Public Access), 30221 (Reserve Coastal Areas), 30231 (Habitats), 30233 (Dredging), 30240 (Sensitive Habitats), and 30251 (Scenic Resources).

West Fairway Park and the North Slopes of Mori Point (NOTE: The City of Pacifica approved amendments to the narrative regarding Mori Point in July 1988, however, the LUP amendments have not yet been submitted to the Coastal Commission for approval).

West Fairway Park is almost fully developed with low and moderate-income homes. A few duplexes front Bradford Way on the east side, the remainder of the existing units are detached single-family. Vacant property includes the west end of Fairway Park and the vacant slopes of Mori Point, to and including the ridgeline. These areas are served by Mori Point Road, an unimproved private road, primarily used by surf fishermen. The view is outstanding from the west end of this site. Beach parking on the west end of Mori Point Road and grazing on the north slopes of Mori Point has damaged the coastal vegetative habitat and led to serious erosion of the thin soils. The erosion has contributed to silting of Laguna Salada marsh.

Beach access is gained across the outlet of the marsh. Human abuse which has increased erosion, the problems associated with beach access crossing a sensitive habitat area, the views at the west end of the site, and the proximity of the existing residential area have resulted in designating this area a Special Area. This designation means that any development of this area should be planned as a unit, considering the geotechnical, slope and environmental limitations of the site as well as to preserve the scenic qualities of the natural landform. Appropriate land uses in this Special Area include visitor-serving commercial uses, such as an inn and/or restaurant on the highly scenic west end, neighborhood commercial on the east end and medium density residential clustered off the steeper slopes in between. The residential development should be compatible (but not necessarily identical) in scale with nearby existing homes. The proposed neighborhood commercial uses should be small scale and limited to those needed to serve the neighborhood. The visitor-serving uses proposed on the west end of the site should be designed to be subordinate to the landform and not sited on a ridgeline. No development should occur on slopes in excess of 35 percent or on the prominent ridgeline. A minimum of 30 percent of the total developable area should be in commercial uses, unless it is determined through geotechnical and environmental studies that the west portion of the site is not suitable for development. In that case, less than 30 percent of the developable area may be in commercial uses. Beach access and beach parking are not appropriate because of the potential impacts on the adjacent habitat of the San Francisco garter snake.

Because portions of this site may include primary or secondary habitat of the San Francisco garter snake, extensive biological and geotechnical study should precede any development in this area. Development should be permitted only if it can be demonstrated that impacts from the use and access road on the adjacent San Francisco garter snake habitat can be adequately mitigated. Proposed mitigation for impacts on the San Francisco garter snake habitat should be reviewed and approved by the Department of Fish and Game before approval of a project.

These proposed land uses are consistent with the following Coastal Act policies: 30211 (Public Access), 30212 (New Development Shall Provide Public Access), 30221.5 (Distribute Parking), 30221 (Reserve Coastal Areas Unless Provided Elsewhere), 30231 (Habitat Protection), 30240 (Sensitive Habitat), 30250 (Concentration of Development), 30251 (Scenic Resources), 30252 (Parking), 30253 (Geologic Stability), and 30254 (Public Works Facilities).

Mori Point

The Mori Point area consists of the prominent, highly visible steep slopes, the ridgeline and the quarry. The Conservation Element of the 1978 General Plan recommends that, because it is a locally important source of construction aggregate, the quarrying operation be continued until it is no longer economically feasible. Mori Point is an important, highly visible coastal landmark. The steep slopes, covered with coastal vegetation, have only a thin layer of soil and are subject to serious erosion. Emergency access to this area is difficult. Because of these problems, the steep slopes and ridgelines have been designated Open Space Residential and Prominent Ridgeline. These designations will preclude any development unless it is shown that the public's safety can be assured, no geotechnical problems will result, and there is no other place on the site to develop.

-  LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  COMMERCIAL
-  SPECIAL AREA
-  GREENBELT

SHARP PARK
MUNICIPAL
GOLF COURSE
(CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.)


Fairway Dr

Ridgeway Dr

SPECIAL
AREA

SPECIAL AREA
TO BE DEVELOPED AS A
UNIT - TO INCLUDE
COMMERCIAL, RES-
IDENTIAL, CITY HALL
& MARINA USES.

Reina-Del-Mar



SHARP PK. GOLF COURSE -
WEST FAIRWAY PK - MORI PT. -
ROCKAWAY BEACH

A few rock fishermen gain access to the beach by climbing down from the top of Mori Point. The Special Area designation will not preclude this informal use, but because of the risk involved, the use is not proposed to be expanded, nor the access improved.

The quarry at the inner area of Mori Point is about 120 acres. About 90 acres are less than 35 percent slope and about 20 acres are in the Calera Creek flood plain. The quarry is one of the few remaining large vacant sites suitable for commercial development in the Coastal Zone and City. Because of its location, the quarry's future is critical to the coastal image of the City. The area is proposed as a Special Area to promote integrated, planned and well designed use of the site. The most accessible, level and visible portions of the site, including the Calera Creek flood plain, should be developed in commercial uses attractive to, and serving visitors. A substantial proportion of these commercial uses should be coastally oriented visitor destinations, including restaurants, small shops, sporting goods and other water-oriented shops, and a marina. Offices and neighborhood-serving commercial activities should also be included to add balance and attract off-season users. City offices could be included as well. Economic studies of Pacifica indicate that the short, split beach season make survival difficult for visitor-serving uses which are not also attractive to local residents. Well planned and designed activities are needed which will draw local and nearby residents during the off season.

Investigation of a marina site in Pacifica was undertaken. The conclusion of that study is that in order to meet landslide requirements, a marina most feasibly could be located in the Calera Creek flood plain. (See Access Component Report, Marina Analysis). This is the only site that is large enough. Plans to develop the quarry should include study of the marina potential. The Army Corps of Engineers has been requested to study potential for marinas along the coast, but it is not known when the study will be undertaken. Their study will determine the off-shore feasibility of this site. If the marina is not feasible, then a developed public beach access and public beach parking near the north end of Rockaway Beach should be designed into the commercial portion of the development.

To fortify the commercial area, upper slopes less than 35 percent not suitable for commercial development would be developed in high density residential uses, the location dependent upon geotechnical studies. This designation is intended to reinforce commercial and employment opportunities. The new residential development shall provide units of outstanding design affordable to both moderate and upper income persons. The quarry neighborhood should reflect Pacifica's diverse social and economic mix by containing a range of housing sizes, types, and tenancies. If necessary to assure such a mix, the developer will be encouraged to reduce the cost of a portion (5 percent) of the units to prices affordable to persons of moderate income. High visibility of this housing will require careful site design and contouring into the hillside. Because of geology, soils, coastal vegetation and erosion, and views, the portion of the Special Area steeper than 35 percent slope should not be developed. A minimum of 50% of the developable area shall be in commercial uses.

Because of the needs for well designed visitor-serving commercial destinations, further investigation of a marina, market-valued housing and the importance of this site for the future image of Pacifica, the Special Area planning designation, with the criteria suggested above, is consistent with the following Coastal Act policies: 30212 (New Development Shall

THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS TO THE MORI POINT LAND USE PLAN NARRATIVE HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL, BUT HAVE NOT YET BEEN SUBMITTED TO THE COASTAL COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL. THE AMENDED LANGUAGE AND MAP IS INCLUDED FOR INFORMATION ONLY.

MORI POINT - PROPOSED LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENTS

- () Indicates language proposed to be deleted
_____ Indicates language proposed to be added

LUP - Page C-40

West Fairway Park and the North Slopes of Mori Point

West Fairway Park is almost fully developed with low and moderate income homes. A few duplexes front Bradford Way on the east side, the remainder of the existing units are detached single-family. Vacant property includes the west end of Fairway Park and the vacant slopes of Mori Point, to and including the ridgeline. These areas are served by Mori's Point Road, an unimproved private road, primarily used by surf-fishermen. The view is outstanding from the west end of this site. Beach parking on the west end of Mori's Point Road and grazing on the north slopes of Mori Point has damaged the coastal vegetative habitat and led to serious erosion of the thin soils. The erosion has contributed to silting of Laguna Salada marsh. Beach access is gained across the outlet of the marsh. Human abuse which has increased erosion, the problems associated with beach access crossing a sensitive habitat area, the views at the west end of the site, and the proximity of the existing residential area have resulted in designating this area a Special Area. This designation means that any development of this area should be planned as a unit, considering the geotechnical, slope and environmental limitations of the site as well as to preserve the scenic qualities of the natural landform. Appropriate land uses in this Special Area include visitor-serving commercial uses, such as an inn and/or restaurant on the highly scenic west end, (neighborhood commercial on the east end and medium density residential clustered off the steeper slopes in between.) commercial development on the east end and low density residential development located off the steeper slopes in between.

The residential development should be compatible but not necessarily identical in scale with nearby existing homes. The proposed (neighborhood) commercial uses should be (small scale and limited to those needed to serve the neighborhood.) complementary to the visitor serving commercial development on the west end of the site. The visitor-serving uses proposed on the west end of the site should be designed to be subordinate to the landform and not sited on a prominent ridgeline. No development should occur on slopes in excess of 35 percent or on the prominent ridgeline. A minimum of 30 percent of the total developable area should be in commercial uses, unless it is determined through geotechnical and environmental studies that the west portion of the site is not suitable for development. In that case, less than 30 percent of the developable area may be in commercial uses. Beach access and beach parking are not appropriate because of the potential impacts on the adjacent habitat of the San Francisco Garter Snake.

Because portions of this site may include primary or secondary habitat of the San Francisco Garter Snake, extensive biological and geotechnical study should precede any development in this area. Development should be permitted only if it can be demonstrated that impacts from the use and access road on the adjacent San Francisco Garter Snake habitat can be adequately mitigated. Proposed mitigation for impacts on the San Francisco Garter Snake habitat should be reviewed and approved by the Department of Fish and Game before approval of a project.

These proposed land uses are consistent with the following Coastal Act policies: 30211 (Public Access), 30212 (New Development Shall Provide Public Access), 30212.5 (Distribute Parking), 30221 (Reserve Coastal Areas Unless Provided Elsewhere), 30231 (Habitat Protection), 30240 (Sensitive Habitat), 30250 (Concentration of Development), 30251 (Scenic Resources), 30252 (Parking), 30253 (Geologic Stability), and 30254 (Public Works Facilities).

Mori Point

The Mori Point area consists of the prominent, highly visible steep slopes, the ridgeline and the quarry. The Conservation Element of the 1978 General Plan recommends that, because it is a locally important source of construction aggregate, the quarrying operation be continued until it is no longer economically feasible. Mori Point is an important, highly visible coastal landmark. The steep slopes, covered with coastal vegetation, have only a thin layer of soil and are subject to serious erosion. Emergency access to this area is difficult. Because of these problems, the steep slopes and upper ridgelines have been designated (Open Space Residential and) Prominent Ridgeline. The(se) designation(s) will preclude any development unless it is shown that the public's safety can be assured, no geotechnical problems will result and there is no other place on the site to develop.

A few rock fishermen gain access to the beach by climbing down from the top of Mori Point. The Special Area designation will not preclude this informal use but, because of the risk involved, the use is not proposed to be expanded nor the access improved.

Coastal Access (page C-44)

There are five beach accesses along the $\pm 7,320$ feet of shoreline in this coastal neighborhood. It is proposed that three be developed. Because of the erosion problems and hazards associated with reaching it, no proposal is made to develop access to the pocket beach on Mori Point. For public safety, use of this area should not be encouraged. There should be no signs or other indications of its presence. In addition, since beach access requires crossing the primary habitat of the San Francisco Garter Snake, access at the north end of Mori Point should not be developed unless an acceptable method to mitigate potential pedestrian impacts on the habitat can be developed and implemented.

Of the three remaining access points, the west end of Rockaway Beach Avenue is the only one improved. Parking for 20 to 40 cars is available

on an undeveloped City street right-of-way adjacent to the seawall. However, this on-street parking will be eliminated when a pedestrian-oriented promenade is constructed. Two additional accesses are proposed for Rockaway Beach, one at Calera Creek and one south of existing development. The Calera Creek access will be developed if a marina is determined not to be feasible at the quarry site. Suitable parking for beach access will be provided. The amount of parking will be determined when development occurs. Access to the south end of the beach will be from the proposed parking area. At least thirty (30) parking spaces for beach users will also be available there.

Trail access is provided this neighborhood by the County's inter-City bicycle trail and the City's north-south pedestrian-bicycle pathway system, both of which parallel Highway 1. The City's north-south pathway should be taken off Highway 1 and placed on the frontage road proposed for the west side of Highway 1 after the frontage road is developed.

Highway access to this neighborhood is from the Coast Highway. Operational and safety, but not capacity-increasing, improvements are proposed. In this area, the highway is now at capacity during commuter's peak-use hours. This congestion hampers emergency access. To resolve these important community issues, (a) local service roads on the east and west sides of Highway 1 (is) may be proposed. (to connect Francisco-Bradford Way). The westerly frontage road would connect the Mori Point property to (Old County Road) Dondee Way and Rockaway Beach Avenue. (This) These roadways would improve commercial access by providing (an) alternative access to and from (Sharp Park Road in this congested area.) the Coast Highway. Because the proposed frontage roads would be (a) part of several separate developments and also help meet City needs, the City should draw up a specific plan which establishes criteria and uniform standards for the roadway. Among these criteria should be standards for the roadway. Among these criteria should be standards: two-lane width; (no development between the frontage road and Highway 1 to the east;) adequate landscaping; provision for a bicycle path or trail; and proper design to provide for public safety and emergency vehicle use if necessary. Included in CalTrans planing should be removal of the stockpiled dirt placed along the highway by CalTrans during the previous roadway construction. This dirt obstructs views of the coast from Highway 1.

Care should be taken in widening the highway along the Rockaway Beach frontage to ensure that nonconforming lots and substandard uses are not left. CalTrans should purchase entire parcels to establish right-of-way and provide improved sight lines and parking on portions of the frontage lots to enhance safety and operation of the roadway. Landscaping along the highway should be negotiated between CalTrans and the City as the highway improvements are planned and designed. The proposed highway improvements should also increase the safety of the existing intersections along Highway 1, including access to the quarry and Rockaway Beach Avenue.

Several alternatives have been proposed for roadway access to the inland ridgeline area. One option would include a local roadway on an overpass of Highway 1 at the Mori Point cut. This roadway would curve at acceptable grade down to the proposed frontage road. This alternative and other possibilities need more study. Should the overpass option be pursued, it is important to the future development of the quarry site that the roadway be developed so that it reduces traffic conflicts and facilitates visitor and resident use of the quarry commercial area.

Proposed General Plan/LUP
amendment

PROJECT:
Mori Point

-  COMMERCIAL
-  SPECIAL AREA
-  GREENBELT
-  MARSH
-  OPEN SPACE/
PUBLIC FACILITY

SALADA
MARSH

SHARP PARK
MUNICIPAL
GOLF COURSE
(CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.)

Fairway Dr

Ridgeway Dr

SPECIAL
AREA

SPECIAL AREA
TO BE DEVELOPED AS A
UNIT - TO INCLUDE
COMMERCIAL, RES-
IDENTIAL, CITY HALL
& MARINA USES.

Reina Del Mar



SHARP PK. GOLF COURSE -
WEST FAIRWAY PK - MORI PT. -
ROCKAWAY BEACH
LAND USE PLAN

Provide Public Access), 30212.5 (Distribute Public Facilities), 30213 (Consistency with Housing Elements), 30220 (Reserve Coastal Areas, Water-Oriented), 30221 (Reserve Coastal Land Areas, Land-Oriented), 30222 (Priority of Coastal Development), 30224 (Recreational Boating), 30233 (Dredging Criteria), 30234 (Commercial and Recreational Boating), 30235 (Shoreline Structures), 30236 (Alterations to Waterways), 30250 (Concentration of Development), 30252 (Parking), 30253 (Geologic Stability), and 30254 (Public Works Facilities).

Rockaway Beach

Rockaway Beach has developed into the City's principal hotel and restaurant area over the years because of its setting and location. With the Pacific Ocean and the Headlands forming the neighborhood's western and southern boundaries, the small area (13.5 acres) is separated from nearby residential neighborhoods by the Cabrillo Highway and the quarry. Although little activity has occurred, the Rockaway Beach area should develop into a commercial center. The City anticipates Rockaway Beach becoming one of the City's principal commercial areas emphasizing visitor-serving retail development.

In 1980, the City's Redevelopment Agency designated West Rockaway Beach as part of the Survey Area for future redevelopment due to this area's small parcelization, need for residential and commercial rehabilitation and need for the City to take a more active role to promote commercial development. The quarry property and the Headlands were also included in the redevelopment area. Since that time, the City acquired several parcels in the neighborhood to achieve some control over future development. The City also participated in the sale and trade of municipally owned property to facilitate development of an inn at the corner of Rockaway Beach Avenue and Maitland Road.

The City's Commercial Development Task Force cited Rockaway Beach as a prime area for increased commercial development and designated it as an economic development area in its "Action Plan to Promote Commercial Development in Pacifica". It was recommended that the City plan an active role in encouraging the commercial development of the area through redevelopment or formation of a local development corporation. A future Specific Plan, Redevelopment Plan, and an Environmental Impact Report will provide more detailed planning direction to promote and control development.

There has been little commercial and visitor-serving development in this area. A 30-room inn was approved on seven vacant lots, prominently located at the southeast corner of Rockaway Beach Avenue and Maitland Road. There is a 92-unit beach-front hotel which has been under construction for more than ten years. The unfinished structure has been an eyesore and its completion or demolition is necessary for the remainder of the neighborhood to develop to its full potential. If the hotel is not completed within a reasonable period of time, the City should take whatever action is necessary to resolve the problem.

The focus for future development in Rockaway Beach should be commercial development emphasizing visitor-serving commercial uses, such as hotels, restaurants, and retail shops, that will take advantage of the neighborhood's coastal location. Although visitor-serving uses should predominate, a mixture of some local-serving businesses, such as offices and personal service establishments will complement the area and meet community

needs. Industrial or auto-related uses, however, should not be allowed because of the importance of compatibility with visitor-related development in this small neighborhood. There are some existing auto-related uses in Rockaway that are incompatible with the visitor-serving commercial development desired for this area. The City should provide assistance in helping these businesses to relocate to a more suitable area in Pacifica. There are also some commercial structures that should either be significantly rehabilitated or rebuilt as part of a new commercial development.

Rockaway Beach has had a mixture of residential and commercial uses for many years. This area is more suitable for commercial or mixed residential use than for residential development. Existing residential units will become increasingly incompatible in this area as the commercial uses expand. It is anticipated that many of the existing residential units will be replaced with commercial development as property is sold. The City should be sensitive to providing a reasonable transition period for residential units in this area. Any City initiated action to promote a commercial development project in Rockaway Beach should endeavor to impact as few residences as possible.

Many of the existing residential units serve low and moderate-income persons. If affordable housing is lost, every effort should be made to replace such housing, either in the neighborhood, or elsewhere in the City. It may be possible to provide replacement housing in the neighborhood by developing mixed use projects. Residential units located above commercial uses would add to the vitality of the area and provide housing as needed.

Consolidation of small parcels is important to achieve well planned, integrated development. Construction of small commercial shops on substandard parcels would create inappropriate spot development without adequate parking or integrated design. Future plans for Rockaway Beach should require property consolidation.

The specifics of future development in Rockaway Beach will be determined by Specific and Redevelopment Plans to be prepared. Height of buildings should generally be limited to two to three stories, consistent with the City's 35-foot height limit. Additional height along Rockaway Beach Avenue could be incorporated into the Specific Plan if compatible with the overall development theme and design for this area.

Rockaway Beach Avenue should become the focus for the area because of its central location and since it is the primary entry point. Existing and planned development for Rockaway Beach Avenue should reflect this focus. The City's initial development efforts in Rockaway Beach should reflect this focus. The City's initial development efforts in Rockaway Beach should also concentrate on this corridor to maximize its commercial development with an integrated plan. Provision of a public plaza area on, or close to, Rockaway Beach Avenue would add to the character of the area, as would prohibition of additional private parking lots directly adjacent to the street.

New projects and plans should emphasize provision of pedestrian amenities. Businesses can be oriented for pedestrian use by providing arcades or outdoor seating areas. Circulation and parking improvements are needed to facilitate visitor use and to take best advantage of the proximity of the beach and ocean. The local road and pedestrian systems should be designed to encourage foot traffic and to eventually tie into the quarry property.

Construction of shared parking facilities will also encourage a pedestrian orientation and is vital to integrated development of the neighborhood. The alternative, scattered parking for each business on individual sites, would divide the neighborhood, limit commercial potential, and unnecessarily add paved areas.

The City-owned property on Old County Road, north of Rockaway Beach Avenue, could be used for an area parking facility to serve new projects. The number of parking spaces needed will depend on the eventual intensity of development. A parking structure may be needed to provide adequate parking. Since the City owns land in the area, costs may be lower than other locations. The area south of Romano's Restaurant, between Old County Road and Maitland, could also be used for an area parking facility as well as other potential areas. Parking improvement costs could be funded through an assessment district and through additional contributions from newly approved development projects which would not be required to meet on-site parking requirements.

Other public improvements are also needed in Rockaway Beach to serve existing and future businesses. Street improvements may include provision of pedestrian amenities on Rockaway Beach Avenue and improving and widening of Old County Road to provide landscaping and parking. Consideration should be given to the future vacation of Dondee Way or the northern section of Maitland Road to add to developable area for commercial businesses and to add a plaza area. General street improvements are needed in the entire neighborhood. Additional public improvements which are needed include water, sewer, storm drainage improvements and undergrounding of utilities.

Proposed improvements in Rockaway Beach will facilitate visitor use of the coastal neighborhood. The southern cove and beach should be planned for visitor use and should be integrated into the development of the area. Public access should be promoted and limited beach parking may be appropriate, provided that development would not adversely affect the sensitive site. The number of spaces which can be provided on the site will depend on its design and environmental conditions. If beach parking can be provided elsewhere, the cove site could provide open space for the neighborhood entirely for beach and park use.

A unifying design, theme, and improved appearance are needed to successfully promote and develop Rockaway Beach. Existing businesses should be encouraged to rehabilitate and upgrade their buildings. The City should investigate funding sources for rehabilitation assistance. The Specific Plan process should be used to determine design standards to be used. View corridor standards contained within the "Plan Conclusion" section of the LUP should be incorporated in the Specific Plan. The Specific Plan, zoning, and a City design review process can then be used to implement the approved concept.

South of Rockaway Beach and below the ridge of the Headlands is designated for visitor-serving commercial uses and recreational use. Development of this highly visible site should be consistent with the geotechnical, visual and access policies of the plan. These proposals are consistent with the following policies of the Coastal Act: 30210 (Maximize Public Access), 30211 (Public Access), 30212.5 (Distribute Parking), 30222 (Priority of Coastal Development), 30252 (Parking), and 30255 (Coastal Dependent Development).

Coastal Access (NOTE: Minor changes to this section were approved by the City in 1988, however, have not yet been submitted to the Coastal Commission for approval).

There are five beach accesses along the \pm 7,320 feet of shoreline in this coastal neighborhood. It is proposed that three be developed. Because of the erosion problems and hazards associated with reaching it, no proposal is made to develop access to the pocket beach on Mori Point. For public safety, use of this area should not be encouraged. There should be no signs or other indications of its presence. In addition, since beach access required crossing the primary habitat of the San Francisco garter snake, access at the north end of Mori Point should not be developed.

Of the three remaining access points, the west end of Rockaway Beach Avenue is the only one improved. Parking for 20 to 40 cars is available on an undeveloped City street right-of-way adjacent to the seawall. Two additional accesses are proposed for Rockaway Beach, one at Calera Creek and one south of existing development. The Calera Creek access will be developed if a marina is determined not to be feasible at the quarry site. Suitable parking for beach access will be provided. The amount of parking will be determined when development occurs. Access to the south end of the beach and adequate beach parking should be specified in the Specific Plan for Rockaway Beach.

Trail access is provided this neighborhood by the County's inter-City bicycle trail and the City's north-south pedestrian-bicycle pathway system, both of which parallel Highway 1. The City's north-south pathway should be taken off Highway 1 and placed on the frontage road proposed for the west side of Highway 1 after the frontage road is developed.

Highway access to this neighborhood is from the Coast Highway. Operational and safety, but not capacity-increasing, improvements are proposed. In this area, the highway is now at capacity during commuter peak-use hours. This congestion hampers emergency access. To resolve these important community issues, a local service road on the west side of Highway 1 is proposed to connect Francisco-Bradford Way to Old County Road and Rockaway Beach Avenue. This roadway would improve commercial access by providing an alternative access to and from Sharp Park Road in this congested area. Because the proposed frontage road would be a part of several separate developments, the City should draw up a Specific Plan which establishes criteria and uniform standards for the roadway. Among these criteria should be standards: two-lane width; no development between the frontage road and Highway 1 to the east; adequate landscaping; provision for a bicycle path or trail; and proper design to provide for public safety and emergency vehicle use if necessary. Included in CalTrans planning should be removal of the stockpiled dirt placed along the highway by CalTrans during the previous roadway construction. This dirt obstructs views of the coast from Highway 1.

Care should be taken in widening the highway along the Rockaway Beach frontage to ensure that nonconforming lots and substandard uses are not left. CalTrans should purchase entire parcels to establish right-of-way and provide improved sight lines and parking on portions of the frontage lots to enhance safety and operation of the roadway. Landscaping along the highway should be negotiated between CalTrans and the City as the highway improvements are planned and designed. The proposed highway improvements should also increase the safety of the existing intersections along Highway 1, including access to the quarry and Rockaway Beach Avenue.

Several alternatives have been proposed for roadway access to the inland ridgeline area. One option would include a local roadway on an overpass of Highway 1 at the Mori Point cut. This roadway would curve at acceptable grade down to the proposed frontage road. This alternative and other possibilities need more study. Should the overpass option be pursued, it is important to the future development of the quarry site that the roadway be developed so that it reduces traffic conflicts and facilitates visitor and resident use of the quarry commercial area.

THE HEADLANDS - SAN PEDRO BEACH

This neighborhood extends from the north slopes of the Headlands to the north bank of San Pedro Creek. San Pedro Beach, the oceanfront of the neighborhood, is the best swimming and picnicking beach in Pacifica. The rocky promontory of the Headlands dominates the north end of the beach and is visible throughout the coastal area. The Headlands is in private ownership and undeveloped. Its most frequent use is by persons hiking to the top for the coastal views and by those tide-pooling and rock fishing along its rocky shore. Past improvements to Highway 1 have limited direct automobile access to this area.

The State Department of Parks and Recreation intends to purchase a portion of the beach between the north bank of San Pedro Creek and the lower slopes of the Headlands. Except for the rest area and a few public easements, the entire beach is in private ownership. Some highway and visitor-oriented commercial and residential development has occurred, but much vacant area remains and the public continues to use the area. A marshy area located at the north end of the beach has potential of being a sensitive habitat. Highway 1, developed as a four-lane arterial, serves as the roadway access to the beach. Because of the heavy use, unregulated access on Highway 1 creates a problem.

The primary issues of concern in this neighborhood are:

1. Ownership and development of beach and beach frontage;
2. Adequate parking and appropriate public facilities, as well as maintenance of facilities and the beach;
3. Highway access, including future design changes required by its role as a regional recreation access, and the impact of local coastal planning south of Pacifica; and
4. Protection of the sensitive marsh habitat at the north end of San Pedro Beach.

The Headlands

This highly visible rocky promontory is covered with coastal vegetation. This vegetation is sensitive to human trampling which results in erosion and scarring. Because of difficult access to the shoreline from San Pedro Beach, abuse of the inter-tidal habitat is not expected and should not require regulating measures. The eastern portion of the Headlands is owned by CalTrans, the remainder is privately owned. In the past, public

acquisition of this area was considered but not implemented because of a shortage of funds.

Because of its value as a vista point, importance to coastal views, value as a recreation area and susceptibility to erosion, this area is designated a Special Area and is a high priority for public acquisition. This acquisition should be actively pursued. Public management would require trails to a vista point to regulate hiking and minimize trampling of the vegetative cover. Because of its assets and to protect the coastal views and viewsheds, the Headlands is particularly suited for acquisition by the Coastal Conservancy.

In the absence of public acquisition, visitor-serving commercial use could accomplish this protection if it were low intensity, such as a small inn or restaurant, built into the hillside and designed and developed with a sensitivity to geologic, habitat, scenic, and safety needs of the site. To protect the view of the area from the public roadway, development should be low profile and below the prominent ridgeline. A vista area should be provided as part of the development and designed to keep the users from wandering on the remainder of the area.

Access would have to be provided in coordination with CalTrans and adjacent private property owners. Since it would be less obtrusive, less steep and could provide needed public access to the north end of San Pedro Beach, access from the south side of the Headlands would be preferred.

Specific criteria for this access should be established in an environmental study prior to development. However, grading for the roadway should be restricted in amount and location to those areas necessary for a right-of-way which meets and does not exceed safe emergency and passenger vehicle access requirements. The access road should be located and designed to avoid construction of additional protective devices during its useful life, taking into account the geology of the roadbed itself and adjacent unimproved areas. The roadway should incorporate measures which respect adjacent secondary and primary habitat areas, including but not limited to: channeling surface drainage away from such areas to either existing improved drainage facilities or facilities required as part of any attendant proposed development; catch basins to trap pollutant and sediment runoff as part of such facilities; provision for an adequate vegetation buffer between the roadway and any identified habitat area and reclamation of adjacent areas disturbed prior to or during roadway construction in a manner which enhances the habitat value of such areas. The roadway should include safe pedestrian trail facilities connecting with access to the vista point and be sited and designed to respect coastal views by avoiding excessive vertical cuts or padding for roadbed construction. The roadway should be located near or below existing grade and be adequately landscaped to meet the intent of these provisions.

Given the above criteria for use, proposals for the Headlands meet the following Coastal Act policies: 30210 (Maximum Public Access), 30211 (Public Access), 30212 (New Development Shall Provide Public Access), 30220 (Reserve Coastal Areas), 30222 (Priority of Coastal Development), 30231 (Habitats to Control Runoff), 30240 (Sensitive Habitats), 30251 (Scenic Resources), 30253 (Geologic Stability), and 30255 (Coastal Dependent Development).

San Pedro Beach

Between the lesser slopes of the Headlands and the north bank of San Pedro Creek lies the major portion of San Pedro Beach. This is the widest beach in Pacifica and is the one most heavily used by swimmers, surfers and picnickers. San Pedro Beach is one of the few areas in the City where Coastal Fore-dune vegetation remains. At the north end of the beach, behind the old Oceanshore Railroad berm, a marsh area has developed. The freshwater is supplied from drainage on the east side of Highway 1. This marsh is important because of its potential as a San Francisco garter snake habitat.

Except for the rest area and a few public easements, all of San Pedro Beach is in private ownership. Ownership at the north end is generally large parcels; those in the center and south end are small, generally less than one acre. This ownership pattern is important to the future use of the beach. In the 1969 Pacifica General Plan and even before, residents of Pacifica have expressed the desire for, and have actively worked toward public acquisition in this area. Subsequently, this beach was designated an "Area of Interest" by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. This designation was followed by a property appraisal to determine which properties, if any, within the area of interest will be purchased. Public use is clearly preferred for San Pedro Beach; however, it is also clear that, although the City will continue to seek funds for acquisition of the entire area, adequate funds are not available.

Because of easy access, high visibility, minimal existing development, and the need cited in the Coastal Act to give priority to coastally dependent developments (30254), specifically visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities (30222), the proposed land use for the private portions of San Pedro Beach is commercial. These commercial uses should include the following activities to enhance coastal recreation opportunities: snack bars, restaurants, beach and recreation equipment rentals, and on the larger sheltered sites, inns, restaurants, or other more formal visitor services. All of the commercial development should be low scale, well designed and located to provide and protect views to the shore. Prominent, highly visible, and inviting public access to the beach should be designed into each individual site which is developed. No development should be permitted in this area without adequate environmental flood and geotechnical investigation and mitigation of adverse impacts. Development of private property should not include development of the sandy beach itself. Private owners should, however, retain ownership and maintain their property. Moreover, there should be no obstruction of the movement of beach users along the full length of the beach, including access from San Pedro Beach to the shoreline of the Headlands.

Another important aspect of development on San Pedro Beach is access to Highway 1. Future private uses should be designed to focus their access, for example, by linking parking lots and sharing a common, well designed and visible access to the highway. Wherever possible, highway access should be encouraged to use the existing intersections of Crespi and Linda Mar. Future commercial uses along the beach also should be required to provide adequate parking for their use.

On the north end of the beach, private development should provide replacement for the 20 informal spaces now used in the area. Weekday

parking will be supplemented on peak use days (weekends and holidays) by commuter-beach lots proposed on the east side of Highway 1 at Crespi and Linda Mar. Any private development on the north end of the beach should also be required to complete a detailed biological and geotechnical study by recognized experts to determine its importance as a habitat area and the impact of proposed development on the marsh area. Mitigations for future development should also be presented. If the area is in public ownership, any proposals which would affect the marsh area or promote public intrusion into the marsh must be studied by experts.


The proposed uses and criteria stated above for San Pedro Beach are consistent with the following policies of the Coastal Act: 30212 (Maximum Public Access), 30211 (Development Shall Not Interfere with Public Access), 30212 (New Development Shall Provide Public Access), 30212.5 (Distribute Parking), 30213 (Provide Lower Cost Visitor and Recreational Facilities), 30221 (Reserve Coastal Areas), 30222 (Priority of Coastal Development), 30251 (Scenic Resources), and 30255 (Coastal Dependent Development).

Coastal Access

Uninterrupted public access across San Pedro Beach to the ocean has always been available. Access to the rocky shoreline of the Headlands has also been unobstructed. In the Access Component, two areas of focused access have been shown, one at the rest area near the center of the beach and the other, from Pedro Point Shopping Center across to the south bank of San Pedro Creek. Designation of these signed public accesses should not obscure the fact that informal access is now available and should be continued the length of the beach frontage. If necessary for compatibility with private development, access may need to be formalized by signing at other points. In the public areas, access should continue unregulated. The only area which might require access regulation is the marsh habitat. Detailed site study and monitoring should be undertaken to determine the possible presence of the San Francisco garter snake and other wetland requirements. All developed formal beach access, whether public or private, should be signed.

One hundred twenty (120) public parking spaces for San Pedro Beach are provided at the rest area. Beach users, on in-season weekdays, often park on the Fore Dune at the north end of the beach. Public parking is not available at the north end of the beach. To meet the average in-season parking need, 140 parking spaces are required. Because of the level of existing informal use and the absence of developed parking in the area, 20 spaces should be provided at the north end of the beach, with access from Crespi intersection. The parking area should be designed so that it does not drain into the marsh. If the area is publicly acquired, the City should seek funds to provide this parking. If the area is privately developed, this public beach parking should be designed into the proposed development in a compatible, visually attractive way. Landscaping of beach parking lots is critical. Natural plantings should soften the edges of these areas and blend into the coastal environment.

The County's inter-City bicycle trail and the City's north-south pedestrian-bicycle trail both parallel Highway 1 in this area. City pathway connections to the north-south pathway will occur at Crespi and Linda Mar. These pedestrian-bicycle pathways will connect inland recreation and historic areas to the coast.



THE HEADLANDS
 SAN PEDRO BEACH
 LAND USE PLAN

Highway 1 provides the regional and local vehicular access to this neighborhood and its beach activities. In this area, Highway 1 is a four-lane arterial which approaches capacity during peak hours of the weekday commute. The beach use season in Pacifica is split (spring and fall) and beach activity peaks on in-season weekends and holidays. As a result, the capacity problems of the highway on weekday hours rarely, if ever, affect the coastal visitors. Planning is underway for safety and operational improvements to this section of Highway 1. These changes would include intersection improvement and improving the safe flow of traffic. Construction is not intended to increase capacity. Planned improvements would handle traffic expected on this stretch of road to 1990. After 1990, the needs of the highway, including its capacity, will be re-evaluated at the regional level. One factor not included in previous planning for Highway 1 is the State Department of Parks and Recreation's policy to focus San Mateo County developed coastside recreation activity in the area north of Half Moon Bay. Implementation of adjacent coastal plans may require the City to request regional re-evaluation of the needs of this vital stretch of Highway 1 before 1990.

The capacity of the four-lane section of Highway 1 in Pacifica affects the volume of traffic on the highway to the south. Future decisions relating to the proposed Devil Slide bypass will also affect the highway. Construction of the bypass, probably a decade or more in the future, will require realignment of Highway 1 from Linda Mar Boulevard south. This realignment should be designed to protect the beach side of the roadway as much as possible. Nonconforming, substandard lots should not be created in this realignment. CalTrans should purchase the entire property and dedicate the unused portions for public beach use.

San Pedro Avenue is proposed to cross San Pedro Creek to connect to the west side of Linda Mar in order to provide safe access to Highway 1 from San Pedro Point. Careful biological and geotechnical studies should precede construction of the portion of the roadway across San Pedro Creek. Care should be taken to protect the mouth of the creek from erosion, run-off, or other impacts which would affect the resident fish population.

PEDRO POINT - SHELTER COVE

West of Highway 1 and south of San Pedro Beach, Pedro Point-Shelter Cove is the southernmost coastal neighborhood in Pacifica. Access to this neighborhood is from Highway 1 via San Pedro Avenue. The narrow coastal beach rising to the prominent east-west ridgeline and forested quality of this area provide an attractive setting for the low to high income homes perched on the less steep portions of the hillside. Neighborhood shopping and auto sales occupy the level land adjacent to the highway. This commercial area, like others in Pacifica, has little landscaping to relieve the low blocks of buildings and expanse of asphalt. Although located very near the shoreline, neither the buildings nor the uses orient to their coastal setting.

Access to the shoreline is limited in this neighborhood. Those wishing access to the south end of San Pedro Beach's swimming, picnicking and surfing opportunities must cross the old Oceanshore Railroad berm or walk through the shopping center. West of San Pedro Beach, access to the shoreline is more difficult because of the vertical cliffs and narrow beach

below. A poorly maintained, narrow private road provides the only access to the Shelter Cove beach opposite San Pedro Point. Use of this beach is further limited because of the houses located there. Although privately owned and difficult to reach, Shelter Cove is a popular diving area and provides the only access to the tidepools and rocks.

There are several coastal planning issues to be dealt with in the preparation of a land use plan for this neighborhood:

1. Protection of the attractive appearance and mixed value housing opportunities of the residential area;
2. Analysis of the geotechnical problems associated with the landform;
3. The problems of orientation and appearance of the commercial areas;
4. Protection of coastal marine resources; and
5. Access to and from the neighborhood via Highway 1.

Approximately 45 percent (+50 acres) of the land area in this hillside neighborhood is committed to single-family residential use. Within this area, there are some vacant lots available for compatible in-fill. Criteria for in-filling the existing residential area should include:

1. Design and scale compatible with the surrounding;
2. Protection of the economic mix of housing opportunities;
3. Assurance of geologic stability; and
4. Minimal tree removal and replacement plantings as needed.

A largely undeveloped area totalling +42 acres lies to the east of the existing residential development in the Pedro Point-Shelter Cove neighborhood. Although bounded by urban development on the west and north, this very steep land (mostly in excess of 35 percent slope) has not been developed. Roads and other public services have not been extended into this heavily wooded area. Geologic constraints include a moderate potential for landsliding. Two existing slide areas have been located on the eastern section of the land. A highly visible parcel, designated Prominent Ridgeline, caps the upper reaches of this land.

A land use designation of Open Space Residential has been assigned to this steep area. This designation would allow single-family residences to be constructed on slopes of less than 35 percent, where geotechnical studies indicate building is safe and access satisfying emergency service requirements is available. Because of the steepness of the terrain, a very low density is anticipated. Construction would not be allowed on the designated portion of the Prominent Ridgeline within the City unless no other portion of a site, including part of the ridgeline, was buildable. The City must also be assured that emergency equipment can reach the proposed ridgeline site. Efforts should be made to coordinate planning with the County to assure that development will not take place on the remainder of the ridge which is in their jurisdiction.

In addition to slope and other geotechnical considerations, development in this area should be carefully designed to minimize impacts on views of the forested hill from Highway 1 and other public viewing points in Pacifica. In keeping with the wooded character of the slope, tree removal to accommodate construction should be minimal and replacement plantings required.

The designation of this portion of the neighborhood for Open Space Residential use is consistent with the following policies of the Coastal Act: 30263 (Geologic Stability) and 30251 (Scenic Resources).

Existing commercial uses adjacent to Highway 1 total about 6 percent of the land use in the neighborhood. Behind the shopping center and bounded by San Pedro and Danmann Avenues and the old railroad berm is a large, flat vacant parcel (+10 acres). Realignment of San Pedro Avenue and improvements to the San Pedro-Highway 1 intersection are proposed. These improvements would facilitate access while improving traffic safety and circulation for the commercial area and the neighborhood as a whole.

The designated land use for this area is commercial with emphasis on coastal related and/or visitor-serving uses. By combining all of the parcels in the area between Danmann and San Pedro Avenue, Highway 1 and the railroad berm and developing them as an integrated project along a realigned San Pedro Avenue, this small, oceanside commercial center could be rejuvenated and expanded to become an attractive visitor destination, as well as provide for neighborhood retail needs. Building on the design character of some of the older homes along Danmann and San Pedro which have been converted to shops, adding a cultural center for performing arts and an attractive motel could, if carefully designed, enhance the appearance of this area and provide visitor services near the shoreline. After appropriate study of the protective character of the railroad berm, this area might be linked directly to the beach by removing a portion of the berm; however, alternatives to berm removal for access are preferred. An Environmental Impact Report should be required for removal of the berm.

Small scale, rustic design and ample landscaping throughout the commercial development would complement the existing attractive design elements in the Pedro Point area. Adequate public access through the development to the shoreline and a general orientation to coastal related/visitor-serving uses within the project would be appropriate in this location. Given these criteria, commercial use of this portion of the neighborhood is consistent with the following policies of the Coastal Act: 30212 (Provision of Public Access in New Developments), 30222 (Priority of Recreational/Visitor-Serving Uses), 30250 (Concentration of Development), 30251 (Scenic Resources) and 30253 (Special Neighborhoods).

The remains of the old Oceanshore Railroad berm lies seaward of the area proposed for commercial development. Between Tobin Station and San Pedro Creek on the ocean side of the berm are some single-family houses and a private boat ramp. If public acquisition of this beach area is not possible, the following use is recommended: low intensity, small scale visitor-serving uses related to the fishing facilities and character of the existing residential enclave. New development must be consistent with Local Coastal Land Use Plan policies regarding access, hazards, scenic resources and marine resources. Although the private launching facility is the only one in Pacifica, it cannot be substantially enlarged. The California Department of Boating indicates that larger scale launching facilities would

not be feasible in this location because of the extensive off-shore structures that would be needed. However, the commercial fishing existing in the area should be consistent with Plan policies as long as it is feasible and safe. New development between the berm and the sea should provide unrestricted public access and permanent housing within the neighborhood for low/moderate income housing units existing on the site at the time of development.

Tobin Station, currently used as a private residence, is located at the southwest end of the beach area described above. It is one of the few remaining stations of the short lived Oceanshore Railroad and is an important local historic landmark. Sited on the bluff with a sweeping view of San Pedro Beach and the Headlands and the main coast, Tobin Station should be protected as a historic landmark. The building could become a coastal overlook point and a small local railroad museum if acquired by a public agency.

The area from Tobin Station atop the Oceanshore Railroad berm, west to Shelter Cove and south along the cove to the City boundary, is in a single private ownership. The parcel extends landward up to the top of the bluff above the cove and totals \pm 17 acres. Only the northerly portion of the parcel is visible from San Pedro Beach and Highway 1. The sandy cove, existing homes, and the west-facing bluff are obscured from all land views by the topography of the point. Access to the 24 residential units on the beach is via a narrow, poorly maintained road that skirts the steep bluffs west of Tobin Station. The beach at the base of these bluffs is narrow and stony. Like the sandy beach at the cove it, too, is frequented by divers who scramble down the bluff.

Geotechnical constraints include steep slopes, eroding bluffs, weak bedrock formations and occasional rock falls. In addition, the existing structures on and near the sandy beach are threatened by wave damage during stormy periods.

Public acquisition in this portion of Pacifica is directed towards the purchase of San Pedro Beach and the Headlands. It is unlikely that the less accessible, generally less usable, Shelter Cove parcel can also be acquired. A Special Area designation, including a low density residential use in concert with visitor oriented commercial uses and increased public access and recreational use of the area, generally from Tobin Station west and south to the City boundary, would be consistent with the requirements of the California Coastal Act if the criteria below were met.

Included among these criteria are protection of the existing marine resources from over-use, protection of the special character of the neighborhood, and protection of the varied recreational opportunities now present in the cove. Because of the unique low and moderate income housing need now being met in the Shelter Cove area, any future development predicated on removal of the existing units, will be required to retain or provide replacement housing to meet low and moderate income needs existing at the time of development. Future new development should be limited to the now developable area available on the bench above the cove. The remainder of the site over 35 percent slope, geotechnically unsafe or at sea level should be limited to open space or other non-structural use. Development on the bench would be out of the coastal viewshed from San Pedro Beach and Highway 1. The development would be visible from the sandy beach below, but setback, differences in elevation, sensitive design and landscaping could

largely mitigate this impact. Extensive geotechnical studies would also be necessary to identify the developable area and to assure the safety of any structures built on the bench. Special attention to site drainage is required to mitigate any adverse impacts on marine life and to avoid erosion.

New low density residential use built in Shelter Cove should allow for providing public coastal access consistent with the special recommendations in the Access Component. Visitor-serving commercial uses would be appropriate on the site, but should be limited to those which do not require permanent improvements, use of existing structures already designed to provide visitor oriented commercial services and/or short-term rental cottages which would not alter the residential character of the area. The provision of ± 25 parking spaces adjacent to the water tank above the cove for public beach parking should also be a development requirement. The level of public use anticipated as a result of the designated land use, the public dedications and the available parking should guarantee that public use would not be so intensive as to adversely affect the ecology of the tidal area.

In the future, new development should be located on the bench above the cove and should not obstruct public access to the beach. However, public parking for beach users and improved beach access must be provided. While phasing of development of this area may be preferred, the initial step should be preparation of the entire site plan. The first phase of development should include the uses of highest coastal priority: public beach parking and improved beach access.

If the criteria outlined above are followed, development of housing on a portion of this parcel would be consistent with the following Coastal Act policies: 30211 (Public Access), 30212 (Provisions for Public Access in New Developments), 30210 (Maximum Access), 30230 (Marine Resources), 30250 (Concentration of Development), 30251 (Scenic Resources), 30253 (Geologic Stability).

Coastal Access

Four beach access points exist in this coastal neighborhood. All are currently unimproved, but are established by frequent use. The most northerly of these accesses is located on the north side of the existing Pedro Point Shopping Center. This access is a trail along the low bank of San Pedro Creek, most of which is in the Headlands-San Pedro Beach neighborhood to the north. This access trail leads through residentially developed frontage on the beach and should be clearly signed. Signing should occur both at the actual access and at the edge of Highway 1 for those using the beach parking on Linda Mar Boulevard.

The second informal beach access is west of the first; a dirt access road used by the residents on the north side of the berm. The developed access to this area should be part of the proposed adjacent commercial development which may include removing part of the unused railroad berm and providing visual and physical access to the beach. Alternatives to berm removal are preferred.

The third access is down the steep bluffs to the cobble beach on the north side of Shelter Cove. Because of public safety problems, particularly landsliding and rock falls, the existing informal access should be allowed to continue, but should not be promoted. The fourth access, Shelter Cove,





the sandy pocket beach and the only access to the rocks called Point San Pedro (actually located in unincorporated County), should be retained in private ownership, but set aside for public use. As a part of development proposed for the area, the access road should be improved. Public beach parking should be provided. Because of the isolated location, small area, and confined nature of the beach, public use should be available but not promoted. Should the State wish to operate and manage this area in the future, the area should be actively promoted for diving.


The Pedro Point-Shelter Cove area is served by the County inter-City bicycle trail system and the City's north-south pedestrian-bicycle pathway. Both routes parallel Highway 1. An extension from the City pathway is proposed from Highway 1 west to the vista point/museum proposed at Tobin Station. The route would follow San Pedro Avenue to Danmann; and west on Danmann. The County's trail will eventually continue south along the Devil Slide bypass and along the coast to the coastal communities and beaches to the south.

Highway 1 provides regional access to Pedro Point and indirectly Shelter Cove. The highway is four lanes at San Pedro Avenue. CalTrans' proposed safety and operational improvements include improvements to the San Pedro Avenue-Highway 1 intersection. Just past San Pedro Avenue at the City line the highway becomes two lanes as it crosses Devil Slide south of the City. Because of continual movement on Devil Slide, CalTrans plans on eventually relocating the roadway. The proposed bypass would result in realigning Highway 1 south from the Linda Mar intersection in Pacifica. When the bypass is built, a decade or more in the future, the San Pedro Avenue intersection with Highway 1 will be realigned again. Proposed vitalization of the commercial area suggests that rather than continue San Pedro Avenue on its existing alignment, it should be relocated to connect to Linda Mar Boulevard on the west side of Highway 1. CalTrans agrees that this would be preferable to a second realignment, but feels the actual relocation would be a private or City expense.

Traffic movement within the residential portion of the neighborhood is adequate. Special street standards exist here which protect the rustic character of the area and should be continued. Local access to Shelter Cove off Danmann is adequate for the existing level of use, but should any new development occur at the cove, safe and more dependable access should be built and maintained. The minimum standard for both Pedro Point and Shelter Cove should be adequate emergency vehicle access, fire, police, and paramedic services.

PEDRO PT. - SHELTER COVE LAND USE PLAN

-  OPEN-SPACE RESIDENTIAL
-  LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
-  COMMERCIAL
-  SPECIAL AREA
-  PROMINENT RIDGELINE
-  CITY NORTH/SOUTH TRAIL



OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS

State law requires cities to prepare general plans which include consideration in nine topical areas: land use, circulation, scenic highways, housing, safety, seismic safety, noise, open space and conservation. By this law, the State expressed its determination that information in these areas was essential for preparation of a "comprehensive" plan. However, recognizing that no two communities in the State are identical, the State also permits optional topics. In Pacifica's case, three optional elements were added: community facilities, historic preservation and community design.

In 1976, the California Coastal Act became law, providing for more detailed planning and regulation of the coastal areas of the State, including temporary supervision of planning activity within the Coastal Zone by the State Coastal Commission. This supervision ends when each jurisdiction develops a plan and implementation program acceptable to the State. Pacifica received a grant from the Coastal Commission to prepare its coastal plan. Recognizing the interdependence of the coastal and inland areas of the City, the General Plan and its required and optional elements include the Policy and Land Use findings of the coastal planning program.


The objective of the State Planning Law in requiring elements was to ensure broad based information as a basis for decision making in the future. The policy statement growing out of each element is a fundamental part of the planning process. These policies and the appropriate implementing or action programs are combined in another section of this report. This section focuses on the findings of the¹ research for each element and implications for future planning in Pacifica.

¹ Drafts of the research, analysis and findings of each element are available among the approved documents of this Plan in the City of Pacifica Community Development and Services Department.

PACIFICA

Select Street System

-  Arterial
-  Collector



↑
September 1977
750 0 1500 3000
Scale in Feet

 Ironsides & Associates
Planning Consultants

CIRCULATION ELEMENT

Section 65302(b) of the Government Code requires a Circulation Element which indicates the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals and facilities correlated with the Land Use Element.

The primary circulation issues in Pacifica are east-west access, the capacity of the north-south access, the future impact of traffic destined for beaches and coastal activities south of the City, access to undeveloped areas and access for public safety. Non-motorized movement is limited in Pacifica because of the layout of the City and the absence of facilities.

Although the California Department of Transportation has studied a number of east-west access alternatives, the current proposal is to provide safety and operational improvements to Sharp Park Road. CalTrans is also asking the community to decide if the proposed segment of State Route 380 in Pacifica should be dropped from the State Highway Plan. If 380 is deleted, the possibility of any kind of State-funded highway or arterial on this right-of-way becomes impossible. The cost of a new east-west connection makes it unlikely to achieve without State funding, therefore, if the option of the future construction is to be kept open for beyond 1990, the route should remain in the State plan. The California Department of Transportation is currently evaluating non-freeway alternatives to the Route 380 freeway in Pacifica.

Purchase of developable portions of Sweeney and Fassler Ridges by the Federal government, or some other agency, would eliminate the concern that an east-west lateral would stimulate development on the ridges. If the ridges are not purchased for park use, the "Prominent Ridgeline" designation and its appropriate zoning would protect much of the ridge area from alteration generated by better access.


North-south access is primarily an issue of highway capacity. The highway now serves as both a regional recreation access to San Mateo beaches south of Pacifica and as the major local arterial for the coastside residents. The southern half of this highway is now a substandard four-lane arterial with unregulated access. At peak commute hours, this roadway exceeds capacity. However, for coastal visitors who rarely travel this route at peak commute hours, the roadway has adequate capacity. Based on MTC/ABAG's recommendation, CalTrans is developing plans for safety and operational improvements on the four-lane portion of this roadway. These improvements were determined by MTC and ABAG to be adequate to accommodate the estimated 42,000 resident population plus coastal visitors to 1990. The MTC/ABAG Plan assumed there would be no development on the ridges. In determining recreational capacity of the highway to 1990, MTC/ABAG assumed the current level of parking and access availability at the beaches south of the City. However, the State Department of Parks and Recreation has recently developed a new policy of locating all expanded parking and beach access in San Mateo County at the beaches between Pacifica and Half Moon Bay. The purpose of this action is to protect the southern coast from more intensive development. This proposal is consistent overall with the MTC/ABAG Plan,

PACIFICA CIRCULATION

SELECT STREET SYSTEM


- ARTERIAL
- COLLECTOR

PROPOSED STREETS



 Ironside & Associates
Planning Consultants
July 1976



PROPOSED REALIGNMENT
OF ROUTE 1 EAST
DEVIL'S SLIDE



PACIFICA TRAILS

PROPOSED ROUTES:

- COUNTY RIDGELINE TRAIL
- CITY BICYCLE ROUTE
- COUNTY BICYCLE ROUTE
- TRAIL DESTINATIONS



I Ironside & Associates
Planning Consultants
September, 1972

PACIFICA

BICYCLE ROUTES

PACIFICA MASTER PLAN ROUTES
(ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL 1973)


— PRIMARY ROUTES

— OTHER ROUTES


..... ROUTES ALONG PROPOSED ROADWAYS

--- COUNTY BICYCLE PLAN ROUTES

--- ROUTES IN ADJACENT JURISDICTIONS



Ironside & Associates
Planning Consultants



Devil's Slide

San Mateo County

but was not considered with regard to the capacity of Highway 1 in Pacifica for coastal visitors. For this reason, it is appropriate for MTC to work with the City in reviewing the visitor-serving requirements of the arterial portion of Highway 1 in Pacifica to determine if any further improvements will be needed before 1990. The proposed Land Use Plan for the area south of Rockaway Beach, where the greatest traffic congestion exists, shows future additional residential development in this area will be limited.

The location of the Devil's Slide bypass will continue to be an issue for those south of Pacifica. The alignment through Pacifica is not disputed. The major issue will be the timing of construction and whether the new road should be two or four lanes. The capacity of the four-lane portion of Highway 1 has a direct effect on the amount of traffic on the Devil's Slide portion of the highway. Thus, the future size of this roadway should be considered in conjunction with the study for Highway 1 capacity in Pacifica.

Alternatives to the automobile are an important planning issue in Pacifica. The County has acquired two major parks on the coastal ridge and proposed linking them and the Portola Discovery Site with an equestrian/pedestrian trail which would extend all the way to Big Basin State Park. Also planned are inter-neighborhood links connecting the coastal and other neighborhoods and the ridge.

The north-south trail is proposed to be separated from vehicular traffic, but primarily because of the cost, the linking trails would be along existing City streets. The MTC/ABAG Coastal Corridor Study recommends that CalTrans provide bicycle/pedestrian trails as a part of their safety and operational improvements. CalTrans intends to provide eight-foot shoulders on Highway 1 for this purpose. They have not determined what will be provided along Sharp Park Road.

Funding for the construction of the bicycle/pedestrian trail system could come from a variety of sources. The County will match local funds for segments of Pacifica's trail which are part of the inter-County system. Depending on availability of funds, CalTrans will assist with roadways under this responsibility. The remainder of the designated trails will be the responsibility of the City, and implemented as funding is available.

The primary recreation access problem is parking. With such a short beach recreation season in San Mateo County, it is unreasonable to provide for peak beach and visitor usage. A more reasonable target would be to provide beach parking for average in-season daily use. Supplemental multiple-use parking at selected locations could also be provided. Average in-season beach parking is needed at Sharp Park State Beach, Rockaway and San Pedro Beach. Supplemental or peak day parking is needed at Sharp Park and San Pedro Beaches. The supplemental parking at Sharp Park could be provided by combining commercial, commuter, and visitor parking adjacent to the commercial uses along Palmetto. On San Pedro Beach, this peak period parking could be gained by using the commuter parking lots proposed on Linda Mar Boulevard at Highway 1 and on Crespi Drive at Highway 1. The Linda Mar lot is being built jointly by CalTrans, SamTrans and the City of Pacifica. CalTrans participation is the result of legislation for demonstration projects (SB 283). With additional special legislation in Sacramento, CalTrans might also assist the City in the development of the Crespi lot. The Sharp Park lots could be funded by a combination of City and assessment district, or could be fee lots.

The San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) provides bus service to Pacifica. Because of the high cost of operating County-wide bus service, SamTrans has adopted a policy that the fare box of local lines must generate at least 25 percent of the cost of operation. Only five lines in the County now meet this criteria; one is the Linda Mar-Daly City BART station line. For financial reasons, SamTrans increased the time between buses in the off-peak hours and moved from the smaller to larger buses. This latter move appears to have caused rapid deterioration of City streets used by buses. The City is seeking financial assistance to rebuild the affected streets. Since this problem was not anticipated when the Federal government became involved in funding and promoting mass transit, there are no existing grants available to repair streets damaged by mass transit use. SamTrans has indicated that, if the City wishes, they would stop service on City streets. Since so many City residents are dependent upon the bus service, the City is reluctant to take this step.

SamTrans provides no bus service for coastal visitors. On the basis that there appears to be no demand for such service and no transportation agency has offered funding, mass transit for recreational access is unlikely without substantial subsidy. Pacifica would promote those lines which provide both local transit and beach access.

Local street problems include limited access to some neighborhoods, the design and use of existing roadways, and the old subdivisions with inappropriate street grades and alignments. Some of the valley neighborhoods have only a single access. If there were a neighborhood-wide emergency, there could be a serious access problem for emergency equipment. For this reason, additional access roads are proposed for Vallemar and Rockaway Valleys, and an extension of the Francisco-Bradford Way frontage road on the west side of Highway 1 through the quarry to Rockaway Beach. Development of Sweeney Ridge either as a park or for homes will require access. Should the area be used for residential development, depending upon the number of units, a loop road is recommended extending from the end of Fassler, north along the ridge westerly to the Coast Highway. A connection to Highway 1 could be made by bridging the highway to the proposed frontage road or directly to the highway on the east side.

Several intersections at Highway 1 need improvement and regulation. CalTrans' plans for safety and operational improvements should consider these needs. The San Pedro Avenue intersection could be improved by a realignment to connect with the regulated intersection of Highway 1 and Linda Mar Avenue. This realignment would also simplify improvements required for the Devil's Slide bypass.

Many of the older neighborhoods in Pacifica have roadways which are substandard by current standards. However, the residents of these areas feel adequately served and indicate that the existing street widths lend a unique character to their neighborhoods. For this reason, the City should continue its policy of individual neighborhood street standards, focusing on public safety requirements and preservation of neighborhood character.

Paper streets created as a part of old subdivisions, filed when less stringent standards existed, were often laid without regard for topography. These streets are a problem in Pacifica's older neighborhoods. Resolution of these problems will require ordinance revisions and creative use of the City's governmental powers.

SCENIC HIGHWAYS ELEMENT

Required by Section 65302(h) of the Government Code, the Scenic Highways Element provides for the development, establishment and protection of scenic highways. The basic parameters for Pacifica's Scenic Highways Element are stated in the two goals of preserving, maintaining, and enhancing the visual qualities of the City's scenic corridors and making the residents of the City more aware of the City's scenic resources.

Local criteria developed for selected eligible scenic roadways in Pacifica are:

1. Arterial streets designated on the City's Select Street System Map or in the General Plan.
2. Scenic quality and ability to connect areas of recreational or historic interest.
3. Generally provide a continuous flow of traffic.
4. Bicycle/pedestrian routes should be provided along the roadways wherever possible.

The scenic roadway proposals are:


1. Reaffirmation of the highways proposed by the State and County on their respective plans: the Cabrillo or Coast Highway (State Route 1) and Sharp Park Road between Skyline Boulevard and Highway 1.
2. The Linda Mar Boulevard-Oddstad-Terra Nova Boulevard-Fassler Avenue loop, providing spectacular views of the coastal ridge and ocean and connecting major recreation areas (San Pedro Valley County Park, Sanchez Adobe, and the Discovery Trail at the end of Fassler) and points of historic interest and scenic beauty.
3. The ridgeline access roadway to the Portola Discovery Site, whether the road provides access to a park or residential development.

Local scenic roadway designation requires a corridor study, a program to protect and enhance the scenic qualities from the proposed roadway and adoption of the roadway with its protection program. The City may choose to mark the roadway with signs identifying it as a scenic corridor and/or indicate the designation on local street maps. The study, program preparation, and adoption of local scenic roadways is exclusively a local responsibility. State and County roadway designations are made by the State and County, but the study and program are prepared locally with local initiative. Citizen participation is essential in preparation of local roadway programs. The City may submit its local scenic highway designations to the State for inclusion in their plan.

PACIFICA

Scenic Highways

-  Proposed By State & County Plans
-  Proposed Only By County Plan
-  Proposed By City



↑
 September 1977
 750 0 1500 3000
 scale in feet

 Ironsides & Associates
 Planning Consultants

San Mateo County

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT

The Historic Preservation Element of Pacifica's General Plan was prepared by a group of knowledgeable citizens who volunteered, out of their concern for conserving remnants of Pacifica's past, to add depth to the human experience today and in the future. The element includes a list and map of all of the sites and structures felt to be of historic significance in Pacifica.

The element would be implemented by an Historic Ordinance which would establish a Pacifica Historic Sites Advisory Committee to review proposed changes to sites and structures designated on the Historic Sites Map and advise the Planning Commission and City Council of the appropriateness of the proposal. The Committee would also spearhead local civic activity, such as local history programs for schools and civic organizations, seeking funding for historic conservation projects, and seeking assistance for further documentation on the Historic Sites list.


The Historic Element text is also published separately so that it may be used by those who participated in its creation to seek funding for additional planning conservation activities, as well as for promoting educational and civic awareness of Pacifica's colorful past.

PACIFICA HISTORIC SITES

1. Dollaradio Station
2. Morrissey Farm House
3. Happy Hollow Ranch
4. Comerford House/ Fahey
5. Double Line of Cypress at Skyline
6. Oceana High School
7. Nike/Milagra Coast Artillery Site
8. Anderson's Store
9. Fahey Ranch House
10. San Pedro School House
11. Little Brown Church
12. McCloskey Castle
13. Salada Beach District
14. Municipal Fishing Pier
15. Hunting Lodge
16. Brighton Beach District
17. Pender's House
18. Laguna Salada & Marsh
19. Sharp Park Golf Course & Clubhouse
20. Trees in Sharp Park
21. Fairway Park WW II Alien Detention Camp
22. Mori Farm House (1880) and Mori Point
23. Quarry
24. Ocean Shore Railroad Station
25. Vallemar (Calera Creek) Arboretum
26. Vallemar District
27. Rockaway Business District
28. Snug Harbor Tourist Cabins
29. Rockaway School House
30. Portola Discovery Trail
31. Portola Discovery Site
32. Point San Pedro
33. Pedro Point District - Post Office
34. Tobin Station
35. Danmann's Hayloft
36. Ocean Shore Railroad Bed & Station
37. Portola Campsite
38. Sanchez Adobe
39. Pitto Ranch
40. St. Peter's Church
41. San Pedro Mt. Road to Montara Mt.



 Ironside & Associates
Planning Consultants



COMMUNITY FACILITIES ELEMENT (1982)

The purpose of the Community Facilities Element is to review the adequacy of the various services and facilities upon which Pacifica residents rely.

Pacifica has a wastewater treatment plant consisting of primary and secondary facilities. Wastewater is transported to the plant by gravity from Sharp Park and the communities to the north of the treatment plant. Wastewater is pumped and transported by force mains from the communities south of Sharp Park. The 1982 average dry weather flow treated at the plant is approximately 2.6 mgd. Peak wet weather flows exceed 15 mgd.

The Regional Water Quality Control Board is the enforcement agency overseeing the City's compliance with the discharge requirements. They have the authority to levy fines and impose building moratoriums if the plant is in noncompliance with such requirements. The Regional Board is presently concerned about compliance during wet weather conditions. Reduction of the peak wet weather flows through an inflow and infiltration reduction program and modifications to the treatment plant may be required within the next five years. The cost of these programs could be borne as an off-site development cost by developers undertaking construction that would contribute to the overload of the treatment plant and collection system facilities.

The capacity of secondary treatment facilities within the existing sewage treatment plant has been determined to be capable of accommodating a population of no more than 46,800 under present discharge requirements. Any increase in population above that amount may be allowed only if the capacity of secondary waste treatment is increased in direct proportion to a further increase in population. The City must ensure that, prior to exceeding a population of 46,800, adequate sewage treatment capacity to accommodate the increase is available.

Local water supply, public utilities, and solid waste collection and disposal facilities are adequate for development proposed in the plan.



Recent studies of City Hall and Corporation Yard facilities indicate the need for additional space for both of these services. The City Police Department is also inadequately housed. Studies have suggested that these three functions be grouped along with a new main post office and perhaps some additional offices to create a Civic Center. Citizens would like to see the Civic Center located near the Vallemar neighborhood or quarry west of Vallemar. An eight to ten acre site would be required. Financial constraints facing the City will inevitably delay the relocation of the City Hall and Police Department. Need for a corporation yard, however, is critical and relocation should occur within the next few years.

The Laguna Salada School District serves grades K-8 and the Jefferson Union High School District, grades 9-12. Enrollment in Pacifica schools has been steadily declining, particularly in the elementary grades. In a period of declining enrollment, the critical issue is not adequate number of classrooms, but alternative uses for schools proposed to be closed. It also is important to provide for continued neighborhood use of school

PACIFICA

COMMUNITY FACILITIES


-  Park
-  Recreation Center
-  School
-  School Site
-  Library
-  Fire Station
-  Church



 Ironside & Associates
Planning Consultants

PACIFICA Water System

-  Storage Tanks
-  Main Trunk Lines
-  Boundary of North Coast County Water District




 September 1977
 750 0 1500 3000
 scale in feet


 Ironside & Associates
 Planning Consultants

playgrounds. Since the School District has a surplus of classrooms, they are disposing of two or three undeveloped school sites.

The Jefferson Union School District does not anticipate closing either of its Pacifica schools. They expect their enrollment to continue to decline into the early 1980s and then stabilize at a level sufficient to continue to operate both schools. The recent property tax initiative may have some impact on this decision in the next few years.

Pacifica is within the San Mateo County Library District. Until recently, the City was served by two branch libraries, but the smaller of these has been closed. However, a new library next to the Park Pacifica Shopping Center will be built in the next few years. In the interim, the Sharp Park Branch Library will continue to serve Pacifica and the area north of Half Moon Bay. The future operation of both libraries remains uncertain. The City's codes and ordinances need to be reviewed for new safety provision and enforcement problems. In addition, the Zoning Ordinance should be clarified and procedures amplified.

Pacifica's population is relatively young. Recreation opportunities are provided by various non-profit youth programs and the City's Department of Parks, Beaches and Recreation (PB&R). The City has a number of community activity buildings and rooms operated by PB&R. Two are being rehabilitated with HCDA funds and the remainder should be reviewed to determine if they need similar assistance.

PB&R also sponsors the City's Resource Center, located in West Sharp Park. This facility provides emergency housing and other assistance to City residents, as well as information about the availability of various public services and assistance.

The Youth Service Bureau, a unique pilot project, is also located in West Sharp Park. This counseling service for youthful offenders receives financial assistance from the State and County, as well as from the City. The State and County funding level is based on its success rate, i.e., the number of youthful offenders who participate in the program and do not commit additional offenses within 90 days of the completion of their counseling program. The Youth Service Bureau has had a good success rate.

SEISMIC SAFETY AND SAFETY ELEMENT (1983)

The Seismic Safety and Safety Elements overlap to the extent that both are better understood if they are combined. The Seismic Safety Element, which requires that cities take seismic hazards into account in their planning programs, is mandated by Government Code Section 65302(f). The Safety Element which is broader based in its intent, including fire protection, geologic hazards, and safety standards, receives its mandate from Government Code Section 65302(i).

The guidelines for both elements recognize the impossibility of eliminating all hazards and, therefore, recommend that each community determine the level of risk to persons and property it feels is acceptable. Once determined, city services, ordinances and levels of enforcement should achieve accepted levels of protection. There are three levels of risk: acceptable, mitigable, and unacceptable. An acceptable level of risk involves recognition that it is not possible to totally eliminate risk and that no direct action by local government is necessary. Unacceptable risk is where it is determined that actions should be restricted by the local government to minimize the risk and to protect life and property. Unacceptable risks should be avoided. Mitigable risks are those risks which initially may be unacceptable, but can be brought to a level of acceptability through mitigation measures. Regulation of all levels of risk is accomplished through City controls, including grading, building, and zoning codes and General Plan policies.

The Pacifica Seismic Safety and Safety Element is organized to summarize existing conditions in the City, particularly focusing on recent catastrophic events, immediate and potential mitigation, and policy direction. Its purpose is partially to alert the community to some of the identified or potential safety problems in the City. Implications of risk factors are also discussed as are suitable City actions to reduce risk to acceptable levels. Implementation will be based upon the policies and action programs of the General Plan and the planning process.

GEOTECHNICAL

The main geotechnical hazards to the Pacifica area are hillside erosion, coastal erosion, earthquake shaking, and ground shaking. Landslides and slope failures can result from all of the listed hazards and have been serious problems in Pacifica.

HILLSIDE EROSION AND LANDSLIDES

Stability of the hillsides within Pacifica is a critical hazard which can best be identified by specific geotechnical studies. Generally, landsliding is a highly localized problem which has had widespread occurrences. Landslides have occurred in Pacifica for many years, but surficial landslides were recently recognized as a significant hazard. Runoff from heavy rain or ground shaking are most likely to activate landsliding.

PACIFICA

GEOLOGY Generalized

NOTE: THIS MAP IS PREPARED AS AN AID TO PLANNING. HOWEVER, THE DATA WERE TAKEN FROM MAPS AT A SMALLER SCALE, AND THE ACCURACY OF LOCATION IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO VERIFICATION.

Quaternary Deposits younger than 2 million years

- Qmf Man-placed Fill
- Qac Alluvium in valley areas;
Colluvium in hillside area
- Qd Dune Deposit
- Qb Beach Deposit
- Qt Terrace Deposit

Tertiary Deposits

- Tm Merced Formation
- Tss Paleocene Sandstone and Shale

Jurassic & Cretaceous

- gr Montara Granite
- sp Serpentine


Franciscan Formation

- fu Undifferentiated: mostly Graywacke Sandstone
- fg Greenstone
- fl Limestone
- fc Chert


Fault Traces

-  Dashed where approximately located,
-  dotted where concealed or inferred

AUGUST 1975



 Ironside & Associates
Planning Consultants




PACIFICA

GEOTECHNICAL HAZARDS

-  San Andreas Fault dashed where approximate
-  Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone
-  Low Stability of Coastal Bluffs
High potential for hazard
-  Moderate Stability of Coastal Bluffs
Intermediate potential for hazard
-  Large Landslide
-  Concentrations of Landslides
-  Flood Hazard Area¹
-  Potential Tsunami Hazard²

1. Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development,
Flood Hazard Boundary Map H-01-05

2. Source: San Mateo County Seismic and Safety Element,
Map Sheet 1



 **Ironsides & Associates**
Planning Consultants

Since surficial slope stability can be a critical factor affecting public safety in Pacifica, it is important that sites with this potential either not be developed in the future, or developed in such a way as to protect those using the structures, surrounding development and the community as a whole. Public facilities, such as water tanks or roads should not be located close to, or on landslides unless adequate mitigation measures are taken.

Sources of information on geology include United States Geological Survey (USGS) material and a 1982 report prepared by Howard Donley Associates, Inc. (HDAI) 'Geological Investigation - Landslide Type and Distribution - Mechanics Details of Nine Representative Failures - January 1982 Rainstorms - City of Pacifica, California' (hereinafter referred to as the HDAI Report). The HDAI Report, including the landslide location maps, is herein adopted by reference.

Two maps are included in the General Plan Seismic Safety and Safety Element. The Generalized Geologic Map of Pacifica was developed from a USGS map published at a scale of 1:62,500 (one inch equals about one mile) which was compiled in 1972 and not field checked. These maps may be used for general planning purposes and as an indication of the actual underlying regional geology.

The Geotechnical Hazards Map is a consolidation of hazard information, including earthquake fault location, coastal erosion, and hillside instability. More detailed landslide location data at a larger scale (one inch equals 400 feet) can be found in the HDAI Report which contains locations of 475 slope failures from the January 1982 storm. The General Plan Geotechnical Hazards Map shows four areas where the distribution of surficial slope failures was concentrated. The landslide area designation on the map indicates areas where more than 20 slope failures occurred in a cluster. The areas range in size from 93 to 206 acres; the number of landslides mapped from the 1982 storm range from 24 to 60. Other areas of the City do not appear to have similar dense concentrations of slope failures although landslides occurred throughout the City.

The maps are most useful for locating areas where landslides have occurred and the HDAI maps provide a useful level of detail. The presence of landslides indicates a hillside stability problem which would require careful attention if the land were proposed for development. The absence of previous landslides on a hillside, however, does not guarantee stability and all hillside areas must have detailed geotechnical reports prior to project approval.

A USGS Map was prepared for the southern half of the City in 1981. USGS also has a Landslide Inventory Map and a Landslide Susceptibility Map for San Mateo County. The maps are of limited usefulness for Pacifica, however, because deep seated bedrock failures were mapped, but surficial failures (such as debris flows) were not included in the mapping or analysis. USGS will be preparing updated maps which will include data from the January 1982 storm, including information on surficial failures. When completed, these maps will be useful for Pacifica because most of the slope failure in the past two years have been surficial.

The HDAI Report focuses on nine selected slope failures which were considered representative of the 475 failures which occurred during the January 1982 storms. The analyses include detailed geological mapping of

each of the nine slides, descriptions of the geographical and geotechnical settings, characteristics and mode of slope failure, and possible mitigation measures. The slope failure analyses are most useful for a geologist who is undertaking a geotechnical study of land which is similar to any of the representative slide areas.

The introduction and conclusions to the HDAI Report are important for planning purposes. The report explains the events which caused the slope failure, summarizes slide characteristics, and suggests mitigation measures for the future. The slope failures of 1982 and 1983 have had a significant effect on planning and development in Pacifica and, therefore, conclusions from the HDAI Report are included in the Seismic Safety and Safety Element. The overall frame of reference for development, City requirements, and procedures for development of hillside areas have changed as a result of the damage from the recent winter storms. It is now recognized that there may be a potential danger to sites located both on and near many of the hill slopes in Pacifica. Some of these may involve life-threatening situations under severe storm or earthquake conditions.

The exceptionally heavy rainfall in early January 1982 triggered hundreds of slope failures. The combination of saturated soil from a wet winter, followed by intense rainfall, led to landslides and slope instability. The saturation and weakening of the slopes was severe enough to permanently damage some of the hillsides. Heavy rainfall in the 1983 winter again triggered slides, although they were not as numerous or as severe as the 1982 incidents.

The 1982 slope failures caused three deaths, total destruction to four homes, damage to tens of others, and potential life-threatening situations for at least 500 families living at the foot of steep hillsides. A special emergency landslide hazard map, which was valid only for the 1982 winter, was prepared and affected residents were advised to evacuate in the event of heavy rainfall. The advisory evacuation notices were not based on site specific geological investigations. Rather, a broad analysis was based on air photo interpretation and homeowners in areas which were identified as 'high risk' received the evacuation notices. However, it was made clear that the maps and notices were intended only for the 1982 rainy season because of the nature of the analysis. Although there had been slope failures prior to the 1982 storms, never before had the potential danger by this phenomena been so widely experienced on or near the hillsides of Pacifica. Damage to municipal facilities and City clean-up costs alone have exceeded \$1.5 million to date. Overall public and private costs of the storm in the past two years are estimated to be \$30 million.

Although the 1983 slope failures were less severe than those in 1982, danger from hillside erosion continued to be a serious threat. There was more rain in 1983, but it had a longer duration and storms may not have been as intense as the one which caused the original slope failures. One house was destroyed and four were damaged from slope failures in 1983. There were many landslides similar to the smaller of the slope failures of the previous year. Most of the 1983 slope failures were not classified as debris flows; rather, the landslides were classified as translational, rotational, or deep seated failures. Debris flows were less common in 1983, primarily because the rainfall was less intense than 1982. The 1983 failures have not been mapped or analyzed in detail.

The 1982 slope failures ranged in size from a few cubic yards to 3,000 cubic yards of earth material. The majority of the slides occurred near the top of the natural hills rather than on engineered slopes. The majority of the natural slope angles ranged from a horizontal to vertical measurement of 1:1 (100% or a 45 degree slope) to 2:1 (50% or a 30 degree slope). Shallower slopes also contained flows, but invariably their toes coincided with an artificial or natural steepening of slope. Long, steep slopes may create an additional danger that a debris flow could accelerate to a debris avalanche capable of reaching exceptionally high velocity and long distances from the base of the slope and having great destructive power.

The slides were characterized as surficial failures (generally less than 10 feet deep), such as earth flows or debris slumps, as opposed to deep-seated bedrock failures. Conclusions were not drawn between the type of bedrock and the frequency of landsliding, however, soil characteristics are described and the analysis may be useful for future site-specific geotechnical studies.

The HDAI Report drew conclusions about the January 1982 slope failures and suggested mitigation measures for the future. Most of the landslides occurred in the southern part of Pacifica on natural, rather than engineered slopes. Several slides, however, occurred on oversteepened cut slopes underlain by soil. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the slope failures disaggregated into flowing masses of soil and water (debris/earth flows); for the remaining 15%, flowage subsequent to sliding did not occur (rotational slides). Only one slope failure was categorized as a type of failure (solifluction) which could be considered a creep process which could generate landslides as it oversteepens the slope (Grand Teton Avenue). Technical conclusions were drawn by the HDAI Report which will be useful for geologists undertaking local studies.

The primary mitigation measure suggested in the HDAI Report is 'avoidance'. The General Plan, Zoning Ordinances, and City review requirements and standards can achieve avoidance and mitigation of hazard areas. In specific cases, development of hillsides with certain types of landslide susceptibility may reduce hazards. For example, an already developed area which may be threatened by upslope hazards from undeveloped property, may benefit from development which would be required to incorporate measures to mitigate the hazard.

Detailed site specific information is not available which indicates areas which are so hazardous as to be unbuildable. For this reason, open space hazard overlay zones are not proposed at this time. However, the planning process can be used to review all proposed developments to assist in mitigating instability of the hillsides and to provide less risk for the residents and surrounding property owners.

Mitigation measures for existing or future slides which may affect developed areas can protect homes and residents. Three types of impact walls are suggested: containment walls, deflection walls, and baffles. These are engineering solutions which could be used to protect existing or proposed buildings in appropriate situations. However, mitigation measures may not always be acceptable. For example, it would not be appropriate to direct potential landslide flows toward other houses or property. Use of the public right-of-way as a landslide repository for new development is not appropriate. Landslide deposits should not be directed toward any public accessway, inhabited property or property likely to become inhabited, or any

special habitat area. Mitigation measures for any individual project should be closely monitored to mitigate against potential adverse effects on public health, safety and welfare.

It is recognized that intense rainfall is the triggering mechanism for the majority of slides and, therefore, drainage improvements are important mitigation measures. Surface swales and subsurface drainage can help avoid saturation of the soil. Erosion control is also an important mitigation measure as gullying from rainstorms can create slope failure where one might not otherwise occur. For steep slopes in excess of 50%, the slopes should contain a mature stand of grass or other type of groundcover. However, shrubbery, brush and trees appear to be more harmful to the overall stability of steep slopes and should be avoided. Slope modification and removal of overburden is also cited as a mitigation measure.

General recommendations of the HDAI Report stress the use of geotechnical evaluation prior to development, including consideration of potential upslope or downslope hazards. Aerial photographs, site inspection, subsurface investigation, laboratory testing, and stability analysis are important tools in determining the stability of a hillside site. The HDAI Report is a useful reference for comparison of sites and for basic technical strategies.

The recent winter storms have increased public awareness that erosion of hillsides is an ongoing process which can become a serious local hazard. General Plan policies have recognized development constraints on steep hillside lots. Steep slopes have traditionally been placed in lowest density land use designations in recognition of the difficulty and potential danger of development. The General Plan includes the following selected policies and action programs which are currently being implemented in response to increased recognition of slope instability.

1. Policy - Prohibit development in hazardous areas unless detailed site investigation ensures that risks can be reduced to acceptable levels.

Implementation - Environmental review procedures mandate detailed studies for any discretionary project which may constitute a risk or which is located in a hazardous area. Development is not permitted unless all risks are adequately mitigated. Building and planning permits are not issued unless the City is satisfied that the level of risk and mitigations are acceptable. The City recognizes both on- and off-site hazards and requires mitigation if necessary and appropriate.

2. Policy - Support public awareness of hazards by providing citizens with hazard information, results of studies, emergency procedures and alternatives.

Implementation - The City actively responded to the recent winter storms and slope failures by notifying property owners and residents of potential risk. Property owners of dangerous hillsides were also notified of their responsibilities. The HDAI Report is available for public use. The Disaster Preparedness Commission, a citizen committee, is actively considering emergency procedures and responses. When appropriate, conditions of approval for specific projects include a requirement to notify buyers of geotechnical uncertainties, risks, or potential costs.

3. Action Program - Develop ordinances requiring geotechnical site investigation prior to allowing site development.

Implementation - A City ordinance was adopted requiring a geotechnical report prior to issuance of a building permit for any project located on a site with an average slope over 15%. City administrative policies also require geotechnical reports for both discretionary and ministerial permits to be reviewed by an independent geotechnical consultant approved by the City. If a lot's slope is less than 15%, geotechnical reports can be required if on- or off-site conditions indicate a potential hazard. In addition, administrative policies have been adopted which provide a technical framework for evaluating slope stability.

4. Action Program - Require that development in marginally hazardous areas be designed and engineered to protect life and property.

Implementation - Development in all areas is required to be designed to protect life and property. Hillside areas are scrutinized carefully and geotechnical reports are required and independently checked to ensure appropriate standards of development. City geotechnical standards must be extremely conservative because of the importance of protecting citizens and the City.

The geotechnical community has been notified that the City has taken a new, extremely strict approach to development of property within the City's jurisdiction. In addition to the policies cited above, the following standards are applied to development review.

- . U.S.G.S. and County geology and hazard maps are not considered an adequate data base upon which reports may be based. Geologists must furnish their own geological map of a site and pertinent off-site areas.
- . Geotechnical reports must be prepared and reviewed by registered geologists, registered engineering geologists, or registered soils engineers.
- . Off-site hazards - either upslope or downslope - that may be related to proposed development must be addressed. Geological cross sections are required.
- . Potential catastrophic geotechnical hazards must be analyzed on the basis of passing a minimum of a 100-year event.

The City and the public are well aware that slope failures are a serious concern. Hillside instability affects both developed and undeveloped property. Much of the loss from the recent storms was a result of slope failure from unimproved upslope property damaging adjacent homes. Many slides occurred on the large tracts of vacant hillsides, increasing awareness of potential development constraints on the property. Future development will have to be designed to mitigate geotechnical problems or development will have to be located in a safe area. This has the potential to lower densities of sites. General Plan and zoning densities and land use designations will be reassessed in light of the changed environmental conditions. All development proposals will be very carefully scrutinized to ensure security for residents, safety of surrounding property, and minimize City liability.

COASTAL EROSION

The ongoing force of the Pacific Ocean constantly wears away at the Pacific coastline. The predominate erosion pattern along the shores of the City is the progressive undercutting of the bluffs by wave action in combination with the sloughing off of large chunks along the top of the bluffs due to saturation by water. Bluff failures result in a landward shift of the shoreline inconsistent with the annual rate of erosion.

Recent studies along the San Mateo coast, including Pacifica, indicate an annual average erosion rate of one to three feet per year. Local studies are currently being revised because stability may have been overestimated in the past. As a result of the 1983 storms, it is recognized that the rate of retreat may also have been underestimated in the past. Bluff erosion can be caused by ground water seepage and related sloughing of sandy material, water flowing over the top of the cliffs, or from wave action cutting away the toe of the bluff. Changes or intensification of any of these factors could significantly increase the rate of bluff retreat for specific sites.

In 1972, the Corps of Engineers prepared a report entitled, 'Beach Erosion Control Report on the Shores of the City of Pacifica'. The report described beaches and erosion patterns for the entire City and considered various alternatives for shoreline protection. Seawalls and groins were suggested for beach and cliff protection, however, Federal participation was not recommended at the time because of marginal economic feasibility and because the City was not financially capable of sharing costs.

Pacifica's sandy beaches vary in width from no sand to 12 or more feet, depending on the tide and wave action. The presence of a sand beach does not provide any substantial protection for adjoining bluffs because wave action can remove the sand and allow direct erosion of the bluff. The height of the bluffs varies from 5 to 120 feet.

Major erosion of the beach, bluffs and sea cliffs occurs during ocean storm conditions. Pacific storms during the winter of 1983 caused unusually high tides and severe erosion, tidal damage and flooding. The damage was particularly extensive because the storm conditions lasted for nearly two months. As much as 75 feet of bluff top was lost along the steep bluffs between Shoreview Avenue and Manor Drive. Mobilehomes were moved and houses on top of the bluffs were threatened. Residents evacuated their homes during the highest tides. The Pedro Point cliffs and beaches sustained the least damage. The Sharp Park and Rockaway Beach seawalls offered some protection from the wave action, but roads, parking areas, and structures were damaged and three homes were lost. The Sharp Park Golf Course dike was completely washed out and the golf course was severely damaged.

The City's approach to development in areas subject to coastal erosion is similar to the approach to hillside erosion and other geotechnical hazards. Density, setback, drainage, and landscaping are carefully examined. Geotechnical reports are required prior to approval of development and setbacks from the edge of the bluff are required to be adequate to accommodate a minimum 100-year event, whether caused by seismic, geotechnical, or storm conditions. The appropriate setback shall be determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on the site specific circumstances and hazards. The setback should be adequate to protect the structure for its design life. As with all geotechnical reports, an

independent City consultant should review project reports to ensure compliance with the City's strict standards.

SEISMIC

The San Andreas Fault Zone with identified traces of the fault and the limits of the Alquist-Priolo Study Zone are shown on the Fault and Slope Stability Hazards Map. Not all earthquakes cause the ground surface to rupture. Therefore, there is potential for ground rupture in Pacifica, but it is not likely to occur with every earthquake. The area within the fault zone is more subject to actual rupture by the fault movement than areas outside a fault zone. In Pacifica, the fault rupture hazard exists in a zone which extends through the Fairmont and Westview districts. There are approximately 952 single-family homes and 399 multiple-family units within the Alquist-Priolo Study Zone in Pacifica. Earthquake experts feel that wood frame structures, such as single-family homes, are flexible enough, as evidenced by the 1957 Daly City earthquake and other earthquakes, that it is unlikely there will be much loss of life from failure of these structures; however, there is likely to be substantial property loss. There are also other significant land uses in the Alquist-Priolo Study Zone which, if not properly constructed, may present a safety hazard. These uses include: Westview Elementary School, Fairmont Elementary School, Fairmont Fire Station, Fairmont Shopping Center and Fairmont West Recreation Center. These structures should be inspected for their ability to withstand a potential earthquake.

All of Pacifica would be affected by earthquake shaking; therefore, specific site conditions are a critical factor. Only an appropriate geotechnical investigation is valid in defining the conditions. The Citywide Generalized Geologic Map, in combination with the underlying Geologic Material Table and distance to the San Andreas Fault, are useful as general indicators of the geologic conditions. Additionally, appropriate maps from the U.S.G.S. and the Division of Mines and Geology can supply valuable information. The actual damage to a structure will be a factor of its design and inherent reaction to shaking.

Portions of Pacifica are underlain by relatively clean, poorly consolidated granular material, such as sand. In places there are perched layers of groundwater so that conditions may exist for liquefaction. Also, where materials are poorly consolidated, there may be ground subsidence or other forms of ground failure. Because the conditions at any particular site control the potential for any type of ground failure, only specific geotechnical investigations, including subsurface testing, can provide a basis for assessing such hazards.

The main tsunami danger is from major earthquakes within the Pacific Ocean basin, rather than local earthquakes. The tsunami hazard presents a risk to structures and individuals within the area. The approximate wave run-up height of 20 feet, judged to be appropriate for planning purposes in Pacifica, is shown on the Flood Hazards Map. There are approximately 900 existing dwelling units within Pacifica's tsunami run-up area. In addition to these dwellings, some important community services and facilities are within the run-up area: Pedro Valley School, a convalescent home in Linda Mar, Pedro Point Shopping Center, the southern half of Cabrillo School, part of the quarry, the City's Wastewater Treatment Plant, the City Council

Chambers, the fishing pier and sewer outfall, and part of the Sharp Park Library site. As a result of dependable warning systems, loss of life from tsunami rarely occurs in the United States. In addition, the amount of damage is dependent upon the site, angle of approach and contour of the coastline relative to the approaching wave. Significant property damage could occur within the areas indicated on the Flood Hazards Map.

Additionally, there could be danger from the Seal Cove Fault, a fault considered potentially active (a potentially active fault is one which has not been proved to have moved within the last 11,000 years, but which has moved within the last 2 to 3 million years). The fault is much smaller than the San Andreas Fault and, therefore, damage from ground shaking would primarily result from the San Andreas Fault. However, the fault is located one mile off shore and the damage from a tsunami could be serious. The entire coastline could be hit by a 10-foot wave with very little notice except earthquake shaking.

Within Pacifica, only Laguna Salada might be subject to seiche, but the potential for significant risk is low. A greater problem is from rupturing of water tanks and high pressure water lines during an earthquake.

FLOODING

Although portions of Sharp Park Golf Course and the lower reach of Calera Creek are subject to flooding, the major flood hazard is from San Pedro Creek. Since rainfall varies between 25 and 45 inches per year, the risk of flooding is highest during and after intense storms. High tides aggravate flooding in the low lying areas. Areas prone to flooding have been delineated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). These areas are subject to special regulation for federal flood insurance purposes and are shown on the Flood Hazards Map. The City officially adopted the Federal Insurance Administration Flood Hazards Maps dated February 4, 1981.

There are approximately 990 dwelling units and ten acres of commercial areas located within the designated flood zones. There are ten different flood zone designations; the major designations are for areas within the 100-year and 500-year flood boundaries. Based on the National Flood Insurance Rate Map, approximately half of the areas prone to flooding are in the 100-year flood boundary and the other half are in the 500-year flood boundary. The lower Linda Mar area, including the residences between DeSolo Drive and Anza Drive, and the Linda Mar Shopping Center, has historically been subject to flooding at a rate of between five (5) and ten (10) years. Minor flooding has mainly consisted of streets, parking areas and yards. Major flooding, including flooding of residences and commercial areas up to a depth of three (3') feet above the finished floor elevations in recent history, has occurred in 1953, 1962, 1972 and 1982.

The January 1982 flooding was especially severe because the damage was not only due to water, but also due to the saturated soils mixed with the storm runoff. Because of the exceptionally heavy rainfalls, hundreds of slope failures were triggered at approximately the same time that the surface runoff reached its peak. This flooded the lower Linda Mar area and deposited a layer of silt approximately 12 inches in depth. In addition, this combination of silt and water caused extensive flooding and silt damage throughout the entire City. There was extensive flooding and up to three

(3') feet of silt/debris along Springwood Way, Perez Drive, Valdez Way, Oddstad Boulevard, Rosita Road and other areas throughout the City.

The flooding was due to a combination of heavy rainfall, high tides, mudslides, overflowing of the banks of San Pedro Creek and the failure of the pump stations after the pumps were submerged for several hours. The pump stations have been repaired. At the Linda Mar Pump Station, all the electrical equipment was raised three (3') feet to help reduce the possibility of flooding of the equipment and failure of the pumps. Other safety measures, such as flood proofing, new pumps, better stand-by generators, and other improvements are considered at this time to improve the storm drainage and sewer pumping facilities.

The City is also establishing a committee to study and make recommendations regarding possible improvements along San Pedro Creek. The actual cost of improvements along San Pedro Creek is the responsibility of the adjacent property owners. The proposed construction of the Peralta bridge will eliminate the present constriction of flow at Peralta Road and San Pedro Creek. The improvements at Adobe Drive will somewhat help the flow, but will not increase the capacity of the existing culvert, except for the efficiency that will be gained by the construction of the transition structure, both upstream and downstream of the Adobe Drive culvert.

The mitigation of flood hazards and the reduction of risk and damage due to flooding is generally accomplished by one of two methods - either structurally or non-structurally. Non-structural techniques relate primarily to flood proofing of existing structures located within the flood plain, ensuring that elevation of new structures are above the level of flood hazard in order to eliminate damage from flooding of predetermined or theoretical events, establishing land use regulations which would not permit construction within a flood plain, relocation of existing structures out of the flood plain, either through acquisition and removal and/or razing, or a combination of the above.

Structural mitigation measures deal primarily through the use of flood control works, such as channelization (deepening, widening or stabilization), levee or floodwall protection, physical relocation of stream beds, enclosure of open drainage ways into pipes or culverts, construction of diversion, detention and retention facilities, or a combination of these. For the past ten years, the emphasis of the Federal Government has been on non-structural solutions to flood plain management and the thrust of their monetary assistance has been toward that end as opposed to structural solution. The National Flood Insurance Act is a small part of the overall National Flood Control Program.

Unfortunately, it is often difficult or impossible to effect non-structural solutions in areas that are almost completely urbanized. This is the type of situation which is present in the lower Linda Mar area, with very little opportunities left for intensified development. As a result, the opportunities for non-structural solutions are limited, although when they do occur, certain mitigation measures are presently required (flood proofing or elevating new or substantially altered structures out of the designated flood plain).

It is for these reasons that the City is looking toward structural solutions in the Linda Mar flood plain. Although the City will attempt to secure the maximum amount of outside agency resources (State and Federal), the

opportunities are greatly limited. Because of limited City resources, the anticipated thrust for improvements will be a project which can be borne by the benefiting property owners. The 1975 Corps of Engineers' study for San Pedro Creek identified a number of structural alternatives which would provide standard project design in terms of level of protection. After completion of the Corps study, the City elected not to pursue implementation of any of the alternatives due to extremely high local participation costs and environmental concerns. The City was not able to identify a source of funds for the project with which to finance its proportionate share of costs. The standard project design used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers provides a degree of protection generally between a 100-year and a 500-year event, but closer to the 500-year event. Generally, the higher the degree of protection, the higher the project cost. Assuming a greater degree of risk and lowering the degree of protection, there is usually a substantial decrease in project cost. If the City elects to pursue a course of action which would yield less than standard project design at a substantially reduced cost, the chances of Federal participation are drastically reduced. If a degree of protection less than standard project design is pursued, the area residents, in addition to the rest of the community, must fully understand that greater risk will need to be accepted.

The City's Disaster Preparedness Commission will be developing guidelines to assist residents in the event of future flooding. In addition, the City has emergency plans established to best carry out the needs required as a result of emergencies.

FIRE

The major fire problems in Pacifica are wildland fires, inadequate water supply in a few areas of older development, the steep terrain of the City, narrow streets, and the increasing cost of fire suppression. Generally, water supply and storage capacity are adequate for firefighting. The ISO¹ graded Pacifica's water service for firefighting as a Class 3, which is better than the City's overall rating of a Class 4. The terrain of the City and confined neighborhoods in steep valleys causes some delay in fire response times. However, in most cases, it is within the acceptable range of six minutes.

Cost of fire suppression is a major concern. The most effective method of controlling the increasing costs of fire suppression is to emphasize fire prevention requiring City residents and businesses to assume more responsibility for fire protection by installation of smoke detectors, fire resistant landscaping, and built-in fire protection.

¹ The Insurance Services Office rates each Fire Department on its ability to fight fires within its area.

OTHER PUBLIC SAFETY

The primary source of water serving Pacifica crosses the San Andreas Fault. This water supply is particularly vulnerable in the event of a major earthquake. Emergency storage capacity is three to four days. Because of Pacifica's isolated location, particularly in the event of a major earthquake, a ten-day emergency water supply is desirable. This would require additional storage of 20 million gallons (MG) at each end of the system. The Water District has recently built the first 5 MG tank of a planned 20 MG additional storage system for the north end of the system on Milagra Ridge. The 20 MG at the south end would be achieved by increasing the size of the tanks to be built there in the future.

The Pacifica Police Department's primary role in an emergency includes crowd control, communications, organizing evacuations and assisting other City departments and agencies in their operations. The department needs adequate personnel and equipment to meet emergency needs.

Pacifica's codes and ordinances are adequate to protect the public's safety. However, with rising operating costs and falling revenues, predominantly residential communities, such as Pacifica, find themselves in financial straits, making labor intensive programs like code enforcement a problem. As a result, only the codes and ordinances most basic to public safety receive constant enforcement; the remainder, although beneficial, do not receive consistent enforcement.

The City's Emergency Plan is regularly updated and improved. Because of State requirements, the focus of the Emergency Plan is on preparedness for a natural disaster. Since a natural disaster is more likely to occur in Pacifica, the City has included preparedness for natural disasters, including earthquakes, unconfined fire, major flooding, tsunami, airplane accident and landslides. The City is currently updating the emergency plan and is including more specific standard operating procedures for natural disasters. The City monitors changes in the Federal Disaster Act regulations. Public awareness and disaster planning for individual neighborhoods has been included in disaster preparedness. A Disaster Preparedness Commission has been established by the City Council.

Access is a serious emergency problem in Pacifica. Access routes cross the San Andreas Fault and the City is burdened with other geotechnical problems. Therefore, the emergency routing system should take into consideration the locations of various geotechnical hazards and the types of vehicles and machinery for road repair in the City.

Emergency communications is the function of three groups: the Emergency Operations Center, the Police and Fire Departments, and the volunteer radio operators. Responsibilities and roles of these groups and agencies has been clearly defined for efficient operations.

IMPLEMENTATION

Each subject area addressed in the Seismic Safety and Safety Elements focuses attention on programs or changes which could be made to improve the

safety of Pacifica residents. The public safety issues are addressed in the policies. The action programs address specific actions the City can undertake to increase public safety.

POLICIES

1. Prohibit development in hazardous areas, including flood zones, unless detailed site investigations ensure that risks can be reduced to acceptable levels and the structure will be protected for its design life. Development shall be designed to withstand a minimum of a 100-year hazard event, regardless of the specific nature of the hazard. This concept applies to both on-site and off-site hazards. (LU) (CT)
2. Support continuing public awareness of hazards by providing citizens with hazard information, results of studies, emergency procedures and alternatives. When appropriate, buyers shall be notified of geotechnical uncertainties or potential risks and costs.
3. Prohibit mitigation measures for potential geotechnical hazards if the mitigation measures could adversely affect surrounding public or private property. For example, use of the public right-of-way as a landslide repository could adversely affect public health, safety, and welfare. (LU)
4. Prohibit seawalls which are necessary as a mitigation measure for new development. Projects should not be approved which eventually will need seawalls for the safety of the structures and residents. (CT)
5. Do not locate structures which are necessary for protection of the public's health and safety, provide for public assembly, or emergency services in hazardous areas unless no reasonable alternative exists. (CF) (LU)
6. Encourage inspection of existing non-residential structures located within fault zones. (LU)
7. Maintain an emergency plan which provides adequate response to disasters, including emergency ingress and egress communitywide and for individual neighborhoods. (CD) (CF)
8. Support the Water District in its efforts to provide adequate water service and emergency water storage. (CF) (LU)
9. Provide and publicize a Citywide emergency communications system. (CF)
10. Emphasize fire prevention measures. (LU)
11. Code enforcement shall be an important City function. (LU)
12. Encourage commercial and residential code compliance. (LU)


ACTION PROGRAMS

SHORT TERM

1. Enforce and monitor ordinances requiring geotechnical site investigation for any site with an average slope exceeding 15% prior to allowing site development. Require geotechnical studies for sites with slopes less than 15% if appropriate. The impacts of increased water runoff from proposed development should be determined as part of the geotechnical study prior to site approval. (LU)
2. Require that development in marginally hazardous areas be designed and engineered to protect life and property. (LU)
- *3. Develop regulations which consider location in a flood zone and tsunami run-up areas as major factors in determining future land uses. (CD)
(LU)
4. Geotechnical studies should include at least a preliminary study of expansive and creeping soils, as well as appropriate analysis of erosion, seismic, tsunami, and other geotechnical hazards.
5. Development in areas subject to flooding should be carefully reviewed for public safety and property loss prior to permitting new development or redevelopment. (LU)
6. Encourage a voluntary program among real estate salespersons and lenders to advise potential homeowners of the geotechnical hazards in various parts of the City, the degree of risk and available insurance programs.
- *7. Continue to increase public education about various localized fire hazard problems, such as wildfires and areas with limited access. (CF)
- *8. Determine areas potentially affected by flooding from ruptured water tanks in the event of a seismic event.
- *9. Develop programs for the public's education and emergency preparedness. Also in siting new facilities, consider the potential hazard of flooding from tank rupture. (CF)
10. Consider type and locations of major fire hazards in determining future location or relocations of fire stations, as well as personnel and equipment needs. In developing new water storage facilities, place a priority on locations least subject to impacts from seismic activity and landsliding.
- *11. Identify neighborhood evacuation routes. Routes may have to be pedestrian in those areas where access is limited and egress will conflict with fire and other emergency equipment. (C)
12. The City staff responsible for emergency planning should continue to monitor changes in the Federal Disaster Act and keep City officials and residents aware of the impacts of these changes.

PACIFICA Fire Hazard Areas

- A Access
- C Construction
- NS Narrow Streets
- W Inadequate Water Supply
- M Requires Additional Manpower
- Medium Hazard
- High Hazard
- Very High Hazard



September 1977
750 0 1500 3000
scale in feet

Ironside & Associates
Planning Consultants

NS
W

Devil's
Slide


San Mateo County

San Pedro Valley Park

PACIFICA

Fire Station Response Times

-  0 - 6 Minutes
-  6 - 9 Minutes
-  Over 9 Minutes



↑
September 1977
750 0 1500 3000
Scale in Feet

 Ironsides & Associates
Planning Consultants

Devil's Slide

San Mateo County

San Pedro Valley Park

13. Continue to maintain State certification of the current emergency plan and its annexes.
14. The Water District has already targeted areas where the distribution system needs upgrading; however, a priority among these areas should be placed on those sections of the distribution system located in areas with moderate or high fire hazard potential.
- *15. Participate in the Countywide study of communications to see if Pacifica can gain better Citywide communications at less cost; particularly emergency communications when access may be cut off.
- *16. Shift the focus of City firefighting from suppression to prevention; and encourage the public participation required to achieve this change in program emphasis.
 - (a) Adopt a City ordinance requiring smoke detectors in residential and commercial structures not now required to have a sprinkler system.
 - (b) Continue the City's volunteer firefighter program.
 - (c) Increase the City's Fire Code enforcement and systematic Citywide inspection programs.
- *17. Zoning and other City ordinances should be revised to restrict development in hazardous areas where access is impractical, or areas particularly prone to hillside and coastal erosion, landslides, seismic shaking, tsunami inundation, or flooding. (OS) (LU) (CT)
- *18. All low density development should require exits on at least two sides of the building.
19. Require geotechnical reports to be prepared and reviewed by registered geologists, registered engineering geologists, or registered soils engineers.
20. Regularly maintain flood control structures, including, but not limited to drainage channels, pipes, culverts, and stream beds. (CF)

LONG TERM

- *1. Periodically provide public education on disaster preparedness. Work through the schools; voluntary organizations and City staff to ensure dissemination of information. (CF)
- *2. Develop a more widespread public education program on personal and public emergency procedures, particularly for the disasters with the highest probability of occurring. (CF)
- *3. The national disaster emphasis of the City's Emergency Plan and its annexes should be supplemented by a plan for local disasters. (CF)
- *4. Review codes and ordinances dealing with public safety and reaffirm those most important. Develop adequate code enforcement procedures and

staffing to ensure that these codes and ordinances accomplish their public safety purposes.

CONSERVATION ELEMENT

The Conservation Element is mandated by Section 65302(d) of the Government Code which describes the intent of this element as considering the conservation, development and use of natural resources within the City's jurisdiction. Guidelines for this element focus on the broad range of natural resources, but emphasize working with agencies providing water to develop policies and programs for water use and protection. Water as a resource has been included in the Seismic Safety and Safety Element. Analysis of available sources, capacities and quality appear in the General Plan Background Report. Because of their increasing importance, energy and air quality were given special attention in the preparation of this element.

Conservation Element data was presented in the General Plan Background Report, September 1977. Analysis of the information, including identification of resource problems, is included here, along with a more detailed implementation section which serves as a basis for the planning action programs.

. LOCAL RESOURCE ANALYSIS

The ocean is a primary factor in Pacifica's environment. The Local Coastal Program Background Report and Access Component identify and indicate ways to protect and enhance the various potentials of the ocean waters.

The City deposits its sewage effluent and storm runoff in the ocean, creating a potential affect on shoreline water quality. To reduce potential problems, the City is improving wastewater treatment from primary to secondary. Inflow and infiltration into the sewage collection system, particularly in the Linda Mar area, results in overflows during long periods of wet weather. The exact locations of this problem are unknown and difficult to assess. The magnitude of the problem and the cost of correction are estimated to be great. The City should seek assistance to investigate and reduce this problem.

Of the six creeks and several drainage basins in Pacifica, only San Pedro Creek in Linda Mar provides year-round flow. Because San Pedro Creek is part of the City water supply and a locally important steelhead trout habitat, protection of its substantial watershed is important. Moreover, because of the potential for downstream flooding, runoff and erosion from developed areas should be considered a major factor in future development within the Creek's drainage area.

The City and County of San Francisco Watershed is located along the eastern edge of Pacifica. Crystal Springs Reservoir is located within this area and is the primary source of Pacifica's water supply. Because of the regional and local importance of the watershed, the City should protect the area from public encroachment, except as approved by the City and County of San Francisco.

Native vegetation in Pacifica is primarily Coastal Prairie vegetative habitat and low shrubs. Protection of this vegetation on steep slopes is critical to reducing erosion and runoff. Development in the past 20 years has left many barren hillsides. Revegetation of the hillsides would improve their habitat quality, as well as reduce erosion and improve their

appearance. New development should be designed to protect existing vegetation, particularly on slopes.

Since the turn of the century, man has introduced trees in Pacifica. Because of their importance to the City and to the quality of its residential neighborhoods, the City should develop a program for planting and managing trees.

There is one wetland area in Pacifica, the Laguna Salada at Sharp Park Municipal Golf Course. The wetland provides habitat for the San Francisco garter snake, a rare and endangered species. The Laguna Salada should be protected because it is one of the few known snake habitat areas in public ownership. With leadership by the California Department of Fish and Game and participation by Pacifica, a species protection committee has been formed to promote and manage the snake habitats.

Pacifica's coastal and inter-tidal zones provide extensive areas for local and migratory birds. Because these areas are fragile and easily disturbed by development and overuse, they should be carefully evaluated and protected.

Although San Pedro Creek is small, it supports a locally valuable steelhead trout population. Because of the declining number of streams in San Mateo County which still support steelhead, regulations and programs to protect riparian vegetation, prevent dumping, regulate urban runoff into the stream, and other stream habitat protection measures should be established. San Mateo County is participating in this effort through its 208 planning.

In April of 1987, the State Mining and Geology Board (the Board) designated the Pacifica Quarry and Mori Point as a construction aggregate resource area of regional significance. The classification and designation maps relating to the Quarry and Mori Point are incorporated herein by reference.

The following policy statements are provided in compliance with the provisions of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act, which require that affected cities adopt statements of policy regarding areas designated as construction aggregate resource areas of regional significance.

The City recognizes that the Board has designated the mineral resources located at the Pacifica Quarry and Mori Point as a construction aggregate resource of regional significance, and has received the maps prepared by the Board in connection with this designation which are incorporated herein by this reference. The following reports are also incorporated herein by reference: Special Report 146, Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the San Francisco-Monterey Bay, 1986; and Designation Report No. 7, Designation of Regionally Significant Construction Aggregate Resource Areas in the South San Francisco Bay, North San Francisco Bay, Monterey Bay Production-Consumption Regions, January 1987.

The City shall refer to and consider the information prepared by the Board when making land use decisions relating to the Pacifica Quarry. However, it is noted that the Quarry is no longer operating, and the resource has been diminished by several years of operation. The quarry operator has abandoned quarrying, believes the minimal amount of local development does not justify use of the site as a quarry, and intends to satisfy regional customers from his quarry operation located near Brisbane in San Mateo County. Therefore, the regional significance of the Quarry as a construction aggregate resource has been substantially diminished, and the City encourages reclamation of

the site. Such reclamation may include removal of mineral resources, depending on the specifics of a revised Reclamation Plan. After reclamation is completed, the City's Redevelopment Plan calls for development of the Quarry with visitor-serving commercial uses, and possibly some residential uses. It should also be noted that San Francisco garter snakes have been sighted on and near the quarry property. Prior to any substantial disturbance to the site, including, but not limited to mining, reclamation, or development, it shall be required that a qualified biologist determine potential impacts on habitat area and that all requirements of the Endangered Species Act be met. Riparian vegetation shall also be protected and enhanced as required by the Coastal Land Use Plan. The above factors shall also be considered when making land use decisions relating to the Quarry.

The City shall refer to and consider the information prepared by the Board when making land use decisions relating to Mori Point. However, it is noted that a mineral extraction operation on Mori Point would be in conflict with the City's adopted General Plan and Local Coastal Plan, would be inconsistent with the planned and pending land use of the property, could exacerbate potential erosion problems, could prohibit coastal access, may disrupt the habitat of the rare and endangered San Francisco garter snake, and would be incompatible with the existing single-family neighborhood to the north of the property. These factors shall also be considered when making land use decisions relating to Mori Point.

In order to ensure the continued acknowledgement of the information prepared by the Board, a notice shall be recorded on the property titles for the Pacifica Quarry and Mori Point which identifies the presence of the mineral deposits identified by the Board.

In summary, the City must balance competing interests in making land use decisions. The City recognizes the importance of mineral resources at the Pacifica Quarry and Mori Point properties as identified by the State Mining and Geology Board. The City supports the conservation and development of identified mineral resources. At the same time, the City must recognize other State policies and regulations. In particular, policies and regulations of the Coastal Act and the Endangered Species Act may conflict with the Board's interest in encouraging mining activities on Mori Point. For example, Coastal Act policies state that the use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over general industrial or commercial development. The City's General Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan are consistent with Coastal Act policies by calling for development of visitor-serving facilities on the two properties.

Except for the dunes, most of Pacifica has average quality soil. Only the dunes fall into the infertile category. All other soils easily support vegetation. Native vegetation in Pacifica runs to Coastal Prairie and Coastal Bluff Scrub and low shrubs. When people trample over the Coastal Prairie and North Coastal Bluff Scrub, it leads to scarring and erosion.

Aspects of atmosphere of particular concern in Pacifica are climate and air pollution. The off-shore high pressure system and upwelling of deeper, cold water just off the coast result in frequent summer fogs and dry weather. Perhaps the most striking thing about Pacifica's weather is that it varies dramatically between valley and coastal areas within the City. During the summer months, fog and high humidity discourage outdoor activity, but keep

residents cool. During a normal winter, the area experiences substantial rainfall.

Air quality is good.¹ The City and coastal corridor should not experience any sub-regional air pollution problems exceeding the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), with the remote exception of a chance of isolated conditions exceeding the NAAQS for carbon monoxide (CO) under² cases of heavy traffic congestion and/or rare meteorological conditions.² The normal wind trajectories for the coastal area are such that they do not traverse any metropolitan areas. As a result, transport of pollutants is negligible.³

The predominantly moderate winds and the distance from the more populated urban center of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Quality Control Region (AQCR) should result in a very good mixing and dilution of any pollutants produced in the Coastal Corridor before they reach the central bay basin. This dilution should minimize the potential effects of any of the corridor emissions upon the bay basin air quality and prevent concentrations of pollutants in the corridor from⁴ degrading the area which already experiences air quality pollutant problems.

The energy shortage is both a national and local problem. Effective local energy conservation measures must be the product of active citizen participation, particularly in Pacifica where City revenues are critical. The City has a number of energy-saving programs, including a volunteer recycling center, a bicycle-pedestrian pathways plan, SamTrans local and commuter bus service, and a life-cost cycle purchasing program. Additional programs to be considered include: amendment of the Uniform Building Code to require heat-retaining insulation, limits on glass in new construction, increased setbacks to permit more window exposure helpful to heating a home, incentives for solar heating, and review of City actions to maximize energy conservation.

Obviously, these programs would affect many City residents. It is important to recognize the inherent conflicts of goals within the planning process. Pacifica wishes to continue to provide low and moderate income housing, but requirements that are too strict could make it impossible for low and moderate income families to afford housing in the City. Therefore, the cost impact of these programs should be weighed against energy saved. Experience in other communities shows that most energy-saving features more than pay for themselves over the life of the structure; however, the capital expenditure is at the beginning.

1 CalTrans, San Mateo Coast Corridor Air Quality, Environmental Quality Branch, January 1975. This technical study was a part of the San Mateo County Coastal Corridor Study undertaken by ABAG and MTC.

2 Ibid., p.2.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid., p.3. Confirmed by Mike Kim, Research and Planning Branch, Bay Area Pollution Control, Interviewed in August 1978.

IMPLEMENTATION

The policies and action programs of the Conservation Element are included in the Policies and Action programs and comprise the implementation program for the Conservation Element.

NOISE ELEMENT¹

Government Code 65302(g), as amended by Senate Bill 860 (1975), requires a Noise Element of all General Plans to provide a basis for comprehensive local programs to control and abate excessive environmental noise. The primary objectives of the Noise Element, as laid down in the guidelines, are:

1. To provide enough information on the community's noise environment that noise may be considered in land use planning;
2. To identify locations in the community deemed "noise sensitive";
3. To develop strategies to abate or mitigate excessive noise exposure situations or locations; and
4. To provide necessary ground work for an effective local Noise Ordinance to allow compliance with State noise insulation standards, to resolve noise complaint situations, and to ensure that noise continues to be considered in future land use and development activities.

The basis for determination of noise compatibility and use is contours of equal energy noise exposure expressed in terms of Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). There is difficulty in measuring these terms with great accuracy, particularly as the distance from the noise sources increases. Therefore, when dealing with noise contours, it is best not to think of them as an absolute line of demarcation on a map, but rather as bands of similar noise intensity. It is also important to note that generally the impact of urban development or vegetation on sound may not be as great as expected.

The primary source of surface noise in Pacifica is the arterial/collector street system. Highest levels, 75 dB, are generated by Highway 1. No stationary noise sources have been identified, since Pacifica has no significant industrial areas where fixed noise sources are usually located. Aircraft noise is not considered a problem for Pacifica under present conditions.


When looking at the number of people exposed to higher noise levels (above 60 dB), the Noise Inventory Chart shows that 79 percent of the population lives in a relatively quiet environment. Of the remaining 21 percent, 13 percent are subject to 60-65 dB, seven percent are subject to 65-70 dB, and less than one percent are subject to over 70 dB.

¹ The following is a summary of the Pacifica Noise Element, March 1978, and includes the major data analysis, maps and conclusions of that report.

PACIFICA

NOISE CONTOURS


Surface Noise (1975 CNEL)




Source: Pacifica Noise Element, 1975

Aircraft Noise
S.F. Airport
1976 Noise Contour

65-70 CNEL



 Ironsides & Associates
Planning Consultants



A look at future noise levels indicates that State and Federal requirements to reduce noise from vehicles and reduction in energy consumption will result in reductions in surface traffic noise levels by 5 dB in 1995 and an additional 7 dB by 1995. The reduction in aircraft noise is less easy to determine, although studies for San Francisco Airport indicate a 5 dB reduction by 1986.

Assuming a fairly conservative reduction of 5 dB in surface and aircraft noise, a marked improvement is achieved in Pacifica's noise environment. Less than one percent of the 1995 population will be subject to noise greater than 65 dB, as compared to eight percent in 1977. The proportion of the City population living in a noise environment of less than 60 dB will increase from 79 to 93 percent over the 1977-1995 period. The major noise source will continue to be the Route 1 and Skyline Boulevard corridors, but noise levels will be lower.

The element reviews in some detail various noise mitigation measures which the City can undertake. These mitigations range from administrative and monitoring activities to codes and ordinances altering construction standards (See Noise Element, p. 18-19).

There is a clear relationship between noise levels and comprehensive planning through land use. While it was shown in Pacifica that future population would be subject to less noise, this should not suggest that the City government become passive and complacent on the subject. There still remains the problem of dealing with noise in the short-term future. This requires directing growth toward the more quiet areas while waiting for noise reducing events to reduce noise in the noisier areas.

OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION ELEMENT (1984)

The Open Space Element is mandated by Government Code Section 65302(e) to encourage recognition of open space as a limited and valuable resource for which a plan should be developed. Local plans should be in accord with State and regional open space plans to provide a comprehensive open space program. Statewide, open space planning relates to the need to ensure that land will continue to be available for the protection of food and fiber, to discourage noncontiguous development patterns which unnecessarily increase the cost of community services, and to assure that cities and counties recognize open space as a limited and valuable resource. Explicit in the State General Plan Guidelines is the assumption that an effective open space program must be undertaken at all levels of government.

For Pacifica, open space is defined as any area which provides recreation, significant visual assets for the City, or is vital for the preservation of irreplaceable natural resources. Open space does not preclude use, nor does it require public ownership. Land uses which would be compatible with this definition are those which preserve natural resources (including animal habitat), provide for the managed production of resources, provide for outdoor recreation, and provide for the public's health and safety (including areas which require special management or regulation because of inherent hazardous conditions, such as earthquake faults, unstable soils, steep slopes and similar limiting qualities).

Use of, and access to, open spaces for recreation are important factors in assessing the value to the City of these areas in and around Pacifica. For this reason, the open space plan includes definite principles and standards for improvement of existing and establishment of new recreation areas and facilities. These principles and standards constitute a Recreation Element in addition to the required Open Space Element.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS*

Pacifica has a unique physical setting in the Bay Area. The scenic qualities of hillsides, beaches and ocean combine to give the City an open quality usually found only in rural areas far from urban encroachment. These scenic qualities have significant aesthetic and potential economic value to the City.

* This section is a summary of the following text and the March 1978 Open Space Element.

Open space areas and facilities include City, County, State and National parks, schools, greenbelts, trails and bluff-top areas. Other open space opportunities include ridgelines and coastal access points. An inventory of publicly owned open spaces is shown on the Open Space and Recreation Facilities Table. The General Plan Land Use Element and Map also provide an inventory of privately owned lands that possess open space qualities (significant visual assets, outdoor recreation potential and/or animal habitat value). Some of these areas are designated Special Area. In such cases, language in the Land Use Element indicates valuable open space qualities to be preserved. Other areas shown as Open Space Residential or Prominent Ridgeline are regulated as to the density of development achievable to preserve open space values in these areas.

In 1988, the Open Space Task Force completed the Pacifica Open Space Task Force Report. The report identifies 51 parcels deemed to have open space values worth preserving. The report contains a number of recommended actions to help preserve open space, including adoption of a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Ordinance. Such an ordinance will help accomplish the policies and goals of this element.

Schools are important neighborhood facilities in Pacifica. The City uses and maintains playfields and equipment jointly with the School District. In some cases, these provide the only developed play areas for a neighborhood. In general, as schools providing needed recreation facilities are temporarily used for other purposes or discontinued, playground and field facilities should continue to be available for use by neighborhood residents; otherwise, they should be replaced.

In addition to the various City parks, the City also owns "greenbelt" areas, some of which are steep slopes unsuitable for development. The City has plans to vegetate areas not suitable to become developed recreation areas. The potential for erosion is significant. Suitable native or drought-resistant plants should be introduced. In areas where greenbelts contain formal trails, this use should be preserved and the trails maintained. The City owns beaches along Esplanade and San Pedro Beach. These areas should be improved with access and parking in cooperation with State agencies.

Federal, State and County parks represent an important asset in Pacifica. San Mateo County owns two large areas along the coastal ridge; San Pedro Valley County Park, a natural recreation area with strictly regulated uses, and Milagra Ridge County Park which is, for the present, intended to remain undeveloped. The City and County of San Francisco own and operate Sharp Park Golf Course and rifle range. The State owns Sharp Park Beach. Parking and access are critical here. Sweeney Ridge is now a part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The City should work with the GGNRA to establish suitable access points.

The ridges make a major contribution to the open space quality of Pacifica. Several prominent ridgelines are in private ownership. Because of their importance to the character of the City, the visual perception of open ridgelines should be retained. (See Land Use Element, Prominent Ridgeline Designation). Historic trails to the Portola Discovery Site should also be developed and preserved.

Pacifica's six-plus miles of coastline and beaches constitute a unique open space resource. A wide variety of recreation opportunities exist here, including isolated beach experiences, outstanding fishing, surfing, tide-pooling and diving. Much of this beach frontage is in private ownership. As development occurs, the City must ensure continued public access to the beach at suitable areas. The Access Component of the Coastal Land Use Plan designates access location; the implementation phase of the Coastal Plan will indicate methods of achieving this objective.

There are a number of open space links in Pacifica, including pedestrian-equestrian, pedestrian-bicycle, and equestrian trails. The proposed County Ridgeline Trail would extend from Daly City along the coastal ridgeline to Pacifica, Montara Beach and then south to Big Basin State Park. This will be a multi-county pedestrian-equestrian trail.

The City has developed a pedestrian-bicycle pathway system. The basic element of this system is the north-south pedestrian-bicycle trail which roughly parallels the Highway 1 right-of-way south to the City/County line. Inland neighborhoods and ridgeline trails connect to the main north-south trail by designated pathway links. There also is an informal City equestrian trail from the coastal area to the inland ridgeline under Highway 1 at Sharp Park Municipal Golf Course. Riders can use this trail to explore the coast and ridge. With a permit from the San Francisco Water District, riders may also gain access to riding trails within the San Francisco watershed.

In order to provide for public health, suitable local open space within neighborhoods should be dedicated as development occurs. Because of Pacifica's extensive community and regional outdoor recreation facilities, the need is more for local neighborhood facilities.

IMPLEMENTATION

Objectives in the Open Space and Recreation Element shall be accomplished consistent with the following guidelines. Policies that constitute these guidelines are divided into three sections - Distribution, Improvement and Protection, and Access.

Distribution:

1. Most areas within the community provide opportunities for views of large scale open spaces. These open spaces should be protected by land use regulations. Smaller scale green spaces, however, may be either absent in some areas or lacking in scenic quality. A tree planting program and additional landscaping for existing open spaces would improve the situation. Community, volunteer or neighborhood organizations have been, and should continue to be, enlisted to assist the City in planting and initial tending. The City should also encourage businesses to install landscaping. Forestation of City greenbelts should be a priority.

* Thus far, over 15,000 trees have been planted within greenbelts through the City's forestation program.

2. The City of Pacifica can be broken down into numerous neighborhood units. Each neighborhood should be served by either a neighborhood park or elementary school playground. In neighborhoods containing elementary schools, basic recreation needs will continue to be met by the school facilities. If a change of use is proposed for elementary schools which provide primary recreation resources for the neighborhood, the playground and field facilities should be continued to be available to neighborhood residents or the recreation resource should be replaced. Areas served only by school facilities include the following districts: Westview, Pacific Manor, West Sharp Park, Vallemar, and the majority of Pedro Valley. Developed neighborhood recreation areas are lacking in the West Fairway Park, Rockaway Beach, and Pedro Point neighborhoods; priority should be placed on these areas.
3. Based on the amount of local park acres (232.5 acres) including City parks, elementary school sites with leases, and sports fields with Joint Powers Agreements, there is a ratio of 6.29 acres parkland for every 1,000 population (based on a population of 37,000). Because of Pacifica's extensive community and nearby regional outdoor recreation areas, the need is more for local neighborhood facilities. To accomplish this and provide for public health, suitable open space shall be dedicated, or in-lieu fees paid, in accordance with State law. Where fees in-lieu of land dedication are agreed to, the funds should be earmarked for purchase and improvement of open space where needed within a reasonable relationship to the neighborhood.
4. The City shall periodically assess park site and facility needs within each neighborhood, taking into account access to existing sites, demographics and neighborhood topography. When complete, this assessment shall be adopted and considered a part of the Recreation Element.
5. Neighborhood parks should range in size from a minimum of five acres up to 20 acres, serving populations of two to 10,000 with a service area between one-quarter and one-half mile. Variations to these standards should be taken into consideration in regard to natural or artificial boundaries, such as hills, highways, streams or major streets. These standards for neighborhood parks are in accordance with National Park and Recreation Open Space Standards as adopted by the National Recreation and Park Association.
6. Recreation Standards: Population ratio method.
By classification and population ration.

| Classification | Acres/ 1000 People | Size Range | Population Served | Service Area |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Playlots | * | 2500 sq. ft. to 1 ac. | 500-2500 | Subneighborhood |
| Vest pocket parks | * | 2500 sq. ft. to 1 ac. | 500-2500 | Subneighborhood |
| Neighborhood parks | 2.5 | Min. 5 ac. | 2000-10,000 | 1/4-1/2 mile |

up to 20 ac.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------|--|---|------------------------------|
| District parks | 2.5 | 20-100 ac. | 10,000-50,000 | 1/2-3 miles |
| Large urban parks | 5.0 | 100+ ac. | One for each 50,000 | Within 1/2 hour driving time |
| Regional parks | 20.0 | 250+ ac. | Serves entire population in smaller communities; should be distributed throughout larger metro areas. | Within 1 hour driving time |
| Special areas and facilities | * | Includes parkways, beaches, plazas, historical sites, flood plains, downtown malls, and small parks, tree lawns, etc. No standard is applicable. | | |

Improvement and Protection:

1. Some open spaces now in private ownership, but too hazardous to develop, should be protected through appropriate development restrictions. These restrictions would remove the uncertainty about the future use of these lands.
2. The City should strive to bring beach frontage into public use through purchase or dedication. Improved and controlled access to the beaches will add to the enjoyment of this recreational asset.
3. In order to improve the appearance of developed areas and reflect and enhance undeveloped areas, the design of major streets at the entry to neighborhoods and areas of significant visitor interest should be improved with side and median planting strips or easements and include native vegetation, wherever feasible.
4. Beaches and other suitable undeveloped areas on the coast should be utilized to their greatest public recreation potential. In order to accomplish this, near shore development should be encouraged where consistent with coastal land use policies and with the character and purpose of the beach area.
5. Retention of open space areas should be encouraged in developments whenever the natural landscape, scenic resources or public access can be preserved, enhanced or provided. Use of open spaces could include hiking and riding trails, vista points or off-street play space.
6. New neighborhood park development should preserve, protect and enhance off-site and, where possible and consistent with public safety, on-site natural beauty and terrain.
7. The City should periodically update its commitment to operating and maintenance agreements affecting individual school sites. Census data and surveys of neighborhood park needs should be used in conducting reassessment studies.

8. A method for voluntary transference of development rights from undeveloped areas which contain open space and recreation value to less environmentally significant or sensitive areas should be developed.
9. Public purchase of privately held lands should be encouraged when such lands are considered of significant value as open space resources. Public purchase for open space and recreation purposes would serve both the community and the area by emphasizing the City's coastal and rural environment.

Access:

1. The Coastal Plan Access Component outlines appropriate beach access points. Most of the ridgeline and hillside open areas have no developed access. Preservation of these areas would be aided by discouraging random pedestrian use and providing corridors for activity. Policing and safe use of these areas are problems that should be addressed in any access proposal.
2. In order to ensure that local trails will be integrated with those outside the City, access to local hiking and riding trails shall be provided or preserved in new developments in accordance with approved trail maps within this Element and the Circulation Element. Where existing development precludes establishment of appropriate trail connections and no other feasible alternative exists, the City should attempt to obtain easements for that purpose.
3. To enhance public safety and facilitate visitor access, safe bicycle and walking paths should be established between neighborhoods and through the City.
4. Access to open space, including coastal areas, by improved or unimproved routes, should be provided only where consistent with public safety and security. Access should be actively discouraged where safe use cannot be ensured and alternate access provided.
5. Access to trails adjacent to existing residences should be upgraded to increase resident security and limit entry by off-road vehicles.
6. Formal access to major park facilities should be provided only where off-street parking can be provided. Informal access at other locations should not be promoted.
7. A sign program should be developed for all recreation areas.

FAIRMONT EAST AND WEST

The Fairmont neighborhoods contain a variety of established recreation areas listed within the inventory of open space and recreation resources. Facilities include 11 acres of City parks containing areas and facilities for active play, 17.5 acres of greenbelts and trails, and a 12.4 acre school site containing sport fields and play equipment. The neighborhood also contains a .5 acre vista point off Edgewood Drive. City parks and school

facilities, otherwise separated by topography, Highway 1 and the local street system, are linked by several miles of integrated pathways within greenbelts. These off-street trails and related access points are designed to:

1. Allow pedestrian access to all park and recreation facilities from different parts of the neighborhood.
2. Minimize the potential for visitor and resident parking conflicts.
3. Increase the safety of visitors to park and school sites, and
4. Permit enjoyment of scenic views of ridgelines and the coast to the south.

Use of greenbelts for these purposes is unique to the Fairmont and Westview/Pacific Highlands neighborhoods. In other areas, most greenbelts are steep slopes unsuitable for use for developed recreation activities. Fairmont greenbelt trails are linked to Imperial Park and Westview School within the Westview/Pacific Highlands neighborhood via the Fairmont Fire Station site. Pedestrian access is directly across Hickey Boulevard from the Fire Station.

In addition to providing neighborhood resident access, the system of trails and parks, if appropriately signed, can establish a north Pacific link between inland trail routes and coastal areas. The portion of the route within Fairmont is indicated within the trails maps contained in the Circulation Element. In addition, trail connections to Milagra Ridge through Fairmont streets and greenbelt areas are referred to within the County's acquisition plan for trails from Thornton State Beach to Milagra and Sweeney Ridges.

The County's plan proposes trail easements over vacant property on the east side of Palmetto Avenue near Westline Drive, to Fairmont West Park via CalTrans property adjacent to the west boundary of Coast Highway, thence to greenbelt trails within Fairmont and across Hickey Boulevard within the Westview/Pacific Highlands neighborhood.

An important element not currently included in the County's plan is recreational access over vacant property on the west side of Palmetto Avenue north of the Dollar Radio Station residence. Passive recreation use could include use of undeveloped portions of bluff-top properties for hiking, nature study and enjoyment of coastal views. Access easements over these areas may be dedicated to the City or held and developed privately with public access and retention of open space resources ensured through transfer of development rights. The County's proposed trail over vacant property on the east side of Palmetto Avenue may conflict with higher densities resulting from density transfer from the vacant bluff tops in the area to this site. Therefore, the County's trail plan should avoid use of the vacant property on the east side of Palmetto Avenue for trail access. Instead, the trail should utilize Palmetto Avenue to Fairmont West Park connecting at that location to greenbelt trails to the east.

Greenbelt trails and portions of the County's proposed recreation trail system have access to local streets in close proximity to residences. In a few instances, trail access is located between single-family residences. In order to ensure that trails remain safe for pedestrians, trail access points, including access to bluff trails, should be improved to increase

security for adjacent residences and for trail users and effectively limit off-road vehicle access.

Trails, especially bluff trails, should be located and improved with priority given to ensuring safe use and avoidance of hazardous areas.

Conclusions:

The amount of park and recreation facilities in Fairmont is adequate to meet the needs of residents. Continuance of the existing system of pedestrian access is critical to the recreation facilities to meet neighborhood recreation needs. Greenbelt trails in Fairmont provide an important link between State, County and City coastal and inland recreation areas. This link should be preserved and enhanced.

WESTVIEW/PACIFIC HIGHLANDS

This neighborhood contains approximately 25 acres of parkland, 15 acres are City-owned parks and 10 acres are school grounds. School facilities comprise the San Andreas and Westview Elementary Schools.

San Andreas School is currently leased by the Laguna Salada School District for private instruction and does not serve a significant neighborhood park need due to its proximity to the Westview School/Park site, Imperial Park, Fairmont Park and Pacific Manor School/Park site.

In 1981, the Laguna Salada School District obtained a General Plan amendment removing the prior commercial designation from the Fairmont III school site. Three acres of the approximately eight acre site are within the Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone, subject to earthquake hazard mitigation. Those areas deemed unsuitable for development should be placed in an open space easement and improved as private open space with appropriate vegetation. Due to the adequacy of existing park facilities serving the neighborhood, improved public access to undeveloped portions of this property should not be provided, nor should the City accept dedication of the portions of this property for park facilities.

Imperial Park is a 19 acre, City-owned park facility containing approximately 1.5 acres developed with play equipment, hard surface and turf play areas, picnic tables, benches and a scenic overlook. The remainder consists of open space and trails west of Imperial Drive. The park connects a series of local and County parks, greenbelts, school facilities and coastal open spaces across virtually the full width of northeastern Pacifica. The trail at the north end of the park is directly across Hickey Boulevard from the Fairmont Fire Station, providing access from Fairmont neighborhoods to the northwest.

The south tip of the park narrows to trail width adjacent to the former Fairmont III School site. An informal trail continues behind houses along Kavanaugh Way, within North Coast County Water District property, to the intersection of Glencourt and Skyline Boulevard. Across Glencourt to the south is the Westview Elementary School. Primary access to the school is along Glencourt. Secondary access also exists along Inverness. This access makes it possible to establish a northeast trail connection from the coast to Milagra Ridge County Park via Manor Drive, in addition to that connection proposed further south. This trail would be available to hikers traveling through Pacifica. However, the primary purpose of the route along Glencourt

to Inverness and Manor Drive is to serve residents of northern area neighborhoods, providing a visible and usable link between active and passive recreation areas. As presently conceived, portions of the Regional trail route are located between the backyards of existing residences on Forest Lake and Heathcliff Drives. The preferred interjurisdictional route is from the south tip of Imperial Park, behind houses along Kavanaugh to Skyline and Glencourt, and along Skyline Boulevard to a suitable point south of Claridge Drive. Use of the informal Manor Drive access to Milagra Drive should not be encouraged due to potential parking and traffic conflicts.

Milagra County Park is located adjacent to, but outside the southern boundary of this neighborhood. Along the neighborhood's south boundary is an area designated by the Land Use Element as Open Space Residential. This property, when combined with the Low Density Residential area at Sharp Park Road and Skyline Boulevard, constitutes one ownership extending from Sharp Park Road to the end of Milagra Drive, between the north boundary of existing Milagra County Park and developed areas along Lockhaven and the upper portions of Manor Drive. The designated ± 40 acre open space area is a logical extension to the Milagra County Park site. San Mateo County has been receptive to the idea of accepting dedication of this south facing side of Milagra Valley as a part of Milagra Ridge County Park. The current owner and the County should be encouraged to continue negotiations for dedication of this area. If these lands are dedicated, the relatively flat area of land along Skyline Boulevard, south of Claridge Drive, should be used as a rest stop and vista point for pedestrian and automobile travelers along Skyline Boulevard.

A triangular portion of this area is publicly owned. The Westborough Water District is currently negotiating with CalTrans for installation of an additional water tank at this location. Whether CalTrans or the Westborough Water District own this property, the City should serve as the catalyst to achieve a link between Skyline Boulevard and trails within the adjacent County park. As previously indicated, the northeastern portion of the trail loop to the park from Thornton State Beach should end at this location, rather than along Manor Drive.

Conclusion:

Trail links and access locations between this neighborhood, Fairmont West and Milagra Ridge County Park should be continued, improved and appropriately signed. The City should encourage additions to the County Park where such extensions will facilitate management and permit safe and convenient pedestrian access.

EAST EDGEMAR/PACIFIC MANOR

The primary recreation facility area in this neighborhood is at the Pacific Manor Elementary School. The City also manages the 1.4 acre Edgemar Park at the intersection of Fremont Avenue and Channing Way. This site was formerly owned by the Laguna Salada School District and held as excess property. Although now privately owned, the City continued to lease and maintain the property for park purposes.

The first priority for allocation of park improvement funds in this neighborhood should be for playing fields and equipment at Pacific Manor Elementary School. The school would then become the focus for recreation activities in the neighborhood. The lower acreage of improved parkland

relative to other areas in the City should be compensated by ensuring that Pacific Manor Elementary School receives primary attention.

Milagra Ridge County Park is adjacent and east of this neighborhood. Informal access to the park is gained at several points, including Manor Drive between Monterey and Heathcliff, Hacienda Court, and from Oceana Boulevard between Edgemar Avenue and San Diego Court. San Mateo County's Recreation Trail Acquisition Plan recommends that Hacienda Court be used as the principal access point from the coast via the pedestrian overpass south of Avalon Drive to Milagra Drive. The second proposed access is along Manor Drive through the City's system of greenbelt trails. As previously described, the Manor Drive access should not be encouraged. Access to the park from Hacienda Court is over private property. Developers of the approximately 57 acre property should be required to dedicate and improve an access trail distinct from the residential uses and common open space within the developed portion of the site.

Coastal recreation and access issues within Pacific Manor are discussed in detail within the Coastal Land Use Plan. The lack of improved coastal access is an important concern in this area. Improvements should include the development of bluff-top trails, visitor-parking, vertical access and a sign program. The sign program should warn visitors of hazardous surf conditions and provide directions as to the safe use of beaches and bluff areas. Access improvements should accompany efforts to upgrade nearby commercial areas consistent with Coastal Land Use Plan policies.

Conclusion:

Pacific Manor Elementary School should be improved as the principal active recreation resource for the neighborhood. Access to Milagra Ridge County Park should be limited to those areas where easements exist, or are feasible, given safety and security considerations.

EAST AND WEST SHARP PARK

East and West Sharp Park are divided by Highway 1, but are linked via the freeway overpass at Paloma Avenue, a pedestrian crossing midway between Paloma on Clarendon Avenues, and a freeway underpass at Clarendon Avenue. Both neighborhoods contain, and have access to, a variety of park resources within residential and commercial areas. These include Sharp Park Elementary School, Oceana High School, Milagra Ridge County Park, Sharp Park Golf Course, the fishing pier and Sharp Park Beach, and the Sharp Park Road Vista Point. Sharp Park School contains approximately 15 acres, including play areas and City-owned equipment which are used by residents of this and other neighborhoods. Oceana High School also serves the City with tennis courts, playing fields, track courses and a natatorium which hosts City-sponsored aquatic programs and events for all City residents. The City leases playing fields and manages the natatorium under a cooperative agreement with the Jefferson Union High School District.

Due to the wide service area of Oceana High School, parking is a critical problem. Parking conflicts between residents along Paloma and side streets occur frequently. When the natatorium was completed, not all of the planned parking spaces allotted for this use were developed. Due to the popularity of aquatic events and activities at this location, additional parking continues to be necessary and should be provided.

Milagra Ridge County Park is adjacent to Each Sharp Park on its east perimeter. Access to the County-owned park from the west is most desirable at Hacienda Court through Milagra Ridge via Oceana Boulevard. Milagra Ridge is the recognized access point to the park and trail access should be dedicated and improved accordingly. A potential trail would connect the future pedestrian public access at the mouth of Milagra Creek with Sweeney Ridge and the San Francisco Bay Discovery Site via the pedestrian crossing over Highway 1 at the Milagra Creek outfall, Milagra County Park, College Drive and the Vista Point at Skyline College. Easements for the trail should be dedicated to the City or another public agency as part of any development proposal. Trails should be separated from residential areas as much as possible. Some off-street parking for the trail access should be provided as part of the residential development on property at the end of Hacienda Court and on Milagra Ridge. If these access points are determined to be infeasible or undesirable, access to the County Park should be limited to Sharp Park Road. The City should explore the feasibility of trail access to Milagra Ridge County Park from Oceana High School.

Milagra Ridge is generally recognized as part of the County Park and is used as such. Public purchase should be encouraged to combine the properties and to continue use of the Ridge for hiking and open space. The area is an essential physical and visual link for both the extension of GGNRA to San Mateo County and the coastal trail system.

Milagra Ridge Park is within the authorized boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). This does not necessarily mean that the GGNRA will assume ownership; however, it is possible that the park could be transferred to GGNRA and used as a trail head for Sweeney Ridge. In the interim, the County is currently removing all military structures. No other improvements are planned. The City should begin working with the County to establish appropriate uses and access sites.

Mori Point is one of the most prominent headlands in the City. It is the first scenic vista seen as people enter Pacifica. Public purchase of the property would be desirable to continue its existing important role in the City identity. Preservation of the scenic qualities of the highly visible landform is essential.

Coastal access and parking for visitors using recreation and open space resources in West Sharp Park are extremely important. Parking conflicts between businesses, residents and visitors have continued to exist since the fishing pier was constructed. The City should determine and implement an appropriate mechanism to provide parking facilities within the neighborhood consistent with Coastal Land Use Plan policies. Other coastal recreation resource issues are discussed in detail in the City's adopted Coastal Land Use Plan.

Several small parks exist in the Sharp Park area, including Pomo Park on Canyon Drive, Palmetto Park on Palmetto Avenue, and Brighton Mini-Park on Brighton Road. Palmetto and Brighton Parks are the only facilities designed to serve as supervised play areas exclusively for small children. Sharp Park Elementary School also contains play areas, fields and equipment for children of all ages. These facilities are intended to meet the majority of recreation needs in the Sharp Park District.

Conclusion:

Due to the variety and adequacy of park and recreation facilities to accommodate both City and resident needs, no new park areas are necessary. Parking and access for both coastal and inland recreation areas and facilities is a critical problem to be resolved by the City in cooperation with State and County agencies.

FAIRWAY PARK

This neighborhood contains one recreation area, located along Cullen Drive within East Fairway Park. This facility is currently owned by the Laguna Salada School District and leased by the City. Informal pedestrian access from West to East Fairway Park is available from Bradford Way to Lundy Way via the underpass serving the Sharp Park Golf Course. Formal access across Coast Highway between the areas is presently extremely difficult. A pedestrian overpass should be provided over the highway at Westport Drive.

Due to the limited accessibility of other active play areas in the vicinity of Fairway Park, the existing play area along Cullen Drive should be maintained and improved as the primary City recreation facility for this neighborhood. The acreage behind this play area is one of the areas excluded from purchase by the GGNRA. Public purchase should be encouraged to ensure the visual integrity of the area. If developed, access to this sloping land should be located and designed to avoid traffic safety impacts on the park. Development on this property should be designed with appropriate access and landscaped buffer areas between upslope developed areas and the park.

CalTrans property currently leased as a nursery south of Fairway Park may provide a convenient and accessible link to Sweeney Ridge. Use of this property for this purpose may be appropriate, provided safe access from Highway 1 and parking are also established. A portion of undeveloped property adjacent to Lundy Way should be reserved for parking and/or access to Sweeney Ridge if this alternative is chosen.

Conclusion:

Although the neighborhood has only one recreation area, it is surrounded by parkland and open space. The one available recreation area is necessary to meet neighborhood needs.

VALLEMAR

A variety of existing and potential park and recreation resources exist in Vallemar. The first of these is Vallemar School, containing play equipment and sports field. Park and recreational amenities are available for public use through a cooperative agreement between the Laguna Salada Union School District and the City of Pacifica.

The school site should continue to be maintained and improved as the primary recreation resource within the neighborhood. Any proposed change by the School District should be studied very carefully by the City to determine future park and recreation impacts. The site is suitably located for administrative uses considering parking, access and location relative to the rest of the community and surrounding uses. Should the School District

determine the site to be surplus, conversion of classrooms and offices to a community service center would be desirable. If this alternative is not feasible, the City should require any developer to maintain sufficient space for active recreation at this location. Preservation of a neighborhood park (4 to 5 acres) is essential for this physically isolated community bordered by steep hillsides and the Coast Highway.

The atmosphere of Vallemar is partially created by the surrounding steep slopes. The three parcels not purchased by GGNRA should be encouraged for public purchase as open space to foster the existing environment.

The east half of Vallemar is divided by Calera Creek. A portion of the creek and associated vegetation, approximately from Minerva to Hiawatha Avenue, constitutes Calera Creek Park, which establishes the character of the neighborhood and is the dominant open space resource for Vallemar residents. Without major renovation, insufficient room exists to establish either footbridges or a separate walkway for pedestrians along the creek. In 1983, Vallemar residents determined that the creek embankment should not be upgraded to allow active recreation uses or improvements. Therefore, the creek should be maintained as an open space resource and should not be altered except as necessary to maintain landscaping in a safe and flourishing condition.

In addition to limiting pedestrian access to the creek, parking along the embankment should continue to be discouraged with a combination of natural and artificial barriers designed and located to be compatible with the natural setting.

Calera Creek Park is linked to Vallemar School by Reina del Mar and an informal pedestrian path known as the Pigeon Trail. This trail provides a safe and convenient route to the school from easterly sections of Vallemar. Maintenance and preservation of this trail is especially important due to the lack of street improvements along Reina del Mar separating pedestrian and vehicle traffic.

Conclusion:

Vallemar School and Calera Creek Park are important recreation and open space resources in this neighborhood. Active play and park resources at Vallemar School should be preserved for neighborhood use. Calera Creek Park should continue to serve exclusively as a scenic area to maintain neighborhood character.

ROCKAWAY BEACH

Like Vallemar to the north, Rockaway Beach has limited access to other parts of the City. Unlike Vallemar, Rockaway Beach contains no established recreation areas. One potential site exists within privately held property at the back of the valley. The City should encourage dedication of land of an appropriate size to establish areas for active play and passive enjoyment of surrounding scenic resources. If the size of residential development does not allow the City to require land dedication, the City should require that on-site usable open space for residents of the project also be made available to the general public. Recreation space should be designed and located to be attractive for public use. Access to the newly established facility should be limited to Rockaway Beach Avenue. Park size and

amenities would be developed following community input, community surveys and an analysis of census information.

Rockaway Beach also contains developed and undeveloped coastal recreation resources that are attractive to both residents and visitors. Policies regarding use and enhancement of these resources are discussed in detail within the Coastal Land Use Plan. Significant recreation concerns include provision for safe pedestrian and bicycle traffic along the west side of the freeway from Fairway Park to the south side of the Headlands. Existing pedestrian access along the east side of the highway should be retained. The City should also attempt to ease pedestrian access across Coast Highway from the east. Currently, residents of Rockaway Beach must negotiate Fassler Avenue and the highway. Public acquisition of the Headlands, south of Rockaway Beach, is an important priority in the City's shoreline access program. CalTrans and the City should work together to provide safe pedestrian access for residents to the beach area across Highway 1.

Conclusion:

The City should facilitate development of a neighborhood park and recreation area at the back of the Rockaway Valley. Improved east/west access across Coast Highway is a critical problem to be resolved.

LINDA MAR

Recreation needs in the neighborhood are met primarily by school facilities, including Cabrillo School on Crespi Drive, Ortega School on Terra Nova Boulevard, Sanchez School on Linda Mar Boulevard, Linda Mar Elementary School on Rosita Road and Pedro Valley School on Arguello Boulevard. City recreation areas include Oddstad Park, with access from Crespi Drive, an unimproved park site behind Crespi School and two greenbelt areas, one behind homes along upper Crespi Drive with access from Crespi Drive and also from the end of Valencia Way, the other along Rosita Road.

Topography and street access limitations make recreation use of most school sites in this neighborhood necessary and require that their recreation facilities be retained. Two exceptions are: Pedro Valley School, due to the proximity of both Linda Mar Elementary School and Cabrillo School for use by residents of the area, and Crespi School, which has a very limited service area and limited future residential development, on Fassler Avenue. Sanchez School is a significant neighborhood park site located between, but out of the service areas, of Linda Mar School/Park site and the Oddstad School/Frontierland Park site. Should the School District determine the site to be surplus, the preservation of a neighborhood park of five acres is essential for this community, bordered by Oddstad Boulevard to the east, Willowbrook Estates to the south, and the hillside streets accessing Linda Mar Boulevard to the north.

Oddstad Park not only includes picnic areas and play equipment, but also a recreation center and undeveloped open space. The park is used primarily by neighborhood residents. The topography of the park boundaries prohibits improvements that would allow a wider service area. Oddstad Park's recreation center provides one of the few City facilities suitable for performing arts and other similar activities of community-wide interest. The center also provides a facility for a variety of functions for the community's senior citizens.

Few greenbelt areas suitable for recreation exist in the Linda Mar area. While access to greenbelts behind Crespi Drive is possible from Terra Nova Boulevard, Crespi Drive and from Valencia Way, use of these areas for established trails and vista points should not be encouraged. Improved trails should be considered, along with any proposal to develop all or portions of the gentle south-facing slopes above the residential area bounded by Roberts Road, Fassler Avenue and Crespi Drive. The path of Portola from Linda Mar Beach through undeveloped slopes in this area to Fassler Avenue and Sweeney Ridge should be signed and preserved - as an historic open space resource.

Linda Mar Boulevard and Rosita Road serve as the entrance to the San Pedro Valley County Park. The route to the park from Coast Highway should be appropriately signed to encourage use by local residents and visitors.

Conclusion:

Recreation needs in this neighborhood should continue to be met by school facilities. Greenbelt trails should continue to serve only as scenic resources unless development on adjacent lands makes establishment of trails possible. City parks and facilities should continue to meet City-wide needs; however, the adequacy of Oddstad Park to meet the needs of special groups, such as senior citizens, is being assessed. Access to major recreation areas outside the City through this neighborhood should be signed to promote use.

PARK PACIFICA

Park Pacifica contains two school sites, Terra Nova High School and Oddstad Elementary School, in addition to the City's one park having a community-wide service area, Frontierland Park. San Pedro Valley Park and significant portions of Sweeney Ridge are also located in Park Pacifica.

Terra Nova High School contains track and field areas, a gymnasium, an outdoor pool, lighted tennis courts, and three baseball fields, one of which is designed for Little League tournament play. Ball fields, tennis courts and the pool are managed cooperatively by both the City and the high school. The City hosts a variety of recreation activities at the school, including aquatic events, indoor sports activities, tennis lessons and tournaments, etc. These opportunities are available to all City residents.

Ortega School is located on Terra Nova Boulevard, between Oddstad Boulevard and Terra Nova High School, and provides a 22 acre neighborhood school/park site. This site is essential as a primary neighborhood facility providing sports fields, play equipment and recreational access to a significant population.

Oddstad School is immediately adjacent to Frontierland Park and provides 11 acres of play area and equipment for neighborhood use. Existing connections between the school and Frontierland Park should be strengthened and improved in order to better meet community and resident needs.

As previously stated, Frontierland is Pacifica's only community park. Located at the southeast portion of Pacifica, the 65.7 acre site is linked to San Pedro Valley County Park by trail to Eagle Point, descending to the County Park's Valley View Trail.

In 1970, the Pacifica City Council formed a citizen's committee to assist in the design of the entire Frontierland Park area. The committee worked for four years on the project, which included the selection of an architect and development of a master plan. The park was dedicated at Pacifica's first annual 4th of July Fiesta in 1974. Through the years of development, amendments to the master plan have eliminated the originally proposed outdoor theatre, animal farm, nature trail and canyon arboretum. The steepness and instability of slopes, potential noise impacts on nearby residences and the remoteness of the park contributed to these deletions.

In the northern corner of the park, originally proposed for the outdoor theatre, a mobile home tenancy has been established to provide better park surveillance for both emergency situations and park user transgressions. An informal caretaker position has been established with the park tenants. The City provides the mobile home site and a portion of utilities in exchange for tenant response to the City regarding public safety problems and vandalism. Although the master plan for the park is not yet completed, the park is extensively used and provides areas for community recreation, picnicking and active play. Phases of development will continue as additional funds become available.

Future master plan development of the park site include a park center building, entry gates, tennis courts and the development of active sports fields at the adjacent Oddstad School site.

Greenbelts within the neighborhood along Terra Nova, Yosemite Drive, Everglades Drive, and between Park Pacifica Avenue and Oddstad Boulevard, should be retained and managed exclusively as scenic open spaces. Improvements within these areas should be limited to forestation on gentle slopes and other improvements necessary to increase the stability of the steep slopes. If the City performs grading operations to increase slope stability, these areas should be revegetated and reforested to reestablish current open space characteristics.

The majority of San Pedro Valley Park within the City's boundary (420 of the park's 1,000 acres are within the City) is located in Park Pacifica. The park currently includes a visitor center containing a natural history museum, family and group picnic areas, restrooms, trails of easy to moderate difficulty, and a walking and jogging path extending to the easterly most reaches of the valley. The County manages San Pedro Creek within the park, in cooperation with the State Department of Fish and Game, as a steelhead trout fishery. Facilities may be expanded to include a day camp or additional family and group picnic sites. Connections exist or are currently possible from San Pedro Valley Park to Frontierland from the northeast side of the park and to Sweeney Ridge via Hazelwood Trail and Whiting Road within the southeast section of the park. A north peak link south to Montara Beach via McNee State Ranch is also planned. The park is capable of serving the entire City. If day camp uses are developed, interjurisdictional hikers may find it convenient to use this area as a stopping or staging point. Interjurisdictional hikers could travel from Thornton State Beach to Montara Beach, provided trail easements are preserved and maintained for that purpose. While San Francisco County generally discourages watershed access, a connection is possible only if Whiting Road is fenced along its approximately 4 mile length adjacent to the watershed.

Private property at the east end of Fassler Avenue presently serves as the south entry to Sweeney Ridge. The City has obtained an agreement with the owner for public access to the ridge at this location. This access should be developed and improved if adequate (10 to 20 spaces) parking is developed within park boundaries.

Potential hiking and equestrian access to Sweeney Ridge exists at the end of Cape Breton Drive. A 20+ acre parcel comprising the existing Coastside Corral stable area and surrounding steep slopes was created in 1984, leaving 90+ undeveloped open space areas. Due to the limited availability of land in Pacifica for this purpose, subdivision of the 20+ acre corral property should include provision for equestrian access and a small staging area for public use.

Conclusion:

Terra Nova High School and Frontierland Park provide a variety of existing and potential park and recreation resources serving the community. Use of these facilities for public recreation activities should be strengthened and continued. Access to, and connections between, City and Regional Park areas adjacent and within the neighborhood should be established, appropriately improved and clearly signed for managed and safe use. Historic trails should be preserved and signed for public use. Greenbelts should be reserved and maintained exclusively for their scenic open space value.

PEDRO POINT AND LINDA MAR BEACH

Pedro Point contains no established neighborhood park. While the neighborhood does contain significant scenic resources, an improved park site is essential for this physically isolated community, bordered by the ocean, steep hillsides and the Coast Highway. Such an area may be feasible within the undeveloped San Francisco Catholic Archdiocese property located on San Pedro Avenue. The Pedro Point Improvement Association and community surveys have indicated that park amenities should include areas and equipment for active play, children's play areas and equipment, some open space for passive recreation, restrooms and street improvements.

San Pedro Beach is managed by the City of Pacifica and is partially through the acquisition process for inclusion in the State Parks System. Currently, it comprises approximately 35.66 acres of State lands and 3.68 acres of City land. Public lands extend from the north boundary of the restaurant site, northward to the rocky shoreline of the Headlands.

The State requires a plan for any improvements prior to entering into agreements with the City for care, maintenance, protection, and control of the beach area. The City is conducting a master plan study of San Pedro Beach. When complete, the study will fulfill requirements for the operating agreement with the State and establish community-accepted guidelines for use and development of the area. These guidelines will also be important to any negotiations for transfer of ownership of City-owned parcels into the State Parks System or the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

The mouth of San Pedro Creek is located at the south end of the beach near the Linda Mar sewer pump station. Inland riparian habitat and the creek should be protected and enhanced through cooperative efforts between the State Department of Fish and Game, the City, and CalTrans, which owns most of the property along the creek alignment.

Conclusion:

Development of a neighborhood park should be encouraged. Plans for San Pedro Beach should reflect community needs.

SITES

Total Acres
 Acres Managed by City
 Hiking, Equestrian Trail
 Basketball Courts
 Softball Fields
 Football/Soccer Field
 Hardball Fields
 Volleyball Fields
 Tennis Courts
 Swimming Courts
 Track
 Picnic Tables/Benches
 Barbeques
 Play Equipment
 Fitness Trails
 Multi-Purpose Trails
 Kitchen Purpose Room
 Restrooms
 Concession Stand
 Horseshoe Stand
 Rest Stop
 Scenic

| SITES | Total Acres | Acres Managed by City | Hiking, Equestrian Trail | Basketball Courts | Softball Fields | Football/Soccer Field | Hardball Fields | Volleyball Fields | Tennis Courts | Swimming Courts | Track | Picnic Tables/Benches | Barbeques | Play Equipment | Fitness Trails | Multi-Purpose Trails | Kitchen Purpose Room | Restrooms | Concession Stand | Horseshoe Stand | Rest Stop | Scenic |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------|-----------|--------|
| Fairway Park | 7 | 3 | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | ▲ | | | | |
| <u>Valleamar</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Valleamar School | 8.2 | 1.1 | ▲ | ▲ | | ▲ | | | | | | | | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | |
| Calera Creek Park | 1.0 | 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ▲ | |
| <u>Linda Mar</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cabrillo School | 17 | 1.7 | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | ▲ | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | | ▲ |
| Ortega School | 22 | 5.6 | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | ▲ | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | | |
| Sanchez School | 12 | 3.6 | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | ▲ | | | | | ▲ | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | | |
| Pedro Valley School | 8.7 | .9 | ▲ | ▲ | | | ▲ | | | | ▲ | ▲ | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | | |
| Linda Mar School | 8.7 | 2.4 | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | ▲ | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | | |
| Oddstad Park | 20 | 1.2 | | | | | | | | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | ▲ | | | |
| Terra Nova High | 49 | 0 | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | ▲ |
| Sanchez Adobe | 55 | 0 | | | | | | | | | ▲ | | | | | | | | | ▲ | | |
| <u>Park Pacifica</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fassler Greenbelts | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ▲ |
| Banyon Way Greenbelt | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ▲ |
| Pk. Pacifica Greenbelt | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ▲ |
| Frontierland | 68 | 68 | ▲ | | | | ▲ | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | ▲ | | ▲ | | | ▲ | |
| San Pedro Valley Pk. | 975 | 0 | ▲ | | | | ▲ | | | | ▲ | ▲ | | | | ▲ | | ▲ | | | ▲ | |
| Oddstad School | 15 | 0 | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | ▲ | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | | |
| Sweeney Ridge | 1100 | 0 | ▲ | | | | | | | | | | | | ▲ | ▲ | ▲ | | | | | ▲ |

| SITES | Total Acres | Acres Managed by City | Hiking, Equestrian Trail | Basketball Courts | Softball Fields | Football/Soccer Field | Hardball Fields | Volleyball Fields | Tennis Courts | Swimming Courts | Track | Picnic Tables/Benches | Barbeques | Play Equipment | Fitness Trails | Multi-Purpose Room | Kitchen Facilities | Restrooms | Concession Stand | Horseshoe Pits | Rest Stop | Scenic Views ³ | Bleachers | |
|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------|--|
| Highlands Greenbelts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kathleen Court | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ▲ | | |
| Grand Teton No. | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ▲ | | |
| Grand Teton So. | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ▲ | | |
| Valdez Way | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ▲ | | |

¹ The inventory does not include beaches or shoreline access points. A detailed discussion of these resources is contained in the Coastal Land Use Plan. This inventory lists publicly owned open space lands. The General Plan Land Use Element and Map indicates additional privately owned lands with open space qualities suitable for preservation in accordance with the policies of this element.

² Either includes or has access to hiking and riding trails.

³ Either provides scenic views or is a scenic resource.

COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT

Pacificans recognize the special qualities of their coastal location with its scenic natural features and rather unique development patterns. They value the individuality of their residential communities and at the same time encourage development of a stronger, more cohesive image of the City. The Community Design Element reviews some of Pacifica's distinctive attributes and relates these to the general patterns of growth and change which are likely to affect the City in the future. Emphasis is given to those factors which will have the greatest influence on the image and livability of the City in the future. The Community Design Element does not present a detailed plan for development or preservation, but rather sets out guidelines and principles which can influence and stimulate more specific planning actions.

To facilitate the planning process, the City should formally designate planning districts within the City with boundaries corresponding wherever possible to traditional neighborhoods, census tracts, and distinct physical features. Because of variations in the terrain, age and type of development, each area has a unique character.


The additional development that is expected should be carefully controlled to ensure that the City will be able to meet the additional demand for services and that the quality of existing residential areas be preserved. New development should offer a variety of housing, both in terms of cost and design. In existing residential areas, where additional in-filling will occur, new development should be compatible in scale and density with the existing neighborhood. By encouraging innovative design, a greater variety of housing can be provided while at the same time preserving the character of existing residential areas.

Guidelines for future in-fill development include considerations for:

1. The relationship between proposed development and the predominant land uses in the area; where the proposed development differs significantly from current land use or building types, special design consideration may be warranted to ensure the compatibility of the proposed development.
2. The type of access available; in some areas special attention will have to be given to ensure that access to proposed development will conform to current standards.
3. Coastal design guidelines; undeveloped parcels in the Coastal Zone will be expected to conform to guidelines developed as part of the Coastal Plan. Standards for public access, views to the ocean, and views from the beachfront should be considered where appropriate.
4. Hillside development guidelines; in-filling on hillside sites should be considered for its potential relationship to, or affect on visually significant slopes, open space, to natural grade and topography of the area, and existing vegetation.

PACIFICA

Visual Characteristics



 Ironside & Associates
Planning Consultants

5. Existing neighborhood plans; wherever possible land uses and building types should be reviewed for their overall relationship to, and compatibility with neighborhood development plans.

The other major concern which affects most of Pacifica's residential communities is future commercial development. Future development should be carried out in a manner which is sympathetic to the residential character of the community and supportive of the City's present shopping areas. New commercial development should be restricted to the vicinity of already developed commercial areas, thus strengthening the viability of these areas. By focusing commercial development to meet the needs in specific areas, such as the planning districts, local merchants benefit from increased numbers of shoppers, while local residents benefit from the convenience of a centrally located shopping center.

For most of its route through Pacifica, the coastal highway is also the City's "Main Street", serving as the primary link between Pacifica's residential and commercial areas. For this reason, that portion of Pacifica which is most visible from the Coast Highway has a large influence on the image of the City. The appearance of the Coast Highway right-of-way should be improved by additional landscaping along the adjoining access roads. Any future development along this right-of-way, and the right-of-way itself, will have a potential influence on the Coastal Zone and the scenic qualities of the corridor.

To protect important viewsheds and the sometimes rather delicate terrain of hillside areas, while at the same time ensuring that the interests of local property owners and residents are represented, consideration should be given to the development of hillside design criteria and regulatory procedures which are responsive to the unusual problems of hillside areas. In most cases, it will be possible, since parcels are large, to direct development toward less prominent portions of the property and thereby preserve the visually important ridgelines. Where this is not possible, construction techniques and screening should be employed to preserve, to the extent possible, the perception of openness along the designated, prominent ridgelines.

Guidelines which can be applied to hillside development to minimize its impact on the terrain and to ensure the safety of residents include:

1. Preserve "visually significant" slopes and ridgelines, maintain natural open space between areas of development, set aside and preserve natural features.
2. Allocate areas not suited to development to open space and recreation.
3. Fit development to the topography; place man-made structures to complement the natural environment.
4. Minimize grading; discourage mass grading and terracing for construction pads.
5. Shape the grading that is required to conform with natural landforms.
6. Landscape developed areas to blend with the natural landscape and require minimum maintenance and water.

7. Minimize the disruption of existing plant life.
8. Phase grading and construction to coincide with periods of dry weather.

Most of these guidelines apply equally well to undeveloped areas within the Coastal Zone. In addition, when development occurs in sensitive coastal areas, special measures should be taken to preserve and enhance the visual quality of the Coastal Zone. Particular areas along the coast which have been developed deserve special attention, not only because of their natural features, but also for their potential as visitor-destination points. Careful consideration should be given to ensure that private residential development and public beach access remain as compatible coastal activities. Consideration should also be given to preserving major natural promontories, such as Mori Point, as well as encouraging access.

AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN

Pacifica's 1980 General Plan revision incorporates two planning processes: a major update of the General Plan and preparation of the City's Local Coastal Land Use and Implementation Plans. In dealing with the General Plan on a day-to-day basis, these two plans should be treated as one; however, the distinction between them must be recognized. The City Council has the ultimate authority in adopting and amending the General Plan. State law (Government Code Section 65361) permits the City to amend its General Plan no more than three times a year. In years of major revision, the adoption of the revised plan is considered one of these three permitted annual amendments.

On the other hand, the Council can recommend changes in the Coastal Plan, but the amendment must be approved by the State Coastal Commission. The approval procedure has not yet been established by the State Coastal Commission and must be embodied into official regulations.

The 1976 Coastal Act does state that minor amendments to a certified plan may be reviewed by the Executive Director and become operative in ten days. However no changes in land use shall be determined to be minor amendments (Article 30514(c)). The Act also states that amendment includes:

.....any action by the local government which authorizes a use of a parcel of land other than that designated in the certified local coastal program as a permitted use of that parcel.....
(30514(d)).


Revisions to the Coastal Land Use Plan document would require State Coastal Commission approval for amendment. These include:

- Policies indicated as being part of the Coastal Element,
- The Coastal Zone Land Use Plan Description,
- The portion of the Land Use Map west of Highway 1,
- The Coastal Zone Element, including the Access Component, Plan Conclusions, Implementation Plan and Ordinance revisions required as a part of coastal plan implementation.
(This document is available under a separate cover).

ADOPTION

On April 30, 1979, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council certify the Environmental Impact Report and adopt the proposed Pacifica General Plan. On July 14, 1980, the City Council certified the Environmental Impact Report and adopted the General Plan on July 28, 1980.

CITY OF PACIFICA
HOUSING ELEMENT
2015-2023



Planning Period: January 31, 2015 - January 31, 2023

Adopted with City Council Resolution No. 13-2015 on May 11, 2015

Prepared by: Planning Department

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| I. | COMMUNITY PROFILE | |
| 1. | The Housing Element..... | 1 |
| | A. Public Participation Process..... | 3 |
| | B. Housing Accomplishments: 2007 to 2014..... | 4 |
| 2. | The City..... | 4 |
| 3. | Population Characteristics..... | 7 |
| | A. Population..... | 7 |
| | B. Ethnicity..... | 10 |
| | C. Persons with Disabilities..... | 11 |
| 4. | Housing Characteristics..... | 13 |
| | A. Households and Housing Units..... | 13 |
| | B. Income..... | 15 |
| | C. Housing Costs..... | 17 |
| | D. Household Characteristics..... | 19 |
| II. | HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT..... | 20 |
| 1. | Purpose..... | 20 |
| 2. | Population Trends and Projections..... | 20 |
| 3. | Employment Trends and Projections..... | 21 |
| 4. | Household and Housing Characteristics..... | 25 |
| | A. Income..... | 25 |
| | B. Housing Costs..... | 25 |
| | C. Rehabilitation..... | 28 |
| 5. | Regional Housing Needs..... | 29 |
| 6. | Special Housing Needs..... | 30 |
| | A. Large Families..... | 30 |
| | B. Single Parent Households..... | 31 |
| | C. Seniors..... | 32 |
| | D. Extremely Low Income..... | 35 |
| | E. Families and Persons in Need of Emergency Shelters..... | 35 |
| | F. Transitional and Supportive Housing..... | 39 |
| | G. Persons with Disabilities..... | 39 |
| | H. Farm Workers..... | 42 |
| 7. | Constraints upon Housing Maintenance, Improvement, and Development..... | 43 |
| | A. Governmental Constraints..... | 43 |
| | B. Nongovernmental Constraints..... | 57 |
| | C. Other Constraints..... | 59 |
| | D. Mitigation of Constraints..... | 61 |
| 8. | Affordable Units at Risk..... | 66 |
| 9. | Opportunities for Energy Conservation..... | 69 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| III. | LAND INVENTORY..... | 71 |
| 1. | Purpose..... | 71 |
| 2. | Sites Available Within the Eight-Year Planning Period..... | 71 |
| | A. Environmental and Physical Constraints..... | 80 |
| | B. Zoning Appropriate to Accommodate Lower Income Housing..... | 81 |
| IV. | GOALS, QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES TO MAINTAIN, PRESERVE, IMPROVE AND DEVELOP HOUSING..... | 87 |
| 1. | Purpose..... | 87 |
| 2. | Overall Goals..... | 87 |
| 3. | Quantified Objectives..... | 87 |
| 4. | Ongoing Policies..... | 88 |
| 5. | Housing Maintenance..... | 96 |
| | A. Policies, Programs and Objectives to Maintain Housing..... | 96 |
| 6. | Housing Preservation..... | 99 |
| | A. Policies, Programs and Objectives to Maintain Housing..... | 100 |
| 7. | Housing Improvement..... | 106 |
| | A. Policies, Programs and Objectives to Maintain Housing..... | 106 |
| 8. | Housing Development..... | 111 |
| | A. Policies, Programs and Objectives to Maintain Housing..... | 111 |
| 9. | Discontinued Programs..... | 122 |
| V. | COASTAL ZONE HOUSING..... | 128 |
| 1. | Purpose..... | 128 |
| 2. | Housing Unit Construction, Demolitions and Replacement..... | 128 |
| VI. | PUBLIC PARTICIPATION..... | 130 |
| VII. | CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN..... | 130 |
| VIII. | SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION..... | 131 |
| IX. | CONTACT INFORMATION..... | 132 |
| ATTACHMENTS | | |
| A. | Administrative Policy No. 2: 2014-2015 Master Schedule of Fees..... | A-1 |

I. COMMUNITY PROFILE

1. The Housing Element

Pacifica's General Plan, comprised of 12 elements, guides all City activities. The Housing Element is an integral part of the General Plan, focusing on analysis of future housing needs and methods to provide adequate housing for Pacificans from all walks of life. It contains goals and policies for housing and action programs which detail the steps the City can take to respond to the community's evolving housing needs. One of the most important aspects of the Housing Element is its identification of sites for housing development that are sufficient to accommodate the City's share of the regional housing need for the planning period (in this case, 2015-2023¹).

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) develops a regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) for all counties in the Bay Area². Based upon that allocation, the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo (C/CAG) assigns specific allocations to incorporated and unincorporated areas within the County. The Bay Area overall received a housing unit allocation of 187,990 units for the period between 2014-2022. ABAG apportioned to San Mateo County 16,418 of those units. Pacifica's share of the County total was 413 units, constituting 2.5 percent of the County's allocation and .22 percent of the Bay Area's allocation. Pacifica will play a small, yet critically important part in meeting regional housing needs.

Out of the total of 413 units allocated to Pacifica as part of the RHNA process for 2014 to 2022, the City has already approved eight units through April 30, 2015. The City can accommodate the balance of its RHNA through the identification of sites properly zoned for residential development that can occur during the planning period. The RHNA segments housing need by income level in the categories very low, low, moderate, and above moderate. The result is that the City must plan for a variety of housing types affordable to persons with varying incomes.

Past housing elements have helped the City of Pacifica work towards meeting its housing needs. The following is a summary of housing elements adopted along with and subsequent to Pacifica's 1980 General Plan:

1980 Housing Element

- Identified the number of housing units needed over the 20-year period between 1980-2000. The Element called for an average of 79 affordable units per year between 1980-2000. From 1980-1985, the projected need was 89 units per year; between 1985-2000, the figure was revised to 73-77 units per year;
- Identified seven vacant sites having the potential for meeting the housing needs indicated for low- and moderate-income groups over the 20-year period;
- Summarized each housing program available;

¹ ABAG's coordinated Housing Element Planning Period is January 31, 2015 through January 31, 2023.

² ABAG's 5th RHNA Projection Period runs from January 1, 2014 through October 31, 2022 (8.8 years).

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

- Identified short- and long-term housing goals and programs; and
- Discussed administration of housing programs.

1983 Housing Element Supplement

- Updated information in the 1980 Element. By 1983, the housing situation in the city had changed, due to infrastructure and land constraints, as well as approval of the Growth Control Ordinance in 1982;
- Estimated the amount of vacant land available for housing development;
- Identified Pacifica's fair share housing need, based on Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) figures. The 1983 ABAG Housing Needs Determinations called for 81 units per year to meet growth needs. The number of low- and moderate-income units had been reduced to 45 units per year from the 73-77 units per year called for in the 1980 General Plan; and,
- Identified current housing programs available.

1986 Housing Element

- Analyzed 1980 Census data, and included a more complete, city-wide vacant land survey;
- Included 1983 ABAG Regional Fair Share Housing needs; and,
- Described the most current housing programs available to maintain, improve, and develop housing.

1990 Housing Element

- Analyzed 1990 Census data; and,
- Added new Action Programs.

2007 Housing Element

- Analyzed 2000 Census data; and,
- Addressed SB 2 requirements related to site identification and zoning for emergency shelters as well as transitional and supportive housing.

The 2014 Housing Element seeks to continue the periodic refinement of the document to address projected housing needs. Notable changes include updated demographics based on the 2010 Census; realignment of the planning period to eight years (SB 375); identification of “beneficial impacts” from

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

action programs (SB 375); assessment of needs of those with developmental disabilities (SB 812); and, adaptation of housing-related activities to the 2012 dissolution of the City's Redevelopment Agency (ABx1 26 and AB 1484).

A. Public Participation Process

The City of Pacifica developed the 2015-2023 Housing Element with participation from members of the Pacifica community, as well as housing advocates and other interested parties. As part of the process to seek public input, staff sent notices to 50 nonprofit housing organizations and service providers servicing special needs populations, including Bay Area Legal Aid, Center for the Independence of the Disabled, Center on Homelessness, Community Legal Services, Golden Gate Regional Center, HIP Housing, InnVision/Shelter Network, Mental Health Association of San Mateo County, and the San Mateo County Commissions on Aging/Disabilities.

The City convened a study session with the Planning Commission to solicit input from the public on the City's housing needs, and to provide the public with an opportunity to shape the City's housing goals, policies, and objectives. The study session was publicized in the local print media, the "Coastal Connection" community event list, the City's web site, and Nextdoor, Twitter, and Facebook social media platforms. In conducting outreach for the study session, care was taken to recruit potential participants that reflect the City's full ethnic and economic diversity.

A study session is a public meeting for which the City provides public notice, but at which no action is taken by the Planning Commission. The informal format of a study session encourages planning commissioners, project proponents, and community members to engage in a vigorous dialogue with question-and-answer exchanges among all participants. A dozen community members attended the housing element study session, with nearly all attendees expressing ideas and communicating with the Commission and fellow community members. The public input focused on the need for more affordable housing in Pacifica; integrating affordable housing with improved access to public transportation; focusing future housing development into mixed use sites rather than the few remaining vacant parcels in the city; and, concerns with specific sites identified in the draft housing element's "Potential Housing Development Sites" (Table III-1 in Section III.2).

In response to the public input received, staff revised the draft housing element to address community concerns where possible. Staff revised Table III-1 containing "Potential Housing Development Sites" to represent the community's desire for higher density, mixed use housing near transit access. The result was the identification of numerous sites clustered primarily around the Pacific Manor Shopping Center in the northern portion of Pacifica. Existing transit routes within this neighborhood provide bus service to the area, including connections to the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system in Colma and Daly City. Furthermore, the underlying commercial land use designation in the neighborhood allows high-density mixed use housing development. An additional result of incorporating the newly-identified sites was the ability to remove from Table III-1 the two sites discussed the most at the Study Session - the "Calson Property" and "Hacienda Court."

The public participation process continued after the study session phase with a public hearing before the Planning Commission on April 20, 2015. At the meeting, 13 members of the public provided comments on various aspects of the draft Housing Element, draft Negative Declaration, and other

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

matters. A result of the public input was another revision of the housing site land inventories contained in Tables III-1 and Tables III-2 to remove all sites that were also listed within the City's Open Space Task Force Report. Public input also resulted in continuation as ongoing policies two action programs that staff had proposed for discontinuance.

The final opportunity for public participation was during a public hearing before the City Council on May 11, 2015. Thirty-six members of the public spoke during the public hearing and several individuals submitted written comments prior to the meeting. In response to public comments, the City Council revised the draft Housing Element to add a note to Table IV-1 stating that the 93 units at Pacific Skies Estates mobile home park are subject to Article 2 of Chapter 1 of Title 9 of the Pacifica Municipal Code, also known as the Rent Stabilization Regulations, and to add a note in appropriate locations within the Housing Element Update that the operator of Pacific Skies Estates mobile home park will continue to replace older mobile homes.

The City provided public notice of all hearings and further encouraged community members and advocates to attend. After these public discussions and additional revisions based on the public input received, the City Council adopted the housing element with Resolution No. 13-2015 on May 11, 2015.

B. Housing Accomplishments: 2007 to 2014

Pacifica's housing allocation for the 2007-2014 period was 275 units, of which 63 were needed for Very Low Income households, 45 for Low Income households, 53 for Moderate Income households, and 114 for Above Moderate Income households. Pacifica met 95 percent of its overall housing need during the period, approving, building, or constructing 262 housing units. Accomplishment by income category, however, reflects differing levels of success. The City met all of the need for Above Moderate Income units; 91 percent of the Moderate Income need; but less than 4 percent of combined Low and Very Low Income need.

Development of affordable housing was highly challenging during the 2007 to 2014 planning period. Among other factors, the economic recession during the planning period slowed all types of development. This in turn limited opportunities to apply inclusionary zoning and housing in-lieu policies to larger developments in order to create new affordable units. The dissolution of redevelopment agencies during the planning period also presented new challenges to the financing of affordable housing projects in the City.

2. The City

Pacifica is located on the Pacific coast side of the San Francisco Peninsula, 13 miles south of downtown San Francisco, in San Mateo County. Two prominent features frame the city, with the ridges of the Coast Range to the east and the shoreline of the Pacific Ocean to the west. Pacifica possesses an attractive combination of secluded valleys and open hillsides set against a coastline of long beaches and rugged headlands.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Regional access is via State Highways 1 and 35 that, in turn, connect to Interstate Highway 280 and 80, and US-101. Through the northern half of the City, Highway 1 is a four-lane freeway. South of Sharp Park Road, the highway becomes a four-lane arterial with uncontrolled access, climbing south of the City and through the Lantos Tunnels (bypassing the infamous Devil's Slide) to the unincorporated villages of Montara and Moss Beach.


Originally visited by the Portola expedition in 1769, the area around what is now Pacifica remained primarily agricultural until after the San Francisco earthquake in 1906. Land speculators, stimulated by the construction of the Ocean Shore Railroad, subdivided and developed a series of small coast-side communities. Several of these communities incorporated in 1957 as the City of Pacifica. Despite incorporating nearly 60 years ago, neighborhood integrity retains special significance in the city. Although recognizing their interdependence, each of the original communities desires to protect those characteristics which make them unique. The Neighborhood Map (Figure I-1) shows the various neighborhoods in the City.

(Continued on Next Page)



FIGURE I-1

NEIGHBORHOOD MAP



3. Population Characteristics

A. Population

Rapid residential development occurred in Pacifica during the 1960s, with the 1960 population of 20,995 residents nearly doubling to 36,020 residents by 1970. From the 1970s onward, residential development tapered off and population increase became more moderate. Despite slowing residential development, Pacifica’s population peaked more three decades later in 2000 at 38,390 residents. Pacifica’s population, average household size, and median age from the last six decennial censuses are shown in Table I-1, below:

TABLE I-1

| Population, Average Household Size, and Median Age – 1960 through 2010 | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 1960 | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| Population | 20,995 | 36,020 | 36,866 | 37,670 | 38,390 | 37,234 |
| Household Size (avg.) | * | * | 2.88 | 2.82 | 2.73 | 2.65 |
| Median Age | 22.5 | 23.6 | 29.2 | 33.5 | 37.6 | 41.5 |

Source: US Census Bureau.
 *The U.S. Census from 1960 and 1970 calculated household size using a different methodology, making it incomparable to figures from 1980 onward.

Changes in average household size and the age of Pacifica’s residents in recent decades have contributed to a shift in housing needs. The table above demonstrates how average household size has steadily decreased since 1980, while median age has increased dramatically during the same period.

The characteristics of Pacifica’s housing stock have also changed in recent decades. In 1970, 87 percent of the City's housing stock was single-family residential; by 2010, this had declined to 77 percent. The majority of apartments and other multi-family housing units have been constructed in the West Sharp Park, West Edgemar, and Fairmont neighborhoods, although several senior housing developments have been constructed in other parts of the City. Despite multi-family development increasing in popularity after 1970, by 2000 all kinds of residential development had leveled-off. Table I-2 summarizes the rates of residential development in Pacifica since 1960. Between 1990 and 2010, 1,265 housing units were developed in Pacifica (with only 391 from 2000-2010). Compared to 1,146 units from 1980-1989 and more than 3,000 units in each of the three preceding decades, it is apparent that housing production has slowed tremendously in recent years. While it is difficult to pinpoint the cause of the dramatic reduction in housing unit production, the increasing scarcity of vacant, buildable sites in Pacifica is believed to be a significant factor.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

TABLE I-2

| Residential Units Constructed in Pacifica – 1960 through 2010 | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 1960- 1970 | 1970- 1980 | 1980- 1990 | 1990- 2000 | 2000- 2010 |
| Units Constructed | >3,000 | >3,000 | 1,146 | 874 | 391 |

Source: US Census Bureau.

To gain a better perspective of Pacifica’s population, it is helpful to compare its various aspects to those of the broader populations in San Mateo County and statewide. The next several tables and figures make comparisons across several dimensions.

In 2011, 37,361 people lived in Pacifica, down more than 1,000 residents from a decade earlier. Pacifica's population was comprised of slightly fewer children and many more seniors than San Mateo County. Table I-3 summarizes population by age group.

TABLE I-3


| Population by Age Group – 2000 vs. 2011 | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------|-------------|------------|
| | 2000 | | 2011 | |
| | Pacifica | Pacifica | County | State |
| Under 5 years | 6% | 5% | 6% | 7% |
| 5 to 19 years | 20% | 17% | 18% | 21% |
| 20 to 34 years | 20% | 18% | 19% | 22% |
| 35 to 44 years | 18% | 15% | 15% | 14% |
| 45 to 59 years | 23% | 26% | 22% | 20% |
| 60 to 74 years | 10% | 15% | 13% | 11% |
| 75 years and over | 4% | 5% | 6% | 5% |
| Median age | 38 | 42 | 39 | 35 |
| Total population | 38,390 | 37,361 | 720,143 | 37,330,448 |

Source: 2000 US Census SF1, 2009-2011 American Community Survey

(Continued on Next Page)

FIGURE I-2

Population by Age Group – 2011



Pacifica's population decreased by 3.0 percent between 2000 and 2010, while San Mateo County's population increased 1.6 percent over the same period. Pacifica's population increased a modest 1.9 percent between 1990 and 2000. Within the last 30 years, the most rapid population increase occurred between 1980 and 1990 (2.2 percent). Table I-4 shows rate of population change in Pacifica for the period 1980-2010. Pacifica's population growth rate has lagged behind that of San Mateo County since 1980, as shown in Figure I-3.

TABLE I-4

Pacifica Population Rate of Change, 1980-2010³

| | Population | % Change |
|-----------|------------|----------|
| 1980-1990 | 37,670 | 2.2 |
| 1990-2000 | 38,390 | 1.9 |
| 2000-2010 | 37,234 | -3.0 |


Base Year 1980 population was 36,866

Source: US Census Bureau

³ Decennial U.S. Census counts for 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2010.

FIGURE I-3

Rate of Population Change (%) - 1980 to 2010



B. Ethnicity

Pacifica’s largest racial group was white persons, who comprised 68 percent of the population in 2011. The largest minority group was Asian persons, at 19 percent of the population. Filipino and Chinese persons comprised two-thirds of the city’s Asian population. Black persons accounted for the smallest share of population of any single-race group at 3 percent. Persons of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, while not counted by the U.S. Census as a separate racial group, comprised 18 percent of the population (most of these persons were counted within the “white” racial group). Non-Hispanic whites comprised 55 percent of the population. Table I-5 provides additional information on Pacifica’s racial composition.


TABLE I-5

| Race and Ethnicity | Pacifica | County | State |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| White | 68% | 59% | 62% |
| Black | 3% | 3% | 6% |
| Asian | 19% | 25% | 13% |
| Other | 4% | 8% | 14% |
| More than one Race | 6% | 5% | 4% |
| Hispanic | 18% | 25% | 38% |
| Not Hispanic | 82% | 75% | 62% |
| Total population | 37,361 | 720,143 | 37,330,448 |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey

FIGURE I-4

Race and Ethnicity



C. Persons with Disabilities

In 2011, 8 percent of Pacificans had one or more diagnosed disabilities, the same rate as San Mateo County (8 percent). Disabilities include physical and mental disabilities such as deafness, blindness, immobility, and cognitive challenges, as well as other conditions. As used throughout the housing element, the term “disability” includes, without limitation, developmental disability. Disabilities can affect the ability of affected persons to work, live independently, drive, and ride public transportation. Limitations of this sort can affect the type of housing needed by persons with disabilities. Perhaps most impactful to housing needs is the ability of persons with disabilities to live independently and to travel outside the home to work and shop.

The prevalence of disabilities in Pacifica varied widely by age group. The population segment with the greatest rate of disabilities was persons age 65 years or older, at 28 percent. Among the working age population 18 to 64 years of age, the disability rate was 5.8 percent. San Mateo County’s respective rates were 31 percent and 5.0 percent. Information on persons with ambulatory (i.e. mobility), self-care, independent living, and other disabilities is summarized in Table I-6:

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

TABLE I-6

| Age and Type of Disability of Residents | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|--------|-----------|----------------|--------|-------|
| | Number | | | Percent | | |
| | Pacifica | County | State | Pacifica | County | State |
| Under 18 with Disability | 173 | 3,270 | 280,649 | 2.3% | 2.1% | 3.0% |
| Age 18-64 with Disability | 1,481 | 23,231 | 1,843,497 | 5.8% | 5.0% | 7.9% |
| Age 65 + with Disability | 1,195 | 28,703 | 1,547,712 | 28% | 31% | 37% |
| Any Age with Any Disability | 2,849 | 55,204 | 3,671,858 | 8% | 8% | 10% |
| Any Age With Hearing Disability | 812 | 15,651 | 1,022,928 | 2.2% | 2.2% | 2.8% |
| With Vision Disability | 299 | 8,199 | 685,600 | 0.8% | 1.1% | 1.9% |
| With Cognitive Disability | 717 | 19,549 | 1,400,745 | 1.9% | 2.7% | 3.8% |
| With Ambulatory Disability | 1,474 | 29,757 | 1,960,853 | 4.0% | 4.2% | 5.3% |
| With Self Care Disability | 663 | 12,819 | 862,575 | 1.8% | 1.8% | 2.3% |
| With Independent Living Disability | 980 | 22,735 | 1,438,328 | 2.6% | 3.2% | 3.9% |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey
 Note: Some people may have multiple disabilities

A segment of the disabled population with particularly challenging housing needs is those with developmental disabilities. The California Welfare and Institutions Code describes a developmental disability to be one that originates prior to adulthood, that continues or can be expected to continue indefinitely, and that constitutes a substantial disability for that individual. Specific conditions include intellectual disability, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism, but not disabilities that are solely physical in nature. Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment; however, more severely disabled individuals require a supervised group living environment, often with medical care and physical therapy provided on-site. Given the pre-adulthood onset of developmental disabilities, a primary concern is transitioning a developmentally disabled person to an appropriate level of independence as an adult.

The U.S. Census does not track developmental disabilities specifically, meaning the City must estimate the population with a developmental disability in another way. The State Department of Developmental Services (DDS) is the lead agency in providing community-based services to approximately 243,000 developmentally disabled persons statewide through a system of 21 regional centers. The Golden Gate Regional Center provides services within San Mateo, San Francisco, and Marin counties. The information from the Golden Gate Regional Center in Table I-7 shows the number of Pacificans (ZIP Code 94044) who received services for a developmental disability in 2014:

TABLE I-7

| Developmentally Disabled Residents, by Age, City of Pacifica (2014) | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 0-18 Years | 19-34 Years | 35-54 Years | 55-64 Years | 65+ Years | Total |
| 54 | 40 | 33 | 9 | 2 | 138 |

Source: Golden Gate Regional Center Service Data for January 2014

San Mateo County is fortunate to have access to a variety of resources to assist persons with developmental disabilities in addition to the Golden Gate Regional Center. Many of the organizations work in close partnership with the Regional Center on a referral basis to ensure continuity of care for developmentally disabled persons. Services of these groups include focusing on job skills to enhance

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

economic stability, and thereby housing stability, as well as direct housing support through counseling, advocacy, search assistance, and direct placement into units. The organizations available to Pacifica residents include the following:

- Abilities United: Provides training, education, and support for persons with developmental and physical challenges.
- The Arc: Provides a range of services relevant to all areas of adult life, from independent living supports and skills building to employment training and creative expression.
- Poplar ReCare: Provides therapeutic treatment, equipment loan, and other services for those with developmental disabilities, illness, or injury.
- Puente Clinic: Provides mental health services for developmentally disabled clients by bridging resources from San Mateo County Behavioral Health & Recovery Services (BHRS), Golden Gate Regional Center (GGRC) and Health Plan of San Mateo (HPSM).
- West Bay Housing Corporation: Provides affordable, community-based supportive housing for individuals with developmental disabilities and other people with special housing needs.

4. Housing Characteristics

A. Households and Housing Units

In 2010, there were 13,967 households⁴ and 14,523 housing units⁵ in Pacifica. Compared to 2000, these figures decreased .2 percent and increased 2 percent, respectively. The annualized production of housing units from 2000 to 2010 was 27 units per year. In effect, Pacifica's household creation and housing unit production have remained relatively static. Average household size reduced to 2.65 persons per household in 2010 from 2.73 in 2000, a decrease of 3 percent. This continues a trend of shrinking household size that started at least as early as 1980. Basic information on households, housing units, and average household size for Pacifica for 1990, 2000, and 2010 are summarized in Table I-8.

⁴ The U.S. Census Bureau defines "household" as "all the persons who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence."

⁵ The U.S. Census Bureau defines "housing unit" as "a house, an apartment, a mobile home, a group of rooms, or a single room that is occupied (or if vacant, is intended for occupancy) as separate living quarters." Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live and eat separately from any other persons in the building and which have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall. The occupants may be a single family, one person living alone, two or more families living together, or any other group of related or unrelated persons who share living arrangements. People not living in households are classified as living in group quarters.

TABLE I-8

| Households and Housing Units, City of Pacifica, 1990 through 2010 | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 1990 | 2000 | 2010 |
| Households | 13,318 | 13,994 | 13,967 |
| Housing Units | 13,853 | 14,245 | 14,523 |
| Household Size (avg.) | 2.82 | 2.73 | 2.65 |

Source: US Census Bureau

Single-family detached housing dominates Pacifica’s housing stock. This housing type comprised 73 percent of housing units in 2011, with another 6.8 percent of units in the single-family attached category. Combined, approximately 80 percent of the housing stock is single-family. The share of the housing stock comprised by single-family-type units has increased since 2000, when attached and detached types were 72 percent and 5.4 percent of the housing stock, respectively. Compared to San Mateo County, Pacifica has a much greater share of detached single-family housing units. The County edges out Pacifica in all other housing categories, except that they both have similar shares of the mobile home housing type. Table I-9 summarizes Pacifica’s housing types.

TABLE I-9

| Building Type of Housing Stock | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Pacifica | County | State |
| Single Family Detached | 73% | 57% | 58% |
| Single Family Attached | 7% | 9% | 7% |
| 2 units | 1% | 2% | 3% |
| 3 or 4 units | 4% | 5% | 6% |
| 5 to 9 units | 4% | 6% | 6% |
| 10 to 19 units | 4% | 6% | 5% |
| 20 or more units | 7% | 14% | 11% |
| Mobile Home or Other | 1% | 1% | 4% |
| Total | 14,577 | 271,140 | 13,688,351 |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey

Pacifica’s predominately single-family housing stock has contributed to high rates of home ownership. Owner-occupied housing units accounted for 69 percent of the housing stock in 2011, a rate that held steady since 2000 and which is 10 percent greater than in San Mateo County. Vacancy rates in Pacifica in 2011 were very low, with the homeowner vacancy rate at 1.5 percent and the rental vacancy rate at 2.4 percent⁶. Vacancy rates in each category increased since 2000.

⁶ The U.S. Census Bureau considers a housing unit as vacant if no one is living in it at the time of the Census interview, unless its occupants are only temporarily absent. In addition, a vacant unit may be one which is entirely occupied by persons who have a usual residence elsewhere. New units not yet occupied are classified as vacant housing units if construction has reached a point where all exterior windows and doors are installed and final usable floors are in place. Vacant sleeping rooms in lodging houses, transient accommodations, barracks, and other quarters not defined as housing

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Homeowner vacancy was comparable to San Mateo County, although rental vacancy was almost-half of the County’s rate. It is generally accepted that an overall vacancy rate of 4 percent is needed to provide for normal turnover in housing units, which means Pacifica was experiencing an insufficient supply of housing. Table I-10 summarizes vacancy rates for Pacifica, San Mateo County, and the State of California.

TABLE I-10

| Vacancy Rates of Owner and Rental Housing Units | | Pacifica | County | State |
|--|--------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| 2000 | Owner | 0.2% | 0.5% | 1.4% |
| | Renter | 1.9% | 1.8% | 3.7% |
| 2011 | Owner | 1.5% | 1.2% | 2.2% |
| | Renter | 2.4% | 4.0% | 5.5% |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey, 2000 US Census

B. Income

Pacifica’s residents enjoy greater household incomes than those in San Mateo County as a whole. Median household income in Pacifica in 2011 was 4.7 percent higher than in the County as a whole. Nearly half of all households earned \$100,000 or more per year, and there were also fewer Pacifica households at the lowest income levels than in the County. Household income characteristics, summarized in Table I-11, contribute to the particular housing needs of the City’s population.

TABLE I-11

| Household Income of Residents | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Pacifica | County | State |
| Under \$25,000 | 8% | 12% | 21% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 7% | 6% | 9% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 6% | 10% | 13% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 18% | 16% | 17% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 15% | 12% | 12% |
| \$100,000+ | 45% | 44% | 28% |
| Poverty Rate | 4.0% | 7.4% | 16% |
| Total | 14,061 | 256,305 | 12,433,049 |
| Median Income 2000 | \$96,845 | \$95,606 | \$64,116 |
| Median Income 2011 | \$96,289 | \$91,958 | \$63,816 |

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments

Note: Adjusted for inflation to 2013 dollars

Household income is only one part of determining housing needs, however. Family size also contributes to the amount of income needed to secure suitable housing and to provide for other needs. Table I-12 depicts California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) 2014

units are not included in the statistics in this report.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

income thresholds for San Mateo County based on family size, which are integral to obtaining adequate and affordable housing.

TABLE I-12

| HCD Income Limits for 2014 | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Family Size | Extremely Low 30% of Median Income | Very Low 50% of Median Income | Low 80% of Median Income | Median 100% of Median | Moderate 120% of Median |
| 1 | \$23,750 | \$39,600 | \$63,350 | \$72,100 | \$86,500 |
| 2 | \$27,150 | \$45,250 | \$72,400 | \$82,400 | \$98,900 |
| 3 | \$30,550 | \$50,900 | \$81,450 | \$92,700 | \$111,250 |
| 4 | \$33,950 | \$56,550 | \$90,500 | \$103,000 | \$123,600 |
| 5 | \$36,650 | \$61,050 | \$97,700 | \$111,250 | \$133,500 |
| 6 | \$39,400 | \$65,600 | \$104,950 | \$119,500 | \$143,400 |
| 7 | \$42,100 | \$70,100 | \$112,200 | \$127,700 | \$153,250 |
| 8 | \$44,800 | \$74,650 | \$119,450 | \$135,950 | \$163,150 |

Source: California Department of Housing and Community Development, February 28, 2014 — <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/state/inc2k14.pdf>

The poverty threshold income as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau is another measure commonly used to assess income levels of a given population. The Census Bureau establishes poverty-level income based on family size, and for 2011 the level ranged from \$10,788 for an individual over 65 years of age with no dependent children to \$43,487 for a family with eight or more children. Poverty threshold amounts are set nationally, and the Census Bureau does not adjust them for variations in cost of living throughout the country. The overall poverty rate for families in Pacifica in 2011 was 1.9 percent, less than half the rate for San Mateo County. The lowest observed rate among various family groups was for married couples at 0.2 percent. The highest rate was for families headed by a female with no husband present, at 7.7 percent. Across all family categories, the presence of children under 18 years of age dramatically increased family poverty rates.

The Census Bureau also calculates poverty rates for individuals by age. The overall individual poverty rate in Pacifica was 4 percent. The highest observed poverty rate was for working age individuals from 18 to 64 years old at 4.7 percent. The poverty rate for persons 65 years of age and older was 2.7 percent. All poverty rates for Pacifica were noticeably lower than corresponding rates for San Mateo County, as shown in Table I-13.

TABLE I-13

| Poverty Rates of Families and Individuals | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Pacifica | County | State |
| Families (All) | 1.9% | 4.8% | 12% |
| Married Couples | 0.2% | 2.8% | 7.0% |
| Female Householder (no husband present) | 7.7% | 13% | 26% |
| Individuals (All) | 4.0% | 7.4% | 16% |
| Under 18 years | 2.8% | 9.1% | 22% |
| 18 to 64 years | 4.7% | 7.0% | 14% |
| 65 years and over | 2.7% | 6.2% | 9.5% |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey

In January 2014, San Mateo County Housing Authority indicated that 4,416 households countywide received housing assistance either through vouchers or by direct placement into public housing units. Within Pacifica, 208 residents received housing assistance, all of them through vouchers.

C. Housing Costs

Housing costs in Pacifica, as in much of the Bay Area, tend to be higher than California as a whole. Pacifica is a costly place to live for homeowners and renters alike. Given the predominance of single-family housing among Pacifica’s housing stock and the high rates of homeownership, the prices of single-family homes have a significant effect on housing affordability. Table I-14 lists median home sale prices for detached and attached single-family units from 2005 through 2012.

TABLE I-14

| | Median Single-Family Home Sale Prices | | | | | |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Detached Units | | | Attached Units | | |
| | Pacifica | County | State | Pacifica | County | State |
| 2005 | \$916,387 | \$939,148 | \$576,436 | \$662,830 | \$586,432 | \$498,848 |
| 2006 | \$874,054 | \$961,170 | \$636,410 | \$592,250 | \$625,140 | \$534,980 |
| 2007 | \$841,860 | \$935,536 | \$594,272 | \$589,120 | \$600,432 | \$493,920 |
| 2008 | \$698,772 | \$865,512 | \$485,784 | \$494,640 | \$554,364 | \$412,776 |
| 2009 | \$614,535 | \$749,304 | \$365,580 | \$395,820 | \$465,696 | \$337,716 |
| 2010 | \$622,260 | \$762,910 | \$359,948 | \$385,200 | \$449,507 | \$333,733 |
| 2011 | \$527,638 | \$691,439 | \$330,527 | \$298,700 | \$390,576 | \$300,142 |
| 2012 | \$535,846 | \$660,944 | \$305,727 | \$314,363 | \$360,065 | \$271,185 |

Source: San Mateo County Association of Realtors, based on actual sales of each year; State based on Zillow/MLS

Note: Adjusted for inflation to 2013 dollars

The table shows that detached single-family housing in Pacifica tends to be 40 to 70 percent more expensive than elsewhere in the State but 10 to 20 percent less expensive than San Mateo County.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Attached single-family housing in Pacifica tends to be 15 to 20 percent more expensive than elsewhere in the State but 10 to 15 percent less expensive than elsewhere in the County.

The cost of rental housing is also an important factor in housing affordability in Pacifica. Lower “costs of entry” to rental housing as compared to ownership units makes it a vital source of housing for those with lower incomes, which can include single heads of household with children, young professionals, or senior citizens. Table I-15 shows average rents for a variety of unit types in Pacifica from 2005 through 2013, and Table I-16 compares average rents in Pacifica to those in San Mateo County.

TABLE I-15

| Average Rents in Pacifica | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | Studio | | 1 Bed, 1 Bath | | 2 Bed, 1 Bath | |
| | Price | Percent Increase | Price | Percent Increase | Price | Percent Increase |
| 2005 | \$1,420 | x | \$1,512 | x | \$1,755 | x |
| 2006 | \$1,615 | 14% | \$1,577 | 4% | \$1,799 | 2% |
| 2007 | \$1,560 | -3% | \$1,617 | 3% | \$1,844 | 2% |
| 2008 | \$1,619 | 4% | \$1,666 | 3% | \$1,893 | 3% |
| 2009 | \$1,518 | -6% | \$1,604 | -4% | \$1,786 | -6% |
| 2010 | \$1,404 | -8% | \$1,548 | -3% | \$1,722 | -4% |
| 2011 | \$1,533 | 9% | \$1,594 | 3% | \$1,762 | 2% |
| 2012 | \$1,541 | 1% | \$1,743 | 9% | \$2,047 | 16% |
| 2013 | \$1,535 | 0% | \$1,778 | 2% | \$1,979 | -3% |

Source: RealFacts Annual Trends Report, based on reporting from large apartment complexes

Note: Adjusted for inflation to 2013 dollars

TABLE I-16

| Summary of 2013 Rents | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | Pacifica | County |
| Studio | \$1,535 | \$1,463 |
| One Bedroom | \$1,778 | \$2,004 |
| Two Bedroom | \$1,979 | \$2,285 |

Source: RealFacts Annual Trends Report, based on reporting from large apartment complexes, Craigslist Survey conducted in June and July 2013

The tables show that, with the exception of studio rental units, rental housing in Pacifica was less expensive than in San Mateo County. Rents for one- and two-bedroom units in Pacifica in 2013 were approximately 10% less expensive than those elsewhere in the County. However, with both ownership and rental units, affordability depends on income, and it is important to assess household housing costs from that perspective. Housing cost burden, or overpayment, will be discussed later in this document.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

D. Household Characteristics

The make-up and size of households can have an important influence on the type of housing units needed and desired within a community. In 2011, Pacifica's most common household type was the family with no children, which comprised 41 percent of households. The least common household type was multi-person, nonfamily, at 7 percent. Table I-17 summarizes Pacifica's household types in relation to San Mateo County and State households.

TABLE I-17

| Household Type | Pacifica | County | State |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| Single person | 24% | 25% | 24% |
| Family (no children) | 41% | 37% | 35% |
| Family (with children) | 28% | 31% | 33% |
| Multi-person, nonfamily | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| Total households | 14,061 | 256,305 | 12,433,049 |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey

The composition of Pacifica's households has changed in recent years. In 2000, single-person households made up 16 percent of the City's households. Only 31 percent of households were families without children, and 32 percent of households had children.

(Continued on Next Page)

II. HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1. Purpose

The housing needs assessment summarizes the specific types of housing needed by various populations within Pacifica. Data and housing issues are discussed and analyzed, and housing needs are quantified wherever possible. The Community Profile (Section I) provides background information for these housing needs.

State housing law, in Government Code Sections 65583(a)(1)-(9), requires that a housing element shall consist of “an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs,” which includes:

- Analysis of population and employment trends and documentation of projections;
- Analysis and documentation of household and housing characteristics;
- Analysis of any special housing needs, such as those of the elderly, persons with disabilities, large families, farmworkers, families with female heads of household, and families and persons in need of emergency shelter;
- Identification of at least one zone where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use;
- Analysis of potential and actual governmental and nongovernmental constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels and for persons with disabilities;
- Analysis of existing assisted housing developments that are eligible to change from low-income housing uses during the next 10 years due to certain conditions.
- Analysis of opportunities for energy conservation with respect to residential development; and,
- Inventory of land suitable for residential development and an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public facilities and services to these sites;

The following analysis satisfies the requirements outlined above.

2. Population Trends and Projections

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has estimated Pacifica's future population growth in its publication "Projections 2009." ABAG expects the City's population to increase 6 percent from 2010 to 2020 and 1 percent from 2020 to 2030. Both growth rates are significantly lower than those projected for San Mateo County. Table II-1 demonstrates population growth from 1990 through 2030 (projected), and compares Pacifica to San Mateo County and the State of California.

TABLE II-1

| Population Growth | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|---------|------------|----------------|--------|-------|
| | Number | | | Percent Change | | |
| | Pacifica | County | State | Pacifica | County | State |
| 1990 | 37,670 | 649,623 | 29,760,021 | x | x | x |
| 2000 | 38,390 | 707,163 | 33,871,648 | 2% | 9% | 14% |
| 2010 | 37,234 | 718,451 | 37,253,956 | -3% | 2% | 10% |
| 2020 (Projected) | 39,300 | 801,300 | x | 6% | 12% | x |
| 2030 (Projected) | 39,600 | 862,800 | x | 1% | 8% | x |

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Projections 2009; US Census SF1 1990-2010
 Note: ABAG does not prepare statewide projections

ABAG similarly projected household growth for Pacifica through 2030. Expected household growth in Pacifica will trail growth in San Mateo County by an even greater percentage than in population growth. Table II-2 shows these projected figures.

TABLE II-2

| Household Growth | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|---------|------------|----------------|--------|-------|
| | Number | | | Percent Change | | |
| | Pacifica | County | State | Pacifica | County | State |
| 1990 | 9,765 | 242,348 | 10,381,206 | x | x | x |
| 2000 | 13,994 | 254,104 | 11,502,870 | 30% | 5% | 10% |
| 2010 | 14,320 | 264,400 | 12,577,498 | 2% | 4% | 9% |
| 2020 (Projected) | 14,410 | 287,350 | x | 1% | 8% | x |
| 2030 (Projected) | 14,550 | 310,970 | x | 1% | 8% | x |

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2009; US Census SF1 1990-2010
 Note: ABAG does not prepare statewide projections

Pacifica's projected low growth rate may be attributable to certain governmental and nongovernmental constraints, as this document will discuss later in this section.

3. Employment Trends and Projections

Pacifica is primarily a residential community, and contained nearly three-times more employed residents than jobs in 2010. Despite the existing imbalance, employment growth increased at a faster rate than population growth between 2000 and 2010. Job growth increased 14 percent with the addition of 780 jobs, while population growth was -3 percent with a loss of 1,156 residents over the same period. Relative to San Mateo County, Pacifica's job growth was positive compared to a 10 percent contraction countywide.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

In 2011, there were 30,807 persons of working age (16 years and over) in Pacifica, 21,582 of which were in the labor force (70 percent). Of those in the labor force, the unemployment rate was 6.7 percent.⁷ Pacifica's unemployment rate was slightly higher than San Mateo County's (6.0 percent) but lower than California's (7.7 percent). Table II-3 displays historical and 2025 projected figures for jobs and employment in Pacifica.⁸ The 2025 projection of a reduction in employed residents may be attributable to the aging of Pacifica's population as many residents will leave the workforce during that timeframe. Still, it appears Pacifica will benefit from strong job growth through 2025, providing greater employment opportunities for residents.

TABLE II-3

| Projections for Population, Households and Total Jobs (2000-2025) | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Geographical Area | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 | 2025 | 2000-2025 Change | 2000-2025 Percent Change |
| Pacifica Planning Area (City Limits and Sphere of Influence) | | | | | | |
| Jobs/Employed Residents | 0.26 | 0.33 | 0.36 | 0.38 | x | x |
| Employed Residents | 21,836 | 19,050 | 19,250 | 19,420 | -2,416 | -12% |
| Jobs | 5,580 | 6,360 | 7,020 | 7,290 | 1,710 | 23% |
| Percent of County Population | 5.4% | 5.3% | 4.9% | 4.7% | x | x |
| Percent of County Jobs | 1.4% | 1.8% | 1.7% | 1.7% | x | x |
| San Mateo County | | | | | | |
| Jobs/Employed Residents | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.07 | 1.08 | x | x |
| Employed Residents | 369,725 | 330,700 | 379,300 | 408,600 | 38,875 | 10% |
| Jobs | 386,590 | 346,320 | 404,400 | 439,850 | 53,260 | 12% |
| Percent of Bay Area Population | 10.4% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | x | x |
| Percent of Bay Area Jobs | 10.3% | 10.0% | 10.0% | 10.0% | x | x |
| Bay Area Regional Total | | | | | | |
| Jobs/Employed Residents | 1.09 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.03 | x | x |
| Employed Residents | 3,452,117 | 3,410,300 | 3,962,800 | 4,264,600 | 812,483 | 19% |
| Jobs | 3,753,460 | 3,475,840 | 4,040,690 | 4,379,900 | 626,440 | 14% |

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2009

Pacifica has few major employers. Employment is greatest in education, government, and food retailing. Table II-4 summarizes Pacifica's largest employers in 2013.

⁷ Unemployment data from 2011 were provided for consistency with other statistics in the housing element. However, by 2013 the Pacifica economy had improved to 22,082 residents in the labor force with an unemployment rate of 4.2 percent.

⁸ Employment figures may vary somewhat between the narrative and the table due to the former's reliance on U.S. Census Bureau 2009-2011 American Community Survey data and the latter's reliance on ABAG Projections 2009 data.

TABLE II-4

| Major Employers in Pacifica, 2013 | | |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Employer Name | Persons Employed | Business Type |
| Pacifica School District | 301 | Education |
| City of Pacifica | 225 | Government |
| Safeway Stores, Inc. | 210 | Food Retailer |
| Jefferson Union High School District | 90 | Education |
| Lucky (Save Mart Supermarkets) | 90 | Food Retailer |
| Recology of the Coast | 49 | Solid Waste Mgmt. |
| Rite Aid Pharmacy | 40 | Pharmacy |
| Ross Dress for Less | 40 | Clothing Retailer |
| North Coast County Water District | 22 | Government |

Source: City of Pacifica Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), 2013

Clearly, Pacifica’s residents have access to jobs not only within the city, but also jobs in large employment centers throughout the Bay Area. Employers outside of Pacifica represent a broader variety of sectors than those found in the city. Table II-5 provides a more compressive depiction of the San Mateo County and Bay Area job market, including employment projections through 2025.

(Continued on Next Page)

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

TABLE II-5

| Projections for Types of Jobs (2000-2025) | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Geographical Area | 2000 | 2010 | 2020 | 2025 | 2000-2025 Change | 2000-2025 Percent Change |
| Pacifica | | | | | | |
| Agriculture and Natural Resources | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 0 | 0% |
| Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation | 380 | 360 | 320 | 330 | -50 | -13% |
| Retail | 830 | 690 | 770 | 820 | -10 | -1% |
| Financial and Professional Services | 1,010 | 1,260 | 1,380 | 1,460 | 450 | 45% |
| Health, Educational and Recreational Service | 2,390 | 2,920 | 3,270 | 3,310 | 920 | 38% |
| Other | 900 | 1,060 | 1,210 | 1,300 | 400 | 44% |
| Total | 5,580 | 6,360 | 7,020 | 7,290 | 1,710 | 31% |
| San Mateo County | | | | | | |
| Agriculture and Natural Resources | 1,910 | 1,900 | 1,910 | 1,900 | -10 | -1% |
| Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation | 93,260 | 73,940 | 84,490 | 86,860 | -6,400 | -7% |
| Retail | 45,930 | 33,840 | 39,030 | 45,540 | -390 | -1% |
| Financial and Professional Services | 95,150 | 90,990 | 104,950 | 118,880 | 23,730 | 25% |
| Health, Educational and Recreational Service | 94,330 | 93,420 | 113,320 | 117,650 | 23,320 | 25% |
| Other | 56,010 | 52,230 | 60,700 | 69,020 | 13,010 | 23% |
| Total | 386,590 | 346,320 | 404,400 | 439,850 | 53,260 | 14% |
| Bay Area Regional Total | | | | | | |
| Agriculture and Natural Resources | 24,470 | 24,520 | 25,070 | 25,270 | 800 | 3% |
| Manufacturing, Wholesale and Transportation | 863,420 | 717,180 | 819,010 | 861,170 | -2,250 | 0% |
| Retail | 402,670 | 347,400 | 399,950 | 453,870 | 51,200 | 13% |
| Health, Educational and Recreational Service | 1,056,030 | 1,120,700 | 1,322,650 | 1,403,080 | 347,050 | 33% |
| Financial and Professional Services | 851,610 | 766,860 | 893,550 | 990,840 | 139,230 | 16% |
| Other | 555,260 | 499,180 | 580,460 | 645,670 | 90,410 | 16% |
| Total | 3,753,460 | 3,693,920 | 4,280,700 | 4,595,170 | 841,710 | 22% |

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2009

Note: Employment data includes jobs within the jurisdictional sphere of influence

Major Bay Area employment sectors in 2010 included Health, Educational and Recreational Services, and Financial and Professional Services. The greatest regional employment growth projected by ABAG is in Health, Educational and Recreational Services. In Pacifica, ABAG projects the greatest growth in Financial and Professional Services.

4. Household and Housing Characteristics

A. Income

In 2011, median household income in Pacifica was \$96,289. Household income increased by 2.1 percent over the 2000 figure of \$94,300. When adjusted for inflation, however, real household income decreased by 22 percent during this period. Shrinking purchasing power can pose a serious challenge for individuals and families seeking quality, affordable housing, especially in the expensive Bay Area housing market. Still, Pacifica’s households had 4.7 percent higher household income compared to San Mateo County households, which in 2011 had a median household income of \$91,958. This is a significant change from 2000, when Pacifica’s household income trailed San Mateo County by 17 percent.

Median income is a helpful measure to demonstrate community-wide economic strength. Yet, it does not provide a complete picture of the earnings of different subsets of the population. For instance, Table II-6 demonstrates income levels of seniors in Pacifica.

TABLE II-6

| Senior Citizen Income Levels | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Pacifica | County | State |
| Below Poverty Level | 3% | 6% | 10% |
| Income under \$30,000 | 30% | 28% | 38% |
| \$30,000-\$49,000 | 18% | 19% | 20% |
| \$50,000-\$74,999 | 15% | 16% | 16% |
| \$75,000-\$99,999 | 13% | 11% | 9% |
| \$100,000+ | 23% | 26% | 17% |
| Total Seniors | 2,517 | 55,093 | 2,474,879 |

Source and Notes: 2009-2011 American Community Survey, Seniors are age 65+

More than two-thirds of seniors had incomes below the Pacifica median household income level in 2011. Lower incomes can present challenges to finding adequate, affordable housing for seniors, especially at market rate. Considering the growing proportion of Pacifica’s population comprised by seniors, these figures demonstrate the importance of understanding housing needs of this key population segment. There are likely other segments of Pacifica’s population, such as persons with disabilities or female-headed households, which require special housing considerations.

B. Housing Costs

Pacifica’s median single-family detached home sale price in 2011 was \$527,638. Attached single-family homes had a median sale price of \$314,363. These sales prices were 24 percent and 31 percent lower than San Mateo County, respectively. Pacifica is fortunate to enjoy a more affordable housing stock than in nearby communities.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Overpayment

Affordability is a relative concept, not an absolute one. Affordability is relative not only to surrounding communities, but also to resident income. Overpayment for housing involves a household paying more than 30 percent of its gross income on housing expenses. Table II-7 shows the number of Pacifica households that overpaid for housing in 2011, and the proportion of each income group that overpaid.

TABLE II-7

| Households Overpaying for Housing | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------|---------|--------|-------|
| | Income | Pacifica | | County | State |
| | | Number | Percent | | |
| Owner-occupied | Less than \$35,000 | 713 | 63% | 68% | 68% |
| | \$35,000-\$74,999 | 1000 | 51% | 53% | 54% |
| | \$75,000+ | 2044 | 31% | 33% | 27% |
| Renter-occupied | Less than \$35,000 | 811 | 94% | 95% | 90% |
| | \$35,000-\$74,999 | 1162 | 81% | 61% | 49% |
| | \$75,000+ | 167 | 9% | 11% | 9% |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey

Note: Excludes Households with no income or cash rent.

Of the 14,061 total households in Pacifica in 2011 (Table I-16), 42 percent overpaid for housing. Those with the lowest household incomes were the most likely to over pay for housing, although 40 percent of those in the highest income category still overpaid. The figures in the table are indicative of the high expense of housing in Pacifica relative to household income.

Another helpful way to assess housing affordability is to view the “amount” of housing a household can afford, both in terms of purchase price and monthly rent. Tables II-8 and II-9 demonstrate the maximum purchase price and monthly rent affordable to persons of various income levels from Extremely Low (30 percent of County median) to Moderate (120 percent of County median) income. A median price detached home in Pacifica was unaffordable to households at all income levels except those well above Moderate income. A median price attached home was affordable only to those slightly above Moderate income.

(Continued on Next Page)

TABLE II-8

| Ability to Pay for For-Sale Housing | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| | Annual Income | Maximum Affordable Home Price | Median Priced Single-family Detached Home | Affordability Gap for Single-family Home | Median Priced Single-family Attached | Affordability Gap |
| Single Person | | | | | | |
| Extremely Low Income | \$23,750 | \$97,114 | \$535,846 | -\$438,732 | \$314,363 | -\$217,249 |
| Very Low Income | \$39,600 | \$161,925 | \$535,846 | -\$373,921 | \$314,363 | -\$152,438 |
| Low Income | \$63,350 | \$259,039 | \$535,846 | -\$276,807 | \$314,363 | -\$55,324 |
| Median Income | \$72,100 | \$294,818 | \$535,846 | -\$241,028 | \$314,363 | -\$19,545 |
| Moderate Income | \$86,500 | \$353,699 | \$535,846 | -\$182,147 | \$314,363 | \$39,337 |

Source: Baird + Driskell Community Planning; San Mateo County Association of Realtors; www.hsh.com/calc-howmuch.html

Note: Maximum Affordable House Price is based on the following assumptions: 4.5% interest rate; 30-year fixed loan; 50% Yearly Salary as Down Payment; 1% property tax; PMI, .5% insurance rate; and no other monthly payments/debt.

The situation for renters was only slightly better. Affordable rental housing was available only to those earning at the Median (100 percent of County median) and Moderate income levels.

TABLE II-9

| Ability to Pay for Rental Housing | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Annual Income | Maximum Affordable Monthly Rent | 2012 Market Rent | Affordability Gap |
| Single Person | | | | |
| Extremely Low Income | \$23,750 | \$594 | \$1,778 | -\$1,184 |
| Very Low Income | \$39,600 | \$990 | \$1,778 | -\$788 |
| Low Income | \$63,350 | \$1,584 | \$1,778 | -\$194 |
| Median Income | \$72,100 | \$1,803 | \$1,778 | \$24 |
| Moderate Income | \$86,500 | \$2,163 | \$1,778 | \$385 |

Source: Baird + Driskell Community Planning; RealFacts (2013)

Note: Estimates based upon upper end of income bracket. Single person analysis based upon 1 bedroom 1 bath unit, information to conduct the four person estimate is based on 3 bedroom 2 bath unit and was not available from RealFacts. Ability to pay is based upon 30% of income devoted to housing.

Overcrowding

Overcrowding is typically defined as more than one person per room, based on the Census Bureau’s definition of “room,” which excludes bathrooms, porches, balconies, foyers, halls, or half-rooms. Severe overcrowding occurs when there are more than 1.5 persons per room. Overcrowding can result when there are not enough adequately sized units within a community, or when high housing costs relative to income force too many individuals or families to share housing.

In 2011, there were 282 overcrowded households in Pacifica. These comprised 2.0 percent of total households. Overcrowding was worse for owner-occupied households, where the rate of

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

overcrowding was four times greater than in renter households. Pacifica had no “extremely” overcrowded households. Rates of overcrowding in Pacifica were substantially lower than elsewhere in San Mateo County, where rates of overcrowding among owner-occupied and renter households reached 4 percent and 13 percent, respectively.

TABLE II-10

| | | Occupied Homes | | Percent | |
|--------|-----------------------|----------------|----------|---------|-------|
| | | Pacifica | Pacifica | County | State |
| Owner | Not overcrowded | 9,440 | 97% | 96% | 96% |
| | Overcrowded | 254 | 2.6% | 3% | 3% |
| | Extremely overcrowded | 0 | 0.0% | 1% | 1% |
| Renter | Not overcrowded | 4,339 | 99% | 86% | 86% |
| | Overcrowded | 28 | 0.6% | 8% | 8% |
| | Extremely overcrowded | 0 | 0.0% | 5% | 6% |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey

Note: More than one person per room is overcrowded, while more than 1.5 people per room is extremely overcrowded

C. Rehabilitation

Pacifica has a relatively old housing stock (see Table II-11). In 2011, more than one-third of homes had been built more than 50 years ago and nearly two-thirds had been built more than 40 years ago. The last period of major residential construction was in the 1970s, when 22 percent of houses were built. By comparison, within the last 30 years, only 16 percent of the housing stock had been constructed. The advancing age of the housing stock means ongoing rehabilitation and preventative maintenance will be necessary to maintain homes in a habitable condition.

TABLE II-11

| Year Structure Built | Year Structure Built | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------|------------|
| | Pacifica | County | State |
| Built in 2000 or more recently | 3% | 5.4% | 12% |
| Built in 1990s | 5% | 6% | 11% |
| Built in 1980s | 8% | 9% | 15% |
| Built in 1970s | 22% | 17% | 18% |
| Built in 1960s | 26% | 17% | 14% |
| Built in 1950s or Earlier | 37% | 45% | 30% |
| Total | 14,577 | 271,140 | 13,688,351 |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey

Homes in Pacifica are exposed to more extreme weather than elsewhere in the Bay Area. Strong winds, near-constant exposure to salty air, and frequent heavy rains during the winter months (in non-drought years) combine to degrade paint, rust metal objects, and blow away roof shingles. Frequent maintenance and repairs are necessary, especially for houses west of Highway 1. Neighborhoods where homes are the oldest and rehabilitation needs are greatest include Sharp Park, Pacific Manor, Edgemar, Pedro Point, Fairmont and Vallemar.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Yet, despite the harsh weather conditions and aging nature, Pacifica’s housing stock remains in good condition. The Building Official and Code Enforcement Officer, who frequently inspect residential properties, estimate that no more than 2 percent, or 291, of Pacifica’s 14,577 housing units require rehabilitation. Still, rehabilitation of homes that do become distressed is important to preserve their viability as housing choices and to sustain neighborhood attractiveness.

5. Regional Housing Needs

The State of California, Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), and local governments determine each locality’s share of regional housing needs through a process known as the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The RHNA allocations set housing production goals for the planning period that runs from January 31, 2015, through January 31, 2023, using a “fair share” approach. The approach is based mainly on projected household and employment growth.

San Mateo County benefits from the ability to more precisely allocate planned housing units among the 21 local jurisdictions (20 cities/towns and unincorporated San Mateo County). Through the creation of a subregion – known as the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) – local governments were able to exercise more control over the allocation process. Those jurisdictions with a higher likelihood or ability to accommodate more housing units received a greater allocation, while others with limited development capacity received a lower allocation.

Overall, ABAG has determined that the Bay Area region must plan for 187,990 new housing units during the planning period. Of those, San Mateo County must plan for 16,418 units, and Pacifica must plan for 413 units. Table II-12 shows the income categories for which Pacifica must plan.

TABLE II-12

| Pacifica’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) 2014 - 2022 | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|--------------|
| | Extremely Low Income 30% of Median Income | Very Low Income 50% of Median Income | Low Income 80% of Median Income | Moderate Income 100% of Median | Above Moderate Income 120% of Median | Total |
| # of Units | 60 | 61 | 68 | 70 | 154 | 413 |

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments, Final 2014-2022 Regional Housing Need Allocation by County

The table depicts planning requirements for housing units affordable to a range of income levels. In practical terms, it means a mix of housing types may be necessary to meet future housing needs, to include low-density single-family housing and higher-density housing in mixed-use developments.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Unmet Need During Past Planning Period (2007-2014)

The City of Pacifica had an adjusted RHNA of 115 housing units for the 2007-2014 planning period (revised downward from 275 units, to reflect units constructed prior to the late adoption of the 2007-2014 Housing Element in 2012). Subsequent to 2007 Housing Element adoption, the City approved 10 total units. When combined with the 195 units approved prior to 2007 Housing Element adoption but during the planning period, the City ultimately met 75 percent of its original 275-unit allocation. Table II-13 demonstrates the income-level breakdown of approved units, as well as unmet housing needs. ABAG did not carry forward Pacifica’s unmet housing needs from the 2007-2014 planning period into the City’s total allocation for the 2014-2022 planning period. The allocation for the 2014-2022 period is based upon new analysis of regional growth projections.

TABLE II-13

| Unmet Housing Unit Needs for 2007 - 2014 Planning Period | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| | Planned Units Needed | Units Approved/Permitted/ Built | Second Units Approved /Permitted /Built | Unmet Housing Needs |
| Extremely Low Income | 32 | 0 | 3 | 29 |
| Very Low Income | 31 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Low Income | 45 | 1 | 0 | 44 |
| Median Income | 53 | 48 | 0 | 5 |
| Moderate Income | 114 | 210 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 275 | 259 | 3 | 109 |

Section III “Land Inventory,” found later in the Housing Element, analyzes land in the City to determine sites suitable for housing unit construction. The Land Inventory will assess whether adequate sites exist to meet the RHNA for the current planning period.

6. Special Housing Needs

A. Large Families

The Census Bureau defines “large family households” as households containing five or more persons. Due to the limited supply of adequately sized units to accommodate large family households, large families face above-average difficulty in locating adequately-sized, affordable housing. The lack of supply, compounded with incomes stretched thin by the greater needs of large families, can result in large families living in overcrowded conditions. Table II-14 shows household sizes in 2011.

TABLE II-14

| Household Size | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Number | Percent of Households | | |
| | Pacifica | Pacifica | County | State |
| 1-person | 3,387 | 24% | 25% | 24% |
| 2-person | 4893 | 35% | 31% | 30% |
| 3-person | 2381 | 17% | 16% | 16% |
| 4-person | 2059 | 15% | 16% | 15% |
| 5-person | 924 | 6.6% | 7.2% | 8% |
| 6-person | 257 | 1.8% | 2.8% | 3.7% |
| 7-or-more person | 160 | 1.1% | 2.3% | 3.0% |
| Total Households | | 14,061 | 256,305 | 12,433,049 |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey

In 2011, 9.5 percent of Pacifica's households had five or more persons. Fewer large family households live in Pacifica than in either San Mateo County or statewide. Fortunately, reported overcrowding does not appear to be widespread in the City (Table II-10). Yet, it is apparent large family households are facing challenges finding appropriate housing in light of Pacifica's existing housing stock.

Table II-15 shows the number of bedrooms per housing unit in the City. Only 3 percent of units have five or more bedrooms, although nearly 10 percent of households have more than five members. Despite low reported levels of overcrowding, large families must be using large areas of housing units for sleeping purposes. Doing so is unfortunate, as it denies them optimal use of their housing, which should include open areas for relaxation or recreation (living rooms, offices, etc.).

TABLE II-15

| Bedrooms in Housing Stock | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Pacifica | County | State |
| No bedroom | 2% | 4% | 4% |
| 1 bedroom | 12% | 16% | 14% |
| 2 bedrooms | 19% | 26% | 28% |
| 3 bedrooms | 44% | 34% | 33% |
| 4 bedrooms | 21% | 16% | 16% |
| 5 or more bedrooms | 3% | 5% | 4% |
| Total | 14,577 | 271,140 | 13,688,351 |

B. Single Parent Households

Single-parent households frequently have lower incomes and higher living expenses than dual-head households. Lower incomes make the search for adequate, affordable housing more important, but also more difficult. Single-parent households also need convenient access to other support services to assist with their parenting responsibilities while balancing employment, such as childcare, recreation programs, proximity to public transit, and other social services. These needs influence their housing decisions and should shape future housing developments in Pacifica.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

In 2011, a single parent headed 7.2 percent of Pacifica households, as shown in Table II-16. Single-parent households were more than twice as likely to be female-headed. These figures were higher than in San Mateo County but lower than elsewhere in the State.

TABLE II-16

| Single Parent Households | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------|---------------|--------------|
| | Pacifica | | County | State |
| | Number | Percent | | |
| Living with own children | 1,018 | 7.2% | 6.2% | 10% |
| Female-headed, no husband | 717 | 5.1% | 4.4% | 7.3% |
| Male-headed, no wife | 301 | 2.1% | 1.8% | 2.7% |
| Total Households | 14,061 | 100% | 256,305 | 12,433,049 |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey, Table DP02

Income levels of single-parent households are also of critical importance when considering housing needs. Single parents must provide for themselves and for their children on one income, stressing their abilities to afford housing. The poverty rate in Pacifica in 2011 for female-headed households with children was 12 percent, as compared to 0.6 percent for married households with children. Comparable figures for male-headed single-parent households were unavailable.

To address both the housing needs and the supportive service needs of single-parent households, the City may consider encouraging development of additional multi-family housing units with integrated child care facilities.

C. Seniors

The 2010 U.S. Census found that 12.1 percent of Pacifica's population was age 65 years or older, up from 9.7 percent in the 2000 Census. The number of seniors as a percentage of the total population is expected to continue increasing due to the aging of the "Baby Boom" generation, lower birth rates, and extended life expectancies. San Mateo County's share of population over 65 years is higher than Pacifica's, although Pacifica has a higher median age – 41.5 years – than both the County and the State. Table II-17 shows comparative figures for Pacifica, San Mateo County, and California.

(Continued on Next Page)

TABLE II-17

| Population by Age Group | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|---------|------------|-------------|---------|------------|
| | 2000 | | | 2010 | | |
| | Pacifica | County | State | Pacifica | County | State |
| Under 5 years | 5.7% | 6.4% | 7.3% | 5.4% | 6.5% | 6.8% |
| 5 to 14 years | 13.5% | 12.8% | 15.6% | 11.5% | 12.1% | 13.7% |
| 15 to 24 years | 11.6% | 11.6% | 14.2% | 11.4% | 11.3% | 15.0% |
| 25 to 34 years | 14.4% | 15.9% | 15.4% | 12.3% | 13.8% | 14.3% |
| 35 to 44 years | 18.4% | 17.4% | 16.2% | 14.6% | 15.0% | 13.9% |
| 45 to 54 years | 17.3% | 14.5% | 12.8% | 17.4% | 15.5% | 14.1% |
| 55 to 64 years | 9.3% | 8.9% | 7.7% | 15.2% | 12.5% | 10.8% |
| 65 years and over | 9.7% | 12.5% | 10.6% | 12.1% | 13.4% | 11.4% |
| Median age | 37.6 | 36.8 | 33.3 | 41.5 | 39.3 | 35.2 |
| Total population | 38,390 | 707,161 | 33,871,648 | 37,234 | 718,451 | 37,253,956 |

Source: 2000 and 2010 US Census SF1

Seniors comprised the largest group in Pacifica with special housing needs in 2011. There were 4,519 residents 65 years of age or older and demographic trends suggest this segment of the population will continue to grow. The growing senior population has distinct housing needs, considering seniors are more likely than the general population to have one or more disabilities (Section I.3.C) and to have lower incomes (Tables II-6, II-18, and II-19). In fact, some seniors subsist on Social Security income alone. The average pension under this program in 2013 was \$1,294 monthly (\$15,528 annually). For a family of two, each receiving his or her own pension, an annual income of \$31,056 would result in the household being considered to have Very Low income. The situation is more acute for a senior living alone, as he or she would be considered to have Extremely Low income. It is apparent then that the combination of disabilities and low incomes present unique challenges to seniors searching for accessible, affordable housing.

TABLE II-18

| Median Household Income by Age for Family Size of Two | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------|
| | Pacifica | Income Category |
| 25 to 44 years | \$103,397 | Moderate |
| 45 to 64 years | \$97,766 | Median |
| 65 years and over | \$52,422 | Very Low |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey, Table S1903

TABLE II-19

| Seniors by Income, Tenure and Age | | Extremely Low <30% of Median Income | Very Low 50% of Median Income | Low 80% of Median Income | Lower Moderate 100% of Median | Above Median >100% of Median |
|--|--------|---|---|------------------------------------|---|--|
| All Ages | Owner | 48% | 58% | 56% | 74% | 76% |
| | Renter | 52% | 42% | 44% | 26% | 24% |
| | Total | 1,315 | 1,440 | 2,515 | 1,490 | 7,215 |
| Age 62-74 | Owner | 75% | 81% | 72% | 95% | 89% |
| | Renter | 25% | 19% | 28% | 5% | 11% |
| | Total | 415 | 315 | 710 | 215 | 1,225 |
| Age 75+ | Owner | 71% | 79% | 92% | 100% | 95% |
| | Renter | 29% | 21% | 8% | 0% | 5% |
| | Total | 245 | 380 | 180 | 175 | 205 |

Sources: CHAS Data 2006-2010

Housing choices for seniors are further complicated by their homeownership status. As shown in Table II-20, 69 percent of Pacifica households own their homes. Among the senior population, however, that figure is 87 percent. The incredibly high homeownership rate for seniors provides both opportunities and risks as they age. Having a large asset such as a home can help to provide the financial means for a senior to pursue alternative housing, whether by downsizing to a home requiring less maintenance or to an assisted living facility that provides for their daily needs. Yet, many seniors are reluctant to sell the homes they have owned and lived in for years. And retrofitting single-family homes to be accessible to persons with disabilities can be complex and costly. The result is that many seniors are not living in housing optimized to the needs they have later in life.

TABLE II-20

| Homeownership by Senior Households | | Pacifica | County | State |
|---|---------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| All Ages | Owners | 69% | 60% | 57% |
| | Renters | 31% | 40% | 43% |
| | Total | 14,153 | 256,423 | 12,433,172 |
| Age 65-74 | Owners | 89% | 79% | 75% |
| | Renters | 11% | 21% | 25% |
| | Total | 1,460 | 27,053 | 1,265,873 |
| Age 75-84 | Owners | 84% | 81% | 75% |
| | Renters | 16% | 19% | 25% |
| | Total | 744 | 18,014 | 823,750 |
| Age 85 + | Owners | 82% | 75% | 69% |
| | Renters | 18% | 25% | 31% |
| | Total | 304 | 9,136 | 342,029 |

Source and Notes: 2009-2011 American Community Survey, Seniors are age 65 +

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

D. Extremely Low Income

Households with low incomes often experience difficulty finding affordable housing. Housing-related challenges are greatest for those in the lowest defined income category, Extremely Low. The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) defines “Extremely Low” income as household income at or below 30 percent of County median. The threshold values vary by family size from one to eight members. In San Mateo County, that ranges from \$23,750 for an individual to \$44,800 for a family of eight (see Table I-12). For the purposes of this section, the analysis will rely upon the threshold value for a family of four, \$33,950.

Households with Extremely Low income (ELI) encompass those in many different life situations. This includes households with one or more full-time wage earners. A person working a full-time, 2,080 hour-per-year job earning an \$8.00 hourly wage (the 2011 California minimum wage) would earn \$16,640 annually, well below the ELI level. Even with two minimum wage incomes, a family of four would still have ELI.

Available household income statistics do not categorize household income to align precisely with HCD income levels. However, the income data in Table I-12 approximate the ELI level for a family of four. Using this rough measure, as many as 1,968 Pacifica households have ELI, representing 14 percent of total households. The same rough measure, based on the data in Table II-7, demonstrates that as many as 63 percent of homeowner and 94 percent of renter households with ELI overpay for housing (1,524 total households). These figures, especially for households that rent, demonstrate the acute need for housing affordable to those with ELI.

E. Families and Persons in Need of Emergency Shelters

Many groups in Pacifica have ongoing special needs, but none are more urgent than the needs of families and persons who are homeless or in immediate risk of becoming homeless. Government Code Section 65583(a)(7) requires cities to provide an analysis of these needs in order to plan for appropriate shelter. Measuring the scale of the homeless population has historically been very difficult as it tends to be transient and strives to remain unseen (and thus, undisturbed). In response, the County of San Mateo spearheads an annual Homeless Census and Survey to attempt to obtain a maximum count of the County’s homeless population. An accurate count is a prerequisite to marshalling resources appropriate for the problem.

The 2013 San Mateo County Homeless Census and Survey found there were 2,281 homeless persons in San Mateo County. The number of homeless counted increased by 217, or 11 percent, since 2007. Within Pacifica, census takers identified 150 homeless persons, all of whom were unsheltered. Table II-21 lists the various locations where census takers found homeless (based on countywide figures). The most common location was on the street, followed by a car, recreational vehicle (RV), or encampment. These locations accounted for more than half of the homeless population identified. Around 34 percent were found in a shelter or transitional housing, while the remaining 13 percent were institutionalized (hospital, jail, or substance abuse treatment). Using an annualization formula the Census and Survey estimated there were 6,737 homeless persons in San Mateo County in 2013.

TABLE II-21

| County Homeless Population Location – 2007 & 2013 | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| | 2007 | 2013 | Change |
| On the Street | 29% | 15% | -41% |
| In Car, R.V., or Encampment | 24% | 41% | 90% |
| In Emergency Shelter | 14% | 11% | -18% |
| In Motel with Motel Voucher | 5% | 1% | -73% |
| In Transitional Housing | 15% | 19% | 41% |
| In Institution | 13% | 12% | 7% |
| Total: | 2,064 | 2,281 | 217 |

Source: 2013 San Mateo County Homeless Census and Survey, 2011 San Mateo County Homeless Census and Survey, 2009 San Mateo County Homeless Census and Survey, prepared by the San Mateo Human Services Agency, Center on Homelessness

The demographics of homelessness in San Mateo County show that there are certain characteristics commonly associated with the homeless. Table II-22 shows several categories including marital status, gender, race, and others. Nearly all homeless identified in the County were single male adults, white, non-veteran, and suffering from one or more incapacities such as alcohol/drug addiction, disability, and physical/mental illness.

TABLE II-22

| | County | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|
| | Unsheltered Homeless | Sheltered Homeless |
| Single Adult or Living w/Another Adult | 94% | 79% |
| Family | 6% | 21% |
| Male | 71% | 60% |
| Female | 29% | 40% |
| White | 60% | x |
| Latino | 19% | x |
| African American | 13% | x |
| Other Races | 10% | x |
| Non-Veteran | 89% | 76% |
| Veteran | 11% | 24% |
| Alcohol / Drug Problems | 72% | 8% |
| Physical Disability | 52% | x |
| Chronic Health Problem | 47% | x |
| Mental Illness | 37% | 10% |

Source: 2013 San Mateo County Homeless Census and Survey, prepared by the San Mateo Human Services Agency, Center on Homelessness. May not total 100% due to rounding

The complexity of the individual situations of homeless persons makes providing shelter and support services all the more difficult. Providing a place to sleep is but one part of the solution, along with physical and psychological treatment programs. Homeless families with children and homeless, unaccompanied children are among the neediest categories. Additional support services are needed to help children cope with the mental and other stigmas associated with homelessness. The County

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Census and Survey found many instances of homelessness involving children, as summarized in Table II-23. Fortunately, all homeless children without parents had been sheltered, but sadly, many families with children remained without proper shelter (all but one “adults with children” household were found in cars or RVs, and none were found in encampments).

TABLE II-23

| County Homeless Households with Children | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| | Adults with Children | Children Only |
| On the Street | 1 | 0 |
| In Car, R.V., or Encampment | 64 | 0 |
| In Emergency Shelter | 7 | 6 |
| In Motel with Motel Voucher | 11 | 0 |
| In Transitional Housing | 97 | 3 |
| In Institution | 0 | 0 |
| Total: | 180 | 9 |

Source: 2013 San Mateo County Homeless Census and Survey

The City of Pacifica has strived to expand shelter opportunities for homeless families and persons. To that end, it has removed any zoning obstacles to establishment of emergency shelters in several zoning districts. The Pacifica Municipal Code in Title 9 “Planning and Zoning” permits by-right in all residential districts “special care facilities” for up to six persons. A special care facility includes “twenty four (24) hour shelters for victims of family violence, homeless persons, or other need categories” (PMC Section 9-4.273.1). Residential zones are inherently suitable for establishment of small shelters due to the wide availability of existing structures available for conversion to shelter use. There are also sufficient undeveloped areas with residential zoning that could accommodate new construction of a shelter. The clean, quiet, and safe character of Pacifica’s residential neighborhoods also provides a welcoming environment to those in need of emergency shelter.

Any special care facility seeking to open in any residential zoning district would simply need to comply with the objective development standards for residential construction. Residential development standards regulate physical aspects of development such as setbacks, height, lot coverage, landscaping, and off-street parking, and there is no public notice requirement. Notwithstanding the City’s zoning, however, special care facilities proposed for construction within the Coastal Zone Appeals Zone would still require a discretionary Coastal Development Permit under the Coastal Act (see PMC Title 9, Article 43 “Coast Zone Combining District). Additionally, certain additions to a single-family residential structure resulting in floor area over 2,800 square feet, or additions increasing floor area by 50 percent or more in certain residential zoning districts, would require issuance of a discretionary Site Development Permit.⁹ Special care facilities for more than six persons in a residential zone, and any special care facility in a commercial zone, must obtain a discretionary conditional use permit.

According to the San Mateo County Human Services Agency, there were a total of 1,258 shelter beds in the County in 2010, the most recent year for which data were available. This figure includes agencies that are not a part of the County of San Mateo such as Samaritan House, Shelter Network,

⁹ The residential districts subjected to the 50 percent floor area threshold by Pacifica Municipal Code Title 9, Article 32 “Site Development Permit” are R-1-H, R-3, R-3.1, R-3-G, R-3/L.D., and R-5.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

and Telecare, among others. Of the 1,258 beds, 142 were in emergency shelters, 660 were in transitional shelters, and 456 were in permanent supportive housing.

An insufficient number of shelter beds exist in Pacifica to accommodate the number of homeless observed during the 2013 count. By applying the County's annualization formula to Pacifica's 2013 count, there were an estimated 469 homeless in the City in 2013. The annualization formula also estimates the number of individuals that became homeless within the last seven days, which was 10 persons based on Pacifica's overall count. The "last seven-day" figure should serve as a minimum figure for determining the number of emergency shelter beds needed in the City. Ultimately, at least 150 emergency shelter beds should be available to accommodate actual need by all homeless individuals on any night. Using these figures, it is next important to estimate the specific needs of these homeless groups in order to provide appropriate shelter and services. Applying countywide demographics of the unsheltered homeless population to the number of persons needing shelter within Pacifica, Table II-24 shows specific needs.¹⁰

TABLE II-24

| Estimated Shelter and Support Needs of Pacifica's Population | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Minimum Beds (10 Homeless) | Optimal Beds (150 Homeless) |
| Single Adult or Living w/Another Adult | 9 | 141 |
| Family | 1 | 9 |
| Male | 7 | 107 |
| Female | 3 | 43 |
| Non-Veteran | 9 | 134 |
| Veteran | 1 | 16 |
| Alcohol / Drug Problems | 7 | 108 |
| Physical Disability | 5 | 78 |
| Chronic Health Problem | 5 | 71 |
| Mental Illness | 4 | 56 |

Note: Totals for Alcohol/Drug Problems, Physical Disability, Chronic Health Problem, and Mental Illness may exceed the number of homeless in each need category since these are not mutually exclusive characteristics.

Source: Derived from 2013 San Mateo County Homeless Census and Survey homeless population demographics applied to Pacifica's population in need of emergency shelter.

Other, non-shelter resources exist in Pacifica to help families and persons experiencing or at-risk of homelessness. The Pacifica Resource Center provides families and individuals with shelter referral, housing assistance, food, clothing and other information and on available services. Shelter referral requires a screening interview at the Resource Center and an intensive interview at the shelter site before acceptance. The Pacifica Resource Center also provides referrals to Communities Overcoming Relationship Abuse (CORA), which provides emergency shelter for battered women.

¹⁰ The year-round and seasonal shelter beds needed in Pacifica are equal given the city's temperate year-round climate.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

F. Transitional and Supportive Housing

Transitional and supportive housing are two important links in the continuum of care for homeless families and persons. Emergency shelters provide immediate relief from the jarring impacts of sudden homelessness, but transitional and supportive housing provide the basis for long-term improvement in the situations of the homeless. Transitional housing is rental-type housing that allows residency for not less than six months, but that ultimately requires the termination of assistance and recirculation of the unit to another eligible recipient. Supportive housing provides long-term residency with no limit on length of stay for target populations, and links the target populations to on- or off-site services that improve health or enhance their ability to live and work in the community. The target populations for supportive housing are those suffering from mental illness, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) or acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS), substance abuse, or other chronic health conditions, or individuals eligible for services provided under the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act.

Senate Bill 2 (SB 2), enacted in 2007, expanded protections for transitional and supportive housing from local zoning discrimination. Pursuant to SB 2, the City must explicitly permit transitional and supportive housing and apply development standards to these uses in an identical fashion as applied to other residential uses in the same zone. The City of Pacifica has yet to amend its zoning ordinance to explicitly permit by-right these uses in residential zoning districts, but the City is aware of SB 2's requirements and will process any application for a transitional or supportive housing facility in accordance with state law. The City also will amend its zoning code within one year of adoption of the housing element in order to comply with SB 2, as described in an action program.

G. Persons with Disabilities

A disability is a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities. Persons with disabilities in Pacifica face unique problems in obtaining adequate and affordable housing. This segment of the population, which includes individuals with mental, physical, and developmental disabilities, needs affordable, conveniently-located housing which is near supportive services and which is adapted to special needs, such as wheelchair accessibility.

In 2011, 7.6 percent of Pacifica's residents, or 2,849 persons, experienced a disability of some sort (Table I-6). The single largest category of disabilities was ambulatory disability. Ambulatory disabilities limit or restrict one's ability to walk, significantly affecting the suitability of many housing options. Many individuals experienced multiple disabilities, compounding the challenges to finding appropriate housing. Living arrangements for persons with disabilities depend on the severity of their disabilities. Independent living, or mostly independent living with limited assistance from family members, are options for some persons with disabilities. Others, including those with severe developmental disabilities, require dedicated caregivers and housing with special design features to accommodate a specific disability or combination of disabilities. A common example is wheelchair accessible housing, which might include a single-story residence without interior level changes; or, apartment housing with an elevator, wide hallways and doorways, and other design factors that enable full wheelchair mobility throughout. Additionally, certain disabilities – or even the costs of owning a specially-equipped automobile – make it impossible to drive. In such cases, housing proximate to public transportation is important.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Persons with disabilities face heightened challenges with securing adequate, affordable housing. In addition to the special requirements of the built environment briefly discussed above, there are significant financial challenges, as well. The majority of persons with disabilities live on incomes that are significantly lower than the non-disabled population. Many disabled individuals live on a small fixed income which severely limits their ability to pay for housing. Table II-25 demonstrates that in 2011 the annual earnings of persons with disabilities were 31 percent lower than persons without disabilities. For females with disabilities, the situation was even more challenging. They earned 25 percent less than males with disabilities, and 41 percent less than the non-disabled population overall.

TABLE II-25

| | | Median Earnings of Disabled Persons (2011 Dollars) | | |
|-----------------|--------|---|---------------|--------------|
| | | Pacifica | County | State |
| With Disability | Total | \$21,389 | \$26,401 | \$21,389 |
| | Male | \$24,352 | \$27,961 | \$24,352 |
| | Female | \$18,244 | \$25,082 | \$18,244 |
| No Disability | Total | \$31,138 | \$42,807 | \$31,138 |
| | Male | \$35,697 | \$47,869 | \$35,697 |
| | Female | \$26,596 | \$38,852 | \$26,596 |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey, Table B18140

Employment is also a challenge for persons with disabilities. Table II-26 demonstrates the employment status in 2011 for those aged 18-64 years, with and without disabilities. Persons with disabilities were employed at less than half the rate as those with no disabilities. Unemployment was also higher among persons with disabilities, but not substantially greater.

TABLE II-26

| | | Employment Status by Disability Status – Persons 18-64 Years | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|---|---------------|--------------|---|
| | | Pacifica | County | State | |
| Employed | Total | 19,040 | - | | |
| | Disability | 471 | 32% | % | % |
| | No Disability | 18,569 | 77 % | % | % |
| Unemployed | Total | 1,832 | - | | |
| | Disability | 155 | 10% | % | % |
| | No Disability | 1,677 | 7% | % | % |
| Not in labor force | Total | 4,595 | - | | |
| | Disability | 855 | 58% | % | % |
| | No Disability | 3,740 | 16% | % | % |

Source: 2009-2011 American Community Survey, Table B18120

Percentages are of total population subsets in Pacifica, as follows: Aged 18-64 years – Disability (1,481 persons); and, No Disability (23,986 persons)

The greatest difference between the disabled and non-disabled working age populations, however, was among those not in the labor force. Persons with disabilities were nearly four times as likely not to be in the labor force, meaning they were either unable to work or not seeking employment. This much higher rate reflects the economic disadvantage faced by persons with disabilities, which

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

translates into additional difficulty finding suitable housing. Accordingly, housing affordability at all income levels is a major consideration for the disabled population.

A large proportion of disabled persons are also seniors. Forty-two percent of those with disabilities in Pacifica, or 1,195 persons, were aged 65 years or above in 2011. The multi-faceted nature of housing needs for this population presents many challenges, but also a unique opportunity. By providing adequate and affordable senior housing, with design features and support services suitable to persons with a variety of disabilities, the City can meet the housing requirements of two or more special needs categories. Due to the unique opportunity it presents, the City may consider making affordable senior housing a priority for future housing development in order to make the most of scarce building sites.

The State Department of Social Services Community Care Licensing Division indicated that in 2014, there were four adult residential facilities in Pacifica that provided 24-hour non-medical care for adults aged 18-59 years who were unable to provide for their own daily needs. These four facilities provided capacity for 28 adults. Consistent with State law, group homes such as these (known under the City's zoning regulations as "special care facilities") with six or fewer residents per facility are allowed by right in all residential zones. The City may allow special care facilities with more than six residents in residential and commercial zoning districts with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit. The purpose of a Conditional Use Permit is to establish a procedure for approving or denying land uses that are not automatically permitted because of their unique nature. The City can approve a unique land use if its effect on the surrounding environment is found to be acceptable through the application of conditions of approval. Several findings need to be made to approve a Conditional Use Permit, including that the proposed use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood or to the general welfare and that it will be consistent with the applicable provisions of the General Plan and other applicable laws of the City and, where applicable, the local Coastal Plan, and where applicable that the use is consistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines.

Other appropriate housing for persons with disabilities includes very low cost units in large group home settings; supervised apartment settings with on- or off-site support services; outpatient/day treatment programs; inpatient/day treatment programs; crisis shelters; and, transitional housing. Ideally, these housing types would be near retail services and public transit. The age of Pacifica's housing stock, with much of it built prior to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, unfortunately complicates locating accessible housing within existing structures. Often times, expensive upgrades are necessary to make housing accessible for persons with a variety of disabilities. Fortunately, Federal and State law now require that all multi-family residential construction projects containing five or more dwelling units be accessible and adaptable to disabled persons. This means any new multi-family housing projects should be more suitable for conversion to housing for disabled persons.

The City ensures that new housing developments comply with California building standards in the California Building Code (Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations), including disabled accessibility requirements. The City also works with applicants who wish to retrofit their single- or multi-family residences to make them suitable for persons with disabilities and to ensure that application of the building code requirements does not create a constraint. There are no identified

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

zoning or other land use regulation practices that could discriminate against persons with disabilities and impede the availability of such housing for this special segment of the population. In fact, the City's regulations encourage production of housing for persons with disabilities. Projects that provide housing for persons with disabilities in accordance with the City's Density Bonus Program are entitled to a reduction of planning application fees and certain other incentives, including greater allowable unit density.

Additionally, the City of Pacifica's Zoning Ordinance allows second units constructed on single-family properties to be larger than standard size if they are designed to be accessible to persons with disabilities. The standard second unit size limitation is 750 square feet. Accessible units may measure up to 850 square feet. Zoning allows second units in the R-1(Single-Family Residential) zoning district on lots measuring at least 5,000 square feet. Other development standards also apply, but in many cases it is possible to construct a second unit accessible to disabled persons with a building permit application only, without undergoing a discretionary review process.

In order to explicitly communicate its support for housing retrofits that expand accessibility for persons with disabilities, the City will undertake an action program to adopt a reasonable accommodation policy and procedures. Reasonable accommodation policies provide a formal mechanism to waive local zoning standards that might otherwise inhibit the construction of access-related architectural features. For instance, a minimum front setback of 15 feet might prohibit construction of a wheelchair ramp to provide access to a front door. By following the reasonable accommodation procedure, a property owner or resident can petition the City for waiver of the setback requirement, and can also appeal any adverse decisions by City staff.

H. Farm Workers

Farm workers are traditionally defined as persons whose primary incomes are earned through permanent or seasonal agricultural labor. Farm workers are generally considered to have special housing needs due to their limited income and the often unstable nature of their employment. Traditional leases for rental property can be a barrier for farm workers to access adequate, affordable housing. Lower incomes make it difficult for them to qualify for leases, and the mobility they require to pursue work in different regions limits makes it difficult for them to commit to typical long-term leases.

The housing needs of farm workers are many throughout the state, but in Pacifica there is little need for farmworker housing. Pacifica is an urbanized area of San Mateo County and does not have any working farms. In 2011, U.S. Census data found that only 70 residents worked in agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining. The figure increased from 23 residents in 2000, but remains a very small segment of the population.

The City has several parcels of land zoned for agriculture use, but none of those parcels are being actively used for agriculture purposes. Should agricultural employment increase during the planning period and a need for farmworker housing arise, it will be possible to accommodate the need. The City's A (Agricultural) zoning district allows ranch and farm dwellings appurtenant to the agricultural district without a Use Permit or Site Development Permit. These dwellings could house a small number of workers depending on the size of the farm. Larger agriculture operations requiring more housing,

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

such as a labor camp, could construct farmworker housing consisting of no more than 36 beds in a group quarters or 12 units or spaces designed for use by a single family or household without issuance of a Conditional Use Permit, in accordance with Health and Safety (H&S) Code Section 17021.6. Development of larger farmworker housing developments is permissible subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Site Development Permit. Within the Coastal Zone, all housing developments would require a Coastal Development Permit.

Residential zones provide another alternative for lower-cost farmworker housing. In all residential zones, farmworker housing for six or fewer employees is permissible subject to development standards applicable to other single-family housing in the same zone, in accordance with H&S Code Section 17021.6. The R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) zoning district further allows rooming houses and boarding houses for more than six farm workers upon approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Site Development Permit. Sites located within the Coastal Zone would require approval of a Coastal Development Permit for any residential development.

The City has yet to amend its zoning code to explicitly permit by-right the types of housing described in H&S Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6, but will process any application in accordance with state law. It will consider an action program amending all residential zones and the A zone to comply with these provisions.

7. Constraints Upon Housing Maintenance, Improvement, and Development

State housing element law requires local agencies to analyze actual and potential constraints upon the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels. The following section discusses governmental, nongovernmental, and environmental constraints affecting housing in Pacifica.

A. Governmental Constraints

Several actual and potential constraints upon housing maintenance, improvement, and development exist in Pacifica as a result of City regulations and procedures. They include:

- Building Codes and Improvement Fees
- Land Use Controls
- Processing and Permitting Procedures
- Growth Control Ordinance

i. Building Codes and Improvement Fees

State law requires local agencies, including the City of Pacifica, to enforce the California Building Code (CBC) and other construction-related codes when reviewing and inspecting new developments and modifications to existing developments. In addition to the minimum standards set forth in the CBC, the City has adopted minor amendments to address certain unique aspects of development in Pacifica. For example, the requirement for the installation of fire sprinkler systems was adopted in 1998 to better

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

protect life and property from fire hazards. The City has also prohibited wood shake shingle roofing due to fire hazards. Building codes, to include the CBC and local amendments, preserve the public welfare by setting standards for structural, electrical, plumbing, and environmental safety. Application of these building codes does, however, lead to increased housing costs. It takes architects, engineers, and contractors additional time to comply with detailed provisions of the codes. Code-compliant construction materials and fixtures may also have additional associated costs as compared to lesser quality items. It also takes the time of City staff to review project plans and to conduct inspections in the field to ensure compliance.

There are many tangible examples of building codes that enhance public safety but that also increase maintenance, improvement, and development costs for housing projects. One such example is that of fire sprinkler installations. All new buildings and additions to existing structures in excess of 1,000 square feet require fire sprinkler systems. These improvements can cost tens of thousands of dollars, yet provide greatly enhanced protection to life and property in the event of a fire. Another example is the California Energy Code. Energy Code requirements can increase construction costs (and the subsequent sales prices) by several dollars per square foot.

Improvement fees can also constrain maintenance, improvement, and development of housing. The most common improvement fee is the building permit fee. Building permit fees include initial review of construction plans and subsequent inspections of the work at the job site. Plan review fees are related to the floor area of projects and the number of electrical, plumbing, and other specialized fixtures installed. Inspection fees relate to the number of inspections and time spent during each inspection at an hourly rate. Simple projects, such as a 500 square foot addition of two bedrooms and a half-bathroom to a single-family residence would typically incur approximately \$3,000 in review fees and \$570 in inspection fees. Building permit fees for a small project of this sort are modest. However, cumulative fees for larger multi-family new development projects can be much higher. Total fees for a substantial multi-family residential apartment complex renovation to improve housing might also be so costly as to discourage property owner investment to enhance the housing stock. Fees are also likely to increase annually in response to increased City staff administrative costs. The City Council has mandated that staff recover actual costs of providing services to the community. During the last fiscal year, the City Council altered how staff calculated building permit fees to better align with industry standard practices, and the results was an overall increase in fees. However, Pacifica's fees are average when compared to those found in other communities in the Bay Area.

There are other improvement fees associated with maintenance, improvement, and development of housing. The Planning Department assesses fees for its review of entitlement applications, which generally precede building permit reviews and fees. Entitlement applications include major efforts, like amending the City's General Plan to allow housing or processing a subdivision or condominium map for new single-family housing. Entitlements can also be smaller, such as a Use Permit to allow an addition to a house that does not conform to the City's current zoning standards. A common entitlement in Pacifica is a Coastal Development permit, mandated by the state for many types of work within the Coastal Zone. In some areas of the Coastal Zone (the Coastal Zone Appeals Zone), additions exceeding 10 percent of existing floor area require a Coastal Development Permit.

The cost of Planning Department fees generally will not be cost prohibitive to a project. Planning Department fees relate directly to the scale of a project, with the City charging an hourly fee for actual

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

time spent working on a project. For instance, a modest-sized multi-family development project of 30 units may typically take 40 hours of staff time to complete the Planning process, not including environmental review. Planning fees would amount to \$7,200 or \$240 per dwelling unit, based on a 2014 hourly rate of \$180 per hour. Like building permit fees, Planning Department fees are subject to annual increases if administrative costs increase. However, the true cost of entitlement processing can be in the time it takes to receive an approval. Common entitlement processing can take three to four months, with larger projects sometimes taking a year or more to clear all review and appeal processes. Major delays add uncertainty and cost to housing projects, and may act to discourage pursuit of certain housing-related activities. The City maintains its annual list of user fees in Administrative Policy No. 2. An attachment to the Housing Element is the 2014-2015 Master Schedule of Fees.

Beyond basic permit review and inspection fees, the City commonly assesses fees for infrastructure or other improvements associated with development. These fees are generally described as “impact fees.” Frequently, these come in the form of off-site improvements, although sometimes developers pay fees in lieu of physical improvements. The City's requirements regarding off-site improvements vary, depending on the scale of the project or its relative location within the city.

Redevelopment or in-fill development of existing sites in some cases may incur fewer impact fees. However, the City's Complete Streets Policy, adopted in 2012, requires developers of in-fill sites to either install sidewalks, curbs, and gutters along the site frontage, or sign a deferred improvements agreement to install them at a later time. In-fill developers must install on-site utilities underground between structures and utility poles, but in most cases need not “underground” the utility poles. Larger projects (i.e. subdivisions of more than four parcels) may have to underground utility poles in addition to providing other improvements listed above.

Street construction is a major off-site improvement cost for new developments. Where a development requires new streets, the slope of the development site determines the minimum street width requirement. The wider the street, the more expensive it is to construct. In general, the steeper the slope the narrower the required street width. However, with rare exception, the City's minimum street width requirement is 22 feet.

The City's Subdivision Ordinance allows the Planning Commission to relax utility and street improvement standards where topography, probable future traffic, or other circumstances justify a lesser standard. The City Engineer may waive the requirement to underground utilities if he finds that the subdivision is within an area where previous developers had not installed underground utilities, that underground utility installation is impractical due to physical constraints, or that overhead utilities will have no significant visual impact. While the City Engineer can waive certain off-site improvements, he can also require others such as street lights, street signs, street trees, fire hydrants, and monuments. These requirements are consistent with most surrounding jurisdictions.

ii. Land Use Controls

The City of Pacifica mostly relies on two sources of authority to regulate all development, including housing – the General Plan and Zoning Code. The Land Use Element of the General Plan provides overarching guidelines for land categories and includes a map of assigned land uses. The Local Coastal Land Use Plan is a companion to the General Plan, and contains additional provisions for

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

land uses in the Coastal Zone. The Zoning Code also includes a map and contains detailed standards for development, regulating specific uses and imposing physical development standards. These development standards can impact the type and intensity of development, which can directly translate into the cost to maintain, improve, and develop housing units. In the event of any conflict, the provisions of the General Plan are controlling.

Zoning Development Standards

Table II-27 summarizes Pacifica’s residential development standards. The table includes standards for minimum lot size, minimum site area per unit, minimum setbacks, maximum height, maximum lot coverage, minimum landscaping, minimum open space, and minimum parking. The standards apply to each of the City’s residential zoning districts; different standards apply to mixed-use developments within commercial zones.

TABLE II-27

| Development Standards by Residential Zoning District | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|---|---------------|
| Standard | Zoning District | | | |
| | R-1 | R-2 | R-3 | R-3-G |
| Lot Area (min.) | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | 5,000 sq. ft. | 7,500 sq. ft. |
| Lot Area Per Dwelling Unit (min.) | 5,000 sq. ft. | 2,900 sq. ft. | 2,075 sq. ft. | 2,300 sq. ft. |
| Lot Width (min.) | 50' | 50' | 50' | 60' |
| Front Setback (min.) | 15' | 15' | 15' | 15' |
| Front Setback to Garage (min.) | 20' | 20' | 20' | 20' |
| Side Setback (min.) | 5' | 5' | 5' | 5' |
| Rear Setback (min.) | 20' | 20' | 20' | 20' |
| Maximum Lot Coverage | 40% | 50% | 60% | 50% |
| Landscaped Area (min.) | 20% | 20% | 20% | 25% |
| Usable Open Space Per Unit (min.) ¹¹ | N/A | N/A | 400 sq. ft. | 450 sq. ft. |
| Height (max.) | 35' | 35' | 35' | 35' |
| Parking Spaces (min.) | 2 covered | 2 covered | 1 per studio; 1.5 per 1 BR; 2 per 2+ BR; and, 1 guest per 4 units | Same as R-3 |

Source: Pacifica Municipal Code, Title 9, Chapter 4 “Zoning”

The City’s main residential zoning districts are the R-1 (Single-Family Residential), R-2 (Two-Family Residential), R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential), and R-3-G (Multiple-Family Residential Garden) districts. The City’s zoning regulations also permit residential development in the C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) and C-2 (Community Commercial) zoning districts. The allowable densities for residential development based on the zoning development standards range from 9 to 21 dwelling units per acre in the residential zones (R-1, R-2, R-3, and R-3-G) and up to 22 dwelling units per acre (2000 square feet of lot area per dwelling unit) in the commercial zones (C-1 and C-2).

¹¹ Usable open space shall mean common or private outdoor living, recreation, domestic use, or landscaping. Such area may be on the ground or on, a roof, porch, deck, court, or balcony.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

The development standards in each zoning district can restrict the maximum number of housing units it is possible to construct on a given site. Sometimes a trade-off is made to reduce density in order to preserve other desirable aspects of development, including open space, views, and reduced congestion. These trade-offs can increase the per-unit cost of housing. Trade-offs among zoning districts notwithstanding, the internal consistency that exists between the General Plan densities and Zoning Code standards results in a situation where it is feasible for developers to achieve maximum allowable residential densities within each respective zoning district. Furthermore, in certain cases, the Density Bonus Ordinance (discussed later) may allow density up to 50 percent beyond the basic allowance.

Listed below are various types of residential uses allowed in the City and a description of which zoning districts in which they are permitted. The lower the density of development, the higher the per-unit cost of housing.

Single-Family Residential – The Zoning Code allows single-family residential development by-right in the R-1 and R-2 districts and subject to a conditional use permit in the R-3 and R-3-G districts.

The R-1 district includes most of the City’s established neighborhoods. It allows detached single-family residential development on lots of 5,000 square feet or greater. Subject to more restrictive regulations, it is also possible to develop housing on lots of less than 5,000 square feet. The purpose of the R-1 district is to retain the low-density character of these areas and its development standards are structured accordingly.

The R-2 district encourages the development of slightly more dense, attached single-family housing that blends easily with single family neighborhoods. Minimum lot sizes are 5,000 square feet and the minimum lot area per dwelling unit is 2,900 square feet. It permits single-family detached housing on lots of 5,800 square feet or less.

In both the R-1 and R-2 districts, a Coastal Development Permit is necessary if a development is located in the Coastal Zone.

Multiple-Family Residential – The Zoning Code allows multiple-family residential development in the R-3 and R-3-G districts subject to a Site Development Permit and in the C-1 and C-2 districts subject to a Conditional Use Permit. A Coastal Development Permit is necessary if a development is located in the Coastal Zone.

Pacifica’s multi-family residential districts vary only slightly. In each one, duplexes and multi-family dwellings are permitted, while single-family detached houses are permitted with approval of a Conditional Use Permit. Multi-family residential zoning covers a significant area between the coastal bluff and Highway 1 at the north end of the city, sections of West Sharp Park, and other pockets of the city.

Most of the recent large developments in Pacifica have been within the Planned Development (P-D) zoning district. The purpose of the P-D district is to allow diversification of the relationships of various buildings, structures and open spaces in planned building groups, while ensuring substantial compliance with the district regulations and other provisions. The P-D section of the Zoning Code

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

states that development standards shall be guided by the regulations of the zoning district most similar in nature to the proposed use. In some of these cases, the R-3 development standards guided the developments. The P-D designation allowed development of these sites with more flexibility and in some cases included new parks and open space.

Parking Standards

Parking can account for a substantial share of residential development expenses. Surface parking – the least expensive parking option – can occupy large portions of a development site, rendering the underlying areas unsuitable for other development. Covered parking, especially garage parking, requires effort and expense to incorporate it into the architecture of the associated structure. Parking structures – the most expensive parking option — can allow development above or below the parking area, but require substantial engineering and construction resources.

The Zoning Code sets different parking requirements depending on the type of housing development. Single- and two-family structures have a parking requirement of two garage spaces per unit. Attached or detached garages satisfy this requirement. Multi-family structures, including apartments, townhouses, and condominiums, have parking standards that vary by the size of the units. Standards range from one parking space per studio unit to two spaces for units with two or more bedrooms. Every four units require a guest parking space. At least one of the required spaces for each unit must be in a garage or carport. A carport is less expensive to construct than a garage space, which can make a housing unit more affordable. The Zoning Code does not allow tandem parking to satisfy parking requirements except in mobile home developments, which can further add to development costs on smaller lots or those with unique design challenges. The Zoning Code does, however, allow for a reduced parking requirement for senior housing (1 space for every 2 units and 1 guest parking space for each 5 units), which can reduce the cost of senior housing development. Certain other parking requirements exist for mobile home parks, lodging and boarding houses, and projects with affordable units. The standards for each are less restrictive and assist with reducing the housing unit development costs.

Clustered Housing Standards

The Zoning Code's Residential Clustered Housing Development Standards apply to condominiums, community apartments, stock cooperatives, zero lot line projects, and similar developments. Clustered housing standards impose additional requirements onto such developments in order to ensure high-quality site design and resident amenities. Additional requirements imposed on clustered housing, but which do not automatically apply to multi-family rental housing, include minimum amounts of usable open space, private open space, building separation, laundry facilities private storage, and individual utility metering. Furthermore, every clustered housing development must undergo a discretionary review process for a Conditional Use Permit and Site Development Permit, unless the site is within the P-D zoning district (which has its own process for discretionary review). The high level of design and lengthy processing required by the clustered housing standards result in greater development costs per housing unit.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Park Dedication Fees

The City's Subdivision Ordinance requires that any subdivision of more than four (4) parcels either:

- Dedicate land for park and recreation facilities sufficient in size and topography to serve present and future needs of subdivision residents (.02 acre per unit), or
- Pay a fee in-lieu of dedication equal to the value of the land which would otherwise be dedicated.

The City uses in-lieu fees it has collected for developing new or rehabilitating existing neighborhood or community parks or recreational facilities reasonably related to serving the subdivision. Parkland dedication can add substantially to the cost of housing development. Dedication of land in the case of single-family detached dwellings can comprise as much as 15 percent of the area developed, or between 17 and 30 percent for multi-family developments.

The City's parkland dedication requirement is consistent with those of neighboring communities. This requirement is typically associated with mitigating environmental impacts of a development. If it is found that the parkland dedication requirement is impossible or impracticable in a particular case for a subdivider to conform fully to the subdivision regulations, the Planning Commission may approve a modification to the subdivision regulations. Additionally, where a substantial private park and recreational area is provided in a proposed subdivision, and the space is to be privately owned and maintained by the future residents of the subdivision as permanent open space, partial credit, not to exceed fifty percent, may be given against the requirement of land dedication or the payment of fees in lieu of dedication if the Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Commission finds that it is in the public interest to do so and certain standards are met. In addition, the Density Bonus Ordinance allows the Planning Commission to grant additional incentives if necessary to make the housing units economically feasible.

Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance

The City's Below Market Rate (Inclusionary) Program (i.e. Inclusionary Ordinance) codified in Pacifica Municipal Code Title 9, Article 47 establishes requirements for housing developers to provide housing units affordable to a range of income levels under certain circumstances. The Inclusionary Ordinance applies to all residential developments of eight or more units, lots, or parcels, including those in which eight or more units will be added to existing projects. Projects subject to the requirement must ensure at least 15 percent of all units, lots, or parcels are affordable to persons with very low, lower, or moderate income.

The Inclusionary Ordinance establishes affordability as follows:

Outside the redevelopment project area, the first required below-market rate (BMR) unit and at least 50 percent of the required BMR units shall be restricted to occupancy by lower income households and the remaining required BMR units shall be restricted to occupancy by moderate income households. Provided, the developer has the right but is not required to increase the percentage of lower income household BMR units.

The City approves sales prices and rental rates to ensure their affordability to low, lower, or moderate income individuals and families. The Inclusionary Ordinance also establishes minimum periods of

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

affordability of 45 years for ownership units and 55 years for rental units, in addition to other use restrictions. In lieu of constructing affordable units, a developer may pay a fee to the City's housing trust fund to enable housing construction by another developer at a different site. Developers providing affordable housing on-site can qualify for a density bonus and other development incentives.

Permit and Impact Fees for Two Sample Developments

In order to provide some context for prospective developers considering the development of housing in Pacifica, Table II-28 presents two sample developments that could foreseeably occur during the planning period and estimated permit and impact fees associated with them. The estimates rely on certain assumptions regarding the size and architectural details of the sample developments. Considering the number of variables inherent in any land use development, estimating permit and impact fees is challenging. Accordingly, these estimates may not be applicable to an actual development undertaken in the future. Furthermore, the estimates reflect fees set in the Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Master Schedule of Fees and Charges, which is subject to change.

TABLE II-28

| Estimated Permit and Impact Fees for Sample Developments | | |
|---|---|--|
| Fee Type | 5-unit Detached Single-Family Residential (R-1 Zone) | 20-unit Attached Multiple-Family Residential (R-3 Zone) |
| Planning Entitlement ¹² | \$7,500 | \$4,500 |
| Legal | \$10,000 | \$10,000 |
| Environmental | \$40,000 | \$40,000 |
| Building Permit | \$37,000 | \$60,500 |
| Sewer | \$15,000 | \$45,000 |
| Encroachment Permit | | |
| Park Dedication | \$35,000 | \$34,000 |
| Highway Impact | \$25,000 | \$92,000 |
| Total: | \$169,500 | \$286,000 |

The 5-unit SFR fee estimate is based on three-bedroom, 1.5 bathroom, 1,500 sq. ft. units, with an overall site area of 25,000 sq. ft. (0.574 acres). The 20-unit MFR fee estimate is based on a mix of three unit types, each with one bathroom: 5 studio units of 500 sq. ft. each; 10 one-bedroom units of 750 sq. ft. each; and, 5 two-bedroom units of 1,000 sq. ft. each. Overall site area estimated at 41,500 sq. ft. (.953 acres).

Highway Impact Fees reflect the maximum anticipated amount based on a project located North of Sharp Park Road. Projects located south of Sharp Park Road are assessed a lower fee of \$1,485 per unit, plus Oceana Boulevard trip-based fees of \$309 per estimated trip (10 trip minimum per development).

Source: Pacifica Planning Department Staff

¹² Typical entitlements required for a 5-unit detached single-family residential development include Tentative and Final Subdivision Maps and a Negative Declaration. Typical entitlements required for a 20-unit attached multiple-family residential development include a Site Development Permit and Negative Declaration. See Table II-29 for typical processing times for these permits.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

iii. Processing and Permitting Procedures

Special processing and permitting procedures required for certain types of housing projects may increase the costs of development and delay the start of construction. Even projects that may otherwise meet zoning development standards and General Plan development guidelines still must undergo special processing due to requirements established in the Zoning Code. For example, all projects within the R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) or any commercial zone require issuance of a Site Development Permit prior to authorizing construction. Furthermore, housing developments within any commercial zone require approval of a Use Permit. Typical processing times for projects of this sort are between three and eight months. Appeals to the City Council or Coastal Commission can extend that timeline further. Delays and uncertainty complicate the investment decisions of developers. For those that choose to proceed, they often must price housing units higher to account for the delays and risks they incurred to reach the construction phase.

Projects within the P-D (Planned Development) district also receive careful scrutiny through the discretionary review process. Review and approval of an overarching Development Plan is necessary for any project within the P-D (Planned Development) zone as a pre-requisite to considering more detailed plans for each parcel. After Development Plan approval, a developer must then seek approval of a Specific Plan for each structure or parcel within the Development Plan area. The only housing projects in the city that may avoid discretionary review in most cases are single-family homes and duplexes outside of the Coastal Zone. These types of housing developments are unlikely to meet the total housing demand in Pacifica given the scarcity of buildable land for these housing types and their relatively high per-unit development costs. Therefore, the bulk of the city's future housing development will undergo lengthy develop processing and permitting prior to receiving construction approvals.

The City's Zoning Code vests the Planning Commission with authority to approve, deny, or approve with conditions most developments in Pacifica. Decisions of the Planning Commission are subject to appeal to the City Council. The Planning Commission must make certain findings in order to approve each permit type. A summary of these findings for the most common permit types is below. In addition to these findings, in most cases the Planning Commission must also affirm environmental findings unique to each development site.

Site Development Permit Findings – A permit shall not be issued if the Commission finds:

1) That the location, size, and intensity of the proposed operation will create a hazardous or inconvenient vehicular or pedestrian traffic pattern, taking into account the proposed use as compared with the general character and intensity of the neighborhood;

2) That the accessibility of off-street parking areas and the relation of parking areas with respect to traffic on adjacent streets will create a hazardous or inconvenient condition to adjacent or surrounding uses;

3) That insufficient landscaped areas have been reserved for the purposes of separating or screening service and storage areas from the street and adjoining building sites,

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

breaking up large expanses of paved areas, and separating or screening parking lots from the street and adjoining building areas from paved areas to provide access from buildings to open areas;

4) That the proposed development, as set forth on the plans, will unreasonably restrict or cut out light and air on the property and on other property in the neighborhood, or will hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof;

5) That the improvement of any commercial or industrial structure, as shown on the elevations as submitted, is substantially detrimental to the character or value of an adjacent R District area;

6) That the proposed development will excessively damage or destroy natural features, including trees, shrubs, creeks, and rocks, and the natural grade of the site, except as provided in the subdivision regulations as set forth in Chapter 1 of Title 10 of this Code;

7) That there is insufficient variety in the design of the structure and grounds to avoid monotony in the external appearance;

8) That the proposed development is inconsistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines; or

9) That the proposed development is inconsistent with the General Plan, Local Coastal Plan, or other applicable laws of the City. If the proposal, however, does not have any of the impacts listed above, the Site Development Permit may be granted.

Conditional Use Permit Findings – A permit shall be issued only if the Commission finds:

1) That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use or building applied for will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City;

2) That the use or building applied for is consistent with the applicable provisions of the General Plan and other applicable laws of the City and, where applicable, the local Coastal Plan; and

3) Where applicable, that the use or building applied for is consistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines.

Development Plan Findings (P-D District) – Approval shall be granted only if the Commission finds that:

1) The proposed P-D District can be substantially completed within the time schedule submitted by the applicant;

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

2) Each unit of the development, as well as the total development, can exist as an independent development capable of creating an environment of sustained desirability and stability or adequate assurance that such objective will be attained;

3) The land uses proposed will not be detrimental to the present or potential surrounding uses but will have a beneficial effect which would not be achieved through other districts;

4) The streets and thoroughfares proposed are suitable and adequate to carry anticipated traffic, and increased densities will not generate traffic in such amounts as to overload the street network outside the P-D District;

5) Any proposed commercial development can be justified economically at the location proposed and will provide adequate commercial facilities for the area;

6) Any exception from the standard district requirement is warranted by the design of the project and amenities incorporated in the development plan;

7) The area surrounding the development can be planned and zoned in coordination and substantial compatibility with the proposed development, and the P-D District uses proposed are in conformance with the General Plan and, where applicable, the Local Coastal Plan, or that changes in the General Plan or Local Coastal Plan are justified;

8) The project is consistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines; and

9) The project is consistent with the City's General Plan and, if applicable, Local Coastal Plan.

Specific Plan Findings (P-D District) – Approval shall be granted only if the Commission finds:

1) That the specific plan is consistent with the approved development plan; and

2) That the specific plan is consistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines.

The time required to process a project varies greatly from one project to another and is directly related to the size and complexity of the proposal and the number of actions or approvals needed to complete the process. Table II-29 identifies typical entitlement processing timelines. It should be noted that each project does not necessarily have to complete each step in the process (i.e., small-scale projects consistent with General Plan and zoning designations do not generally require Environmental Impact Reports (EIR), General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, or Variances). Also, in most cases certain review and approval procedures run concurrently. For example, a review for a condominium project would be processed concurrently with the Site Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit, and Tentative Subdivision Map, as well as any necessary Variances, Parking Exceptions or other permits. Environmental review is also processed simultaneously.

TABLE II-29

| Timelines for Discretionary Permit Processing | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Permit/Approval Type | Typical Processing Time | Approval Body |
| Site Development Permit, Conditional Use Permit, Variance, Coastal Development Permit, Parking Exception | 6-8 weeks | Planning Commission |
| Zone Change | 12-24 weeks | Planning Commission/City Council |
| General Plan Amendment | 12-24 weeks | Planning Commission/City Council |
| Tentative Subdivision Map | 12-24 weeks | Planning Commission/City Council |
| General Plan Amendment | 12-24 weeks | City Council |
| Final Subdivision Map | 6-8 weeks | City Council |
| Negative Declaration | 12-30 weeks | Planning Commission/City Council |
| Environmental Impact Report | 6-18 months | Planning Commission /City Council |

Source: Pacifica Planning Department Staff

Planning Department processing fees also act as a constraint to housing maintenance, improvement, and development. The Planning Department bases its review fees on the City Council-adopted fee schedule, which for 2014-2015 established an hourly rate of \$180.00. Some projects require minimal staff review and are relatively inexpensive to process for entitlements. However, large projects – such as those requiring an environmental impact report (EIR) – require a public hearing and can take from 6 to 8 months to process, with a corresponding increase in staff time and cost. The City works closely with developers to expedite approval procedures so as not to put any unnecessary timing constraints on development. Other agencies including Public Works, Fire, Building, and Police review submittals concurrently for consistency with City ordinances, Design Guidelines and General Plan consistency.

After project approval by the Planning Commission or City Council, City permitting and processing continues during the Building Permit stage. The Building Division of the Planning Department performs plan checks and issues building permits. Throughout construction, the Building Division performs building inspections to monitor the progress of the project. Corrections needed during the plan review portion of the building permit stage, or failed inspections during the construction phase, can delay project completion. State law requires local agencies to implement plan reviews and construction site inspections to ensure compliance with the California Building Code, limiting Pacifica’s ability to mitigate this constraint.

Table II-30 lists the typical discretionary permits required for the sample developments presented in Table II-28. Certain discretionary permit requirements tend to be site specific, and will depend on site location, topography, zoning, and other factors. Thus, as with the fee estimates for these sample developments, determining the discretionary permits required for the sample developments relied on certain assumptions that may be different for an actual project.

TABLE II-30

| Discretionary Permit Requirements for Sample Developments | | |
|--|---|--|
| Permit Type | 5-unit Detached Single-Family Residential (R-1 Zone) | 20-unit Attached Multiple-Family Residential (R-3 Zone) |
| Site Development Permit | | X |
| Conditional Use Permit | | Req'd for condominium/townhome projects only |
| Coastal Development Permit | Only within Coastal Zone | Only within Coastal Zone |
| Tentative Subdivision Map | X | |
| Final Subdivision Map | X | |
| Negative Declaration | X | X |
| Environmental Impact Report | | |
| Total Review Time: | 6-8 months | 6-8 months |

The 5-unit SFR permit estimate is based on an development site comprised of a single 25,000 sq. ft. (0.574 acres) parcel requiring subdivision. The 20-unit MFR permit estimate is based on an apartment project on a single 41,500 sq. ft. (.953 acres) parcel not requiring subdivision. Neither site is within the Coastal Zone, nor within a wetlands or other highly sensitive area for environmental purposes, nor requiring a deviation from any development standards (variance or parking exception).

Source: Pacifica Planning Department Staff

Second Units

Construction of second dwelling units in conjunction with existing single-family detached residential structures is an important way to expand the City’s housing stock. It can benefit property owners with additional income, or allow them to care for a family member that needs to be close to care, but still desires some independence. Pacifica’s zoning regulations allow construction of second units in many situations within the R-1 zoning district subject only to issuance of a building permit, in accordance with state law. Government Code Section 65852.2(a) allows a local agency to establish regulations for construction of second units. The City of Pacifica has adopted regulations that impose certain limited restrictions on second unit construction.

Pacifica’s ordinance allows second units only within the R-1 district. In the R-1 district, the ordinance limits by-right construction of second units to lots in full conformance to development standards. It further limits the density of second units to no more than 25 percent of lots on any block. Additional development standards and density limitations exist, as provided in Pacifica Municipal Code Section 9-4.453. The City’s current ordinance requires more than one parking space for a second unit; prohibits the use of tandem parking spaces to meet the minimum parking requirements; and prohibits locating a required parking space for a second unit within a required front yard setback. These provisions are inconsistent with state law, and the City has included an action program in this housing element to adopt a revised ordinance to comply with the Government Code.

iv. Growth Control Ordinance

In January 1982, the Pacifica City Council adopted Ordinance No. 322-C.S., an initiative ordinance known as the “Growth Control Ordinance” which provided for controlled residential growth through 1992. A series of ordinances have extended growth control policies to present day. The current

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

ordinance controlling growth in Pacifica is set to terminate on June 30, 2017. The purpose of the Growth Control Ordinance (GCO) is to manage the timing of residential growth in Pacifica so that development does not outpace the City's ability to provide essential services and infrastructure to support the growth. The Ordinance does not place a cap on residential development. The GCO contains findings concerning adverse effects of rapid residential growth in Pacifica and, as a result, limits new dwelling units to a maximum of 70 units annually. To ensure an equitable distribution of units and to encourage in-fill, the GCO provides that no applicant for development approval shall receive greater than 20% of the annual allotment each year.

There are a number of factors that determine actual development allocations under the GCO. Since enactment, the City has interpreted the GCO to allow accumulation of unallocated units for development in subsequent years. As of December 2014, the balance of units available for allocation was 1,415, resulting from a large number of unused development applications in recent years. A single housing developer could propose a project at any time for up to 283 housing units, or 20 percent of the available allocations. There are also a number of exclusions from the annual development limitations. These include one single-family dwelling unit on an individual existing lot; affordable, senior, or accessible dwelling units; second units; any statutory housing programs which are excluded from growth controls limitations; and any future amendments to the Growth Control Ordinance. At the beginning of fiscal year 2008-2009, there were 1067 allocations available. As of July 2010, a balance of 1,144 permits remained. An excess of permits (over the 70 units allotted per year) has accumulated due to a carry-over of unused permits from previous years.

The GCO provides for a competitive evaluation system to distribute development allocations. The competitive allocation procedure includes criteria and a ranking process. Criteria include, but are not limited to, the following: ability of public facilities, utilities and services to meet the demands created by the project; presence or absence of adverse environmental impacts; site and architectural design quality; the provision of private or public usable open space; consistency with neighborhood character; and, provision of affordable housing, senior housing and housing for persons with disabilities. Low and moderate income projects receive preferential ranking. The Planning Commission must consider each application for a residential development allocation at a public meeting and evaluate and rank the applications according to these criteria. The Planning Commission recommendations are forwarded to the City Council for review and approval. At the public hearing, the City Council must consider the Planning Commission's recommendations and ranking. The City Council then adopts a final ranking list and award residential development allocations pursuant to that list. The City Council may adopt, reject or modify the recommendations and ranking of the Planning Commission.

To permit phasing of multi-unit projects, where such projects exceed the available annual allotment of residential development allocations, the allocation procedure includes a procedure for the phasing of such projects over more than one fiscal year by reservation of succeeding year allotments. Such reservations can be deducted from the number of residential development allocations to be awarded for the fiscal year under consideration. When the number of available residential development allocations exceeds demand for the allocations, the City Council may issue the allocations on an "as needed basis" (i.e., without following the competitive evaluation system process) throughout the year.

The GCO also provides that property zoned A (Agricultural) or HPD (Hillside Preservation) district may not be rezoned out of agriculture or hillside preservation uses without a vote of the people. The

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

purpose of retaining agricultural zoning is to prevent premature conversion of agricultural land to urban uses, to prevent urban sprawl, and to conserve coastal and open space resources upon which Pacifica's economy depends. The purpose of retaining hillside areas is to protect against potentially hazardous conditions peculiar to hillsides, to ensure development compatible with Pacifica's hillside resources, to preserve open space, and to retain natural terrain by encouraging the concentration of dwelling within developed areas of the city.

The GCO in its current state is not constraining housing maintenance, improvement, or development. Several large developments could occur simultaneously before depleting the existing balance of housing unit allocations. However, should several years of strong residential development occur during the planning period, it is possible the GCO could constrain housing development in the mid- to long-term, especially for larger mixed-use developments with many units. Developments of this sort are essential to meeting Pacifica's housing needs, especially for affordable housing units for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income families, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

B. Nongovernmental Constraints

Many nongovernmental factors can constrain the maintenance, improvement, and construction of housing. Factors include access to financing, costs of land and construction, and community opposition.

i. Availability of Financing

Housing prices continue to recover from the devastating economic downturn that occurred during the Great Recession starting in 2007. The median sales price of a single-family detached home in 2007 was \$841,860, while in 2012 it was down to \$535,846 (in 2013 dollars). The median sales price for a single-family attached home was similarly depressed, falling from \$589,120 in 2007 to \$314,363 in 2012. Falling housing prices makes access to financing for purchases more difficult for home buyers. Lenders face uncertainty about the future value of the property serving as collateral for the loans, and as a result are less likely to lend to prospective purchasers. This limits the ability of purchasers, especially those with lower incomes or imperfect credit histories, to pursue home ownership. When individuals and families are unable to access financing to purchase homes, residential developers in turn are less likely to pursue permits for housing developments. The cycle results in fewer home ownership opportunities for Pacificans.

Limited access to financing not only affects home buyers and residential developers, but it also affects existing owners seeking to maintain or improve their housing. Financing plays an important role in funding additions to accommodate growing families or aging family members. It also helps with renovations and upgrades to beautify or improve energy efficiency of the housing stock.

Unfortunately, the City of Pacifica can do little to affect the mortgage lending market. Until mid-2008, home mortgage financing was readily available at attractive rates throughout San Mateo County and California. Rates varied, but ranged from 6.25 percent to 7 percent from 2006-2008 for a 30 year fixed rate loan (HSH Associates Financial Publishers).¹³ Starting in late-2008, it became difficult to obtain a home purchase loan, even though the average interest rate had fallen to around 5 percent. In

¹³Source: San Mateo County Department of Housing and Baird + Driskell Community Planning.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

particular, people with short credit histories, lower incomes, or self-employment incomes, or those with other unusual circumstances, have had trouble qualifying for a loan or were charged higher interest rates.

Small changes in the interest rate for home purchases can dramatically affect affordability. A 30-year home loan for \$400,000 at 5 percent interest would result in monthly payments of roughly \$2,150. A similar home loan at 7 percent interest would result in payments of roughly \$2660, an increase of more than 20 percent.

Many builders have also struggled recently to find construction loans for residential properties. Complicated projects, like mixed-use developments, are often the hardest to finance. Nonprofit developers find it especially difficult to secure funding from the private sector. In past years, lenders would provide up to 80 percent of the cost of new construction. Yet in recent years, due to market conditions and government regulations, banks require larger investments by builders. All of these factors combine to constrain residential development in Pacifica.

ii. Land Costs

The cost of land is one of the most basic elements of housing development. The more expensive the underlying land, the more expensive the resulting units for prospective purchasers or renters. Opinions vary as to the relative importance of land costs in contributing to housing price increases, although the price of land undoubtedly plays a major role.¹⁴ For example, in 1990 a standard size (5,000 square feet) vacant infill lot in Pacifica, zoned for residential use, sold for \$150,000 to \$175,000 (in 2013 dollars). In 2001, a similar lot sold for \$165,000 to \$295,000 (in 2013 dollars). In 2009 a standard lot for residential use sold for \$325,000 to \$540,000 (in 2013 dollars).¹⁵ Prices have moderated for some inland lots, with several selling for approximately \$155,000 in 2014. Still, land prices in Pacifica are high, equating to well over a \$1,000,000 per acre based on recent sales data. It is difficult to estimate the cost of land zoned for multi-family residential development since so few vacant sites exist. However, an estimate of \$107,000 to 200,000 per unit is generally considered satisfactory.¹⁶

iii. Construction Costs

According to the Pacifica Building Division, in 2014 the cost of developing a 2,000 square foot single-family residence in Pacifica ranged from \$180 to \$220 per square foot, including the price of land. Construction costs for multi-family developments ranged from \$150 to \$200 per square foot. Costs vary depending upon the type of construction, building materials, and quality of finishes. Soft costs, such as architectural and engineering services, development fees, etc., usually comprise an additional 10 to 15 percent of the construction and land costs. The City attempts to mitigate the cost of construction of affordable rental and ownership housing through granting density bonuses and allowing second residential units.

¹⁴Schwartz, Seymour and Johnson, Robert, Local Government Initiatives for Affordable Housing, U.C. Davis, 1981.

¹⁵Estimate based on August 2009 MLS listings.

¹⁶Estimate based on August 2009MLS listings.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

iv. Community Opposition

Community opposition can be a significant obstacle to obtaining approvals for new housing developments. Traffic, parking, and/or visual impacts are usually the greatest concerns of residents opposed to new developments. Among the visual impacts that are most sensitive in Pacifica is the concept of “private open space.” Many residents have become accustomed to certain privately-owned properties in their neighborhoods remaining undeveloped for many years. These undeveloped properties have served as open space for them, and there is a perception they will remain indefinitely in this state. However, these properties are owned by private individuals who may have expectations of development and corresponding financial returns. When owners finally unveil development plans, resident opposition can be fierce. Affordable housing developments also elicit community concerns about crime and property values. Residents can exert significant political pressure on the elected City Council to oppose developments on vacant land or affordable housing developments. Unknown likelihood of approval or a bruising public engagement process that could tarnish a developer’s reputation can discourage new developments in these circumstances. The City can strive to provide accurate information on all aspects of new developments, but cannot always satisfy resident concerns and quell community opposition.

C. Other Constraints

Pacifica has two constraints to development which are not governmental or nongovernmental limitations. They include geologic hazards and highway capacity.

i. Geological Hazards

In January 1982, Pacifica experienced widespread and severe landslides and flooding which caused loss of life and significant property damage. These events caused Pacifica to undertake a new approach to development, including instituting a new geological review process and retaining an independent engineering and geology firm to review all hillside projects. According to Pacifica's geotechnical consultant, slope stability has been overrated in the past in Pacifica, and standards used to evaluate hillside development must be reassessed and strengthened. Pacifica's Seismic and Safety Element (adopted in September 1983) addressed and assessed these geologic events.

Pacifica also experienced coastal bluff retreat of approximately 75 feet in some areas as a result of winter storms during 1983 and 2009. Areas previously considered stable were undercut, houses and trailers were damaged, destroyed, or had to be relocated further inland. Coastal bluff retreat continued throughout 2014 in the northwest section of the City west of Esplanade Avenue. Several apartment buildings have been deemed uninhabitable, and another is at risk of becoming uninhabitable if bluff retreat continues. City staff continues to encourage property owners to implement mitigation measures to prevent the loss of valuable rental housing stock and to restore habitability to those units already lost.

The City now recognizes that geologic hazard mitigation will be required in many areas of Pacifica. This may affect the timing, location, and intensity of future development. For example, geologic studies of some bluff top properties may result in lowered densities by reducing the amount of net developable acreage. Additionally, densities on inland sloping properties may be affected where geologic studies indicate that the revenue produced by locating units to achieve maximum densities

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

does not justify the cost of providing engineering solutions sufficient to achieve those densities. In these cases, hazard avoidance may be the only acceptable mitigation measure because mitigation of both on- and off-site geotechnical hazards is a requirement of project approval or building permit issuance.

Pacifica expects that mitigation of existing and potential geologic hazards will, to some extent, reduce its growth rate; however, this effect cannot be quantified at this time, since these constraints are to some extent site specific. It is possible that land use designations may be revised to reflect changed conditions and policies, and this, too, may constrain Pacifica's future housing development potential.

ii. Highway Capacity

The primary north-south traffic corridor to, from, and through Pacifica is State Highway 1. The roadway is also known as Coast Highway and Cabrillo Highway. In 1978, Caltrans noted that considerable vehicular and pedestrian traffic was present (Report of Engineering and Traffic Survey - March 31, 1978). Studies prepared in 1979 (Mori Point Project and Rockaway Beach Condominiums Draft Environmental Impact Reports) indicated that service at critical intersections was at or below Level of Service (LOS) D. Roadway operation at LOS D results in unstable flow and tolerable delays. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for each anticipated development concluded that without mitigation, roadway operation would drop to LOS E and possibly LOS F (unacceptable and intolerable congestion and delays).

The 1985 Rockaway Beach Redevelopment Plan EIR indicated that the Highway 1/Reina Del Mar intersection operated at LOS E and F during both A.M. and P.M. peak hours. While the Highway 1/Fassler Avenue intersection operated at LOS E in the A.M. peak hour and LOS C in the P.M. peak hour, the EIR also described alternative Highway 1 improvement options to improve roadway operations.

More recent traffic studies and impact analyses along Highway 1 between Reina Del Mar and Fassler Avenue confirmed that the level of service at the Highway 1/Reina Del Mar intersection operated at LOS F during A.M. and P.M. peak hours while the Highway 1/Fassler Avenue intersection operated at LOS F in the A.M. peak hour and LOS C in the P.M. peak hour. The City has long held that LOS C (stable flow, acceptable delay) or better is a satisfactory level of service for Highway 1 and facilitates movement and commerce while preserving public safety.

In response to the ongoing peak hour congestion on Highway 1, Caltrans has proposed highway widening improvements between Westport Drive and Fassler Avenue. Known as the "Calera Parkway Project," it would (if ultimately constructed) add a third lane for both northbound and southbound traffic along Highway 1 between the intersection with Reina Del Mar and the intersection with Fassler Avenue. Caltrans expects the project would improve peak hour traffic level of service to LOS C from the current LOS F. Construction of the project is not a certainty, however. In mid-2013, opponents of the highway widening challenged Caltrans's Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project in Superior Court. After conclusion of the trial, the Superior Court took no action to stop the project, and instead issued a ruling rejecting the petitioners' claims on March 10, 2015. Despite the Court's ruling to allow Caltrans to continue preparations for the project, the agency has yet to obtain approval of all required permits for the Calera Parkway Project. Whether the Calera Parkway Project is eventually

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

constructed or not, the City should still identify the constraint that traffic flow on Highway 1 may pose to future housing development.

Another important roadway within Pacifica is Sharp Park Road. Sharp Park Road is the city's major east-west thoroughfare, handling approximately half of the total peak hour trips leaving Pacifica each day. Drivers exit Highway 1 at Sharp Park Road to drive towards South San Francisco, San Bruno, and other Peninsula cities along Skyline Boulevard or Interstate 280. The remainder of trips continue northbound on Highway 1 to San Francisco or the East Bay via Interstate 280. In the fall of 1990 the reconstruction of lower Sharp Park Road commenced. Construction lasted for one year and was reopened in 1991. This new section of Sharp Park Road now has 2 lanes for both westbound and eastbound traffic directions. The improvement resulted in a roadway with greater capacity that is less winding and safer to travel due to a new concrete median barrier. However, severe slopes along the roadway limit opportunities for future widening, and this could be a major constraint on housing development.

D. Mitigation of Constraints

The City has a strong interest in mitigating constraints on the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing. Its residents need adequate and affordable housing options so persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes can pursue their livelihoods and care for their families. Quality housing development can strengthen the community and the economy, enhancing the already desirable character of Pacifica. The summary below addresses the City's attempts to mitigate the constraints identified above. Some constraints are extremely difficult to mitigate, but the City will continue to consider ways to promote appropriate housing development.

i. Governmental Constraints

Land Use Controls

Exemptions from Standards

Pacific's Zoning Code contains provisions that allow relief from the strict application of development standards. Allowing flexibility for developers can result in lower construction expenses or higher densities, which lead to more housing units affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes. In extreme cases, relaxing a particular requirement can mean the difference between pursuing project approvals and abandoning a housing development altogether.

The Planning Director, acting as the Zoning Administrator, may grant Minor Modifications to standards governing area, yard requirements, distance between buildings, lot coverage, fence/wall height, and off-street parking. Modifications approved by the Zoning Administrator may not exceed 20 percent of the respective standards, except in the case of off-street parking, where a reduction of one space is allowable.

When circumstances warrant a greater departure from development standards, the City may grant a permit known as a Variance. A Variance authorizes any deviation from zoning regulations the

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Planning Commission finds is necessary to allow a property owner to enjoy the same privileges enjoyed by other owners with similarly situated property. The main limitation to a Variance is that it may not authorize a use not permitted by the zoning of the subject site.

The Planning Commission may grant a Variance only if it finds:

1) That because of special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, the strict application of the provisions of this chapter deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under an identical zoning classification;

2) That the granting of such variance will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the subject property and will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the area;

3) Where applicable, that the application is consistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines; and

4) If located in the Coastal Zone, that the application is consistent with the applicable provisions of the Local Coastal Plan.

Definition of "Family"

The term "single-family residential" can be confusing or misleading in some cases. In the traditional sense a family includes members such as parents, their children, and perhaps an elderly relative for whom the family provides care. The City's Zoning Code does not define a family in these same terms, however. The City has a more flexible definition that respects different associations of individuals, whether related by blood or not, that choose to live with one another.

The Zoning Code defines "family" as "one or more persons occupying a premises and living as a single housekeeping unit, as distinguished from a group occupying a hotel, club, or fraternity or sorority house. A family shall be deemed to include necessary servants." Pacifica's definition of family does not discriminate against unrelated individuals living within a single dwelling unit, whether in a single-family or multi-family residential development. The only requirement to qualify as a "family" is that the individuals living together must function as a single housekeeping unit. Generally, this means cooking and sharing meals in a common kitchen as well as sharing other housing-related expenses with one another (i.e. utility bills, insurance, groceries). Pacifica's definition of "family" provides flexibility to those seeking adequate, affordable housing. These persons can safely and lawfully form a household with unrelated persons in order to share housing-related expenses.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

ii. Nongovernmental Constraints

Land & Construction Costs

Allowances for Residential Uses in Commercial Zoning Districts

Most of the City's future housing development potential lays in commercially-zoned sites. The days of large tract housing development on vacant sites are over in Pacifica. The few remaining vacant sites zoned for residential development are small, fragmented, and often have geological challenges to development. Therefore, it is important to consider commercial sites for their ability to meet Pacifica's future housing need.

The City permits housing development in several commercial zones, most notably the C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) and C-2 (Community Commercial) zones. Residential development in commercial districts must have a mixed-use configuration with residential uses above ground floor commercial spaces. Approval of mixed-use housing developments is not by-right, but is subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Site Development Permit. Table II-31 indicates the development standards for residential uses in the City's main commercial zones. For clarity in presentation below, the table will only display standards for the C-1 and C-2 districts. The Zoning Code applies standards from the C-1 district to developments in the C-1-A district and from the C-2 district to developments within the C-R and O districts.

TABLE II-31

| Allowances for Housing in Commercial Districts | |
|---|---|
| | Zoning District |
| Standard | C-1 & C-2 |
| Lot Area (min.) | 5,000 sq. ft. |
| Lot Area Per Dwelling Unit (min.) | 2,000 sq. ft. |
| Lot Width (min.) | 50' |
| Setbacks (min.) | None, unless req'd by Site Development Permit |
| Maximum Lot Coverage | None |
| Landscaped Area (min.) | 10% |
| Usable Open Space Per Unit (min.) ¹⁷ | 450 sq. ft. |
| Height (max.) | 35' |
| Parking Spaces (min.) | 1 per studio; 1.5 per 1 BR; 2 per 2+ BR; and, 1 guest per 4 units |

Source: Pacifica Municipal Code, Title 9, Chapter 4 "Zoning"

Development standards in commercial zones are generally favorable to mixed-use (residential and commercial) development. These commercial zones have no front, side, or rear setbacks, no floor area ratio limitations, and no lot coverage limits. The flexibility inherent in these regulations create larger developable areas than comparably sized residential sites, helping to mitigate land costs, construction costs, and delays associated with processing and permitting. Larger developable sites

¹⁷ Usable open space shall mean common or private outdoor living, recreation, domestic use, or landscaping. Such area may be on the ground or on, a roof, porch, deck, court, or balcony.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

result in greater density, which in turn reduces the per-unit cost of development and ultimately can make housing more affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes.

In terms of parking, multi-family units in mixed use projects are subject to the same requirements that apply to other multi-family dwellings. The requirements are cumulatively added to the requirements for the commercial portions of the project to determine the total number of spaces needed. In certain cases, the Planning Commission can grant a lower parking requirement if a developer can show the characteristics of uses within a development can offset parking demands from one another. For instance, certain commercial uses may have large parking requirements during business hours when many residents are away from the site at work. Correspondingly, during evening hours the residential use has a large parking demand while most businesses are closed.

Combined, the favorable treatment of mixed-use housing developments in commercial zones mitigates the constraints of land and construction costs. Given that the City is relying on commercial sites to accommodate housing, the City will encourage and facilitate residential development on commercial sites (mixed-use) for lower-income households.

Density Bonus Ordinance

The Density Bonus Ordinance, adopted in April 1984, offers the incentive of increased density and flexibility in development standards in exchange for housing which will meet the City's need to provide ownership and rental housing affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes. Multi-family residential projects can exceed their maximum density, reduce unit floor area, or provide less parking, if provision is made for rental housing, affordable housing, or housing for the elderly or persons with disabilities. The amount of the density bonus ranges from 15 percent for rental housing (including market rate projects) to 50 percent for housing affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes, elderly persons, or persons with disabilities. The Density Bonus Ordinance ensures the continued availability of housing granted a density bonus by requiring deed restrictions or other legal arrangements on properties so developed.

Higher housing density combined with relaxed floor area and parking requirements allows developers to mitigate the constraints imposed by land and construction costs. Lower per-unit costs of construction can result in lower per-unit sales costs or rental rates, making housing more affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes. An added advantage of the Density Bonus Ordinance is that it provides the greatest bonus for providing housing to the neediest groups: those with extremely low, very low, and low incomes, and seniors or persons with disabilities.

Pacifica's Density Bonus Ordinance requires certain revisions to remain consistent with state law, and the City will undertake an action program to initiate the amendment.

Manufactured Housing

The City's development standards allow construction of manufactured housing in any zoning district that permits single-family dwellings. The R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoning district permits single-family dwellings by-right, and a property owner or developer can construct manufactured housing without undergoing discretionary review. In the R-2 (Two-Family Residential) and R-3

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

(Multiple-Family Residential) zoning districts, single-family dwellings – including manufactured housing – require a Use Permit.

The City enacted its Manufactured Housing Ordinance in January 1982. A manufactured house is a structure comprising two or more modules, including mobile homes, which is manufactured off-site and later assembled or installed on a property. Manufactured housing, by virtue of being mass-produced, can be significantly less expensive to develop and to purchase than traditional single-family structures. The design of manufactured housing has improved greatly in recent years, and is a viable option for many lower-income residents. The City's main requirement for manufactured housing is that it meets all California Building Code requirements so that the housing is safe.

Community Opposition

Study Sessions

The City offers study sessions to developers seeking to gauge community and Planning Commission receptiveness to various development proposals. Ahead of a study session, the City sends notices to property owners within 300 feet of a potential development site and holds a public meeting hosted by the Planning Commission. Commissioners, members of the public, and City staff have an opportunity to discuss details of the project in an informal setting. Developers can then build on feedback to revise their development proposals before investing substantial time in finalizing detailed plans.

Offering study sessions allows the City to help developers minimize review time and associated costs by identifying major issues prior to formal application processing. Study sessions fees for commercial projects are refundable if a developer pursues to final building permit inspection the entitlements covered in the study session. For mixed-use projects including housing, the fee refunded is proportional to the amount of the project dedicated to commercial use.

iii. Other Constraints

Highway Capacity

Collection of Improvement Fees

Pacifica has established special funds for the deposit of impact fees to assist in the construction of needed improvements to meet or approach LOS C. Developers of residential projects must contribute a per-unit fee according to the location of their projects within the City. The primary impact area south of Westport Drive in the Fairway Park neighborhood requires relatively higher contributions per unit than the secondary impact area to the north. The fee schedule has been established because the majority of improvements will be necessary along the southern stretch of the highway. Until traffic flow along Highway 1 improves – either by roadway widening or other improvements – the City intends to control the timing of residential development through its Growth Control Ordinance.

8. Affordable Units at Risk

A potential threat to existing housing units affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes is the termination of rental contracts by owners of properties subject to federal subsidy programs. Such contracts may be terminated through cancellation of a Section 8 contract ("opting out") after a certain number of years, or early pay-off of the interest loan after 20 years ("pre-payment"). Project owners who opt-out or pre-pay their rental contracts are free to rent at market rate or, with City approval, may convert rental units to condominiums or a nonhousing use.

The following analysis complies with Section 65583 of the Government Code, which requires that cities analyze and develop programs to preserve assisted housing developments:

A. Inventory of Units At-Risk of Losing Use Restrictions.

i. Period of Analysis

This analysis includes the ten-year period between July 2015 and June 2025.

a. July 2015 – June 2025

Pacifica has only one project subject to risk of losing use restrictions during this ten-year period. Relevant project information is provided below.

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Name and Address: | Casa Pacifica 1060 Terra Nova Boulevard |
| Type of Assistance Received: | HUD Sec. 221(D)(3) <u>Market Rate Interest Program</u> |
| Earliest Date of Possible Change From Low-Income Use: | January 10, 2020 (Opt-out Date) |
| Number of Elderly and Non-Elderly Units: | Elderly: 101 Non-Elderly: 1 Elderly units are assisted by the Section 8 New Construction rental Assistance Program. |
| Bedroom Mix: | All units are one (1) bedroom |
| Building Age: | Approximately 40 years old |
| Building Condition: | Good - No rehabilitation necessary |

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

How Units are at Risk: The owner has already renewed the Section 8 which was due on January 30, 2015. If the owner fails to renew its Section 8 participation by January 30, 2020, the project could lose its low-income use restrictions. The project could then be "converted" to market rate units. One-bedroom units rented for \$2,021 per month in 2015, an increase from \$1,292 per month in 2014. The substantial increase reduced market pressure for the owner to discontinue participation in the Section 8 program. However, if annual increases allowed by HUD do not keep pace with market rates over the term of participation, the owner may at some point feel financial pressure to pursue greater financial returns.

Factors Which May Eliminate or Reduce Risk:

1. Should the owner decide to "opt-out" of the Section 8 contract, this action would be subject to provisions of federal and state law designed to minimize hardship for the project's tenants.
2. The owner has had renewal options in the past (1987, 1992, 1997, 2005, 2010, 2015) and has always renewed.
3. An "opt-out" is only valid if a one-year notice is provided, allowing time to develop a strategy for preservation of units affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes.
4. The Casa Pacifica project includes a condition of approval making the Use Permit valid only for a multi-family senior housing complex. Should the owner attempt to convert the project to non-senior housing, it would require a new Use Permit from the City. However, the condition of approval does not require that the owner maintains the units for low-income occupancy.
5. The City also granted the Casa Pacifica project a Variance from the required number of parking spaces on the condition that the property is used solely as residential housing for seniors. Should the owner attempt to convert the project to non-senior housing, the Variance would no longer be valid and the parking would have to meet current standards. Alternatively, the property owner could request a new Variance. However, the condition of approval does not require that the owner maintains the units for low-income occupancy.

No other projects are "at risk" during this ten-year period.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

B. Cost Analysis of Preserving Versus Replacing At-Risk Units

- i. Cost to Replace
It is estimated that replacing the Casa Pacifica units would cost approximately \$14,962,967 (\$150 per square foot plus \$50,000 per unit).
- ii. Cost to Preserve
It is estimated that the cost to preserve the units would be substantially less than to replace due to the cost and scarcity of developable land and increased construction costs.

C. Resources for Preservation

- i. Public Agency and Nonprofit Housing Corporations Listed below are agencies that have the ability to assist in preserving the Casa Pacifica project.

- City of Pacifica
170 Santa Maria Avenue
Pacifica, CA 94044
(650) 738-7300
- Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition
303 Vintage Park Drive
Foster City, CA 94404
(650) 356-2900
- National Church Residences
2335 North Bank Drive
Columbus, OH 43220
(800) 388-2151
- BRIDGE Housing
600 California Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 989-1111

- ii. Public Financing and Subsidy Programs
Listed below are financing and subsidy programs that could be used to preserve the Casa Pacifica project for low-income use.

- Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) funds for the purpose of preserving low-income housing.

The City does not currently receive any CDBG funds for the purpose of preserving low-income housing.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

- Administrative fees (reserves) of any housing authority operating within the community.

There is no local housing authority operating within Pacifica.

- Pacifica Housing Fund

The City has limited financial resources that in some instances may assist with preservation of senior housing units. The primary source of funding for affordable housing development or preservation in the future is expected to be the City's in lieu housing fee. The City adopted an inclusionary zoning ordinance in April 2007 which contains a provision allowing developers to pay an amount of money "in lieu" of constructing an affordable unit. The in-lieu payment for each below market rate unit (BMR) shall reflect the estimated cost to provide the BMR unit.

D. Other Projects

Three other projects in Pacifica offer subsidized low-income housing for seniors. The Ocean View Apartments at 555 Crespi Drive are entirely occupied by seniors receiving Section 8 rental assistance. However, the owners of the project (National Church Residences) have already fulfilled their mortgage obligations, and the City is not required to analyze the "at-risk" potential of the project. National Church Residences has previously expressed its commitment to continuing Section 8 rentals at the site. Nevertheless, the City should continue to monitor the status of the Ocean View Apartments. As with the Casa Pacifica project, the City granted a Parking Variance to the Ocean View project on the condition that the project remains senior housing, and the Variance will become "null and void" if converted to market rate housing (and the site will require additional parking). This condition will encourage the maintenance of senior housing at the Ocean View project. If necessary, the City could use the resources noted above to help preserve the project for low-income use. In 2015, BRIDGE Housing was in the process of purchasing the project from National Church Residences. BRIDGE Housing is a non-profit affordable housing development and property management organization.

Another project for low-income seniors in Pacifica is the Pacific Oaks project at 750 Oddstad Boulevard. The covenants, conditions, and restrictions for Pacific Oaks run with the life of the project, and no preservation efforts by the City are necessary.

The Good Shepherd Senior Housing project has added an additional 42 units for the elderly population of Pacifica. The Good Shepherd project is located at 901 Oceana Boulevard and has restrictions protecting the status of the units as senior housing. No preservation efforts by the City are necessary.

9. Opportunities for Energy Conservation

In December 2013, the City of Pacifica adopted the state Green Building Standards Code in California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11. These standards, more commonly known as the "Green Building Code," regulate many aspects of construction to reduce the impacts of buildings on the environment. The City's regulations are in conformance to statewide standards.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

There are several benefits of green building:

Environmental benefits

- **Reduces use of natural resources**

Health and safety benefits

- **Enhances occupant comfort and health, as well as that of the greater community**

Community benefits

- **Minimizes strain on local infrastructure, improves the quality of the building stock, and extends the useful life of structure**

Economic benefits

- **Improves the bottom line for owners, building professionals, and the community**

Prior to its adoption of statewide standards, in May 2008, the City of Pacifica created a Citizens' Green Building Task Force to provide a forum for development of "green building" regulations. The City thereafter developed and adopted its own Green Building Ordinance in late-2010. The City also adopted a Climate Action Plan in 2014 which identifies strategies to reduce energy consumption, thereby reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The City of Pacifica has demonstrated a strong commitment to pursuing energy conservation in the built environment.

(Continued on Next Page)

III. LAND INVENTORY

1. Purpose

State housing law (Government Code Section 65583(a)(3)) calls for "an inventory of land suitable for residential development, including vacant sites and sites having potential for redevelopment and an analysis of the relationship of zoning and public services to these sites." In 2009, a City consultant completed a survey of vacant or undeveloped sites. These sites were identified by field surveys, aerial photographs, and County Assessor data. Despite being five years old, the survey remains valid due to the low-level of residential development in Pacifica during the interceding period. Furthermore, no zoning changes with significance for housing development have occurred. Based on an updated review of the survey in 2015, the City has concluded that sufficient land exists to accommodate residential development within the eight-year planning period covered by this Housing Element update.

The following section summarizes the survey results and identifies sites in Pacifica where development of housing can occur within the current housing element planning period. More detailed site specific information is available in the "Pacifica General Plan Existing Conditions and Key Issues" report from July 2010.

2. Sites Available Within the Eight-Year Planning Period

The land identified in the survey is designated in the Land Use Element of the General Plan for residential or mixed-use (commercial/residential) development, and public services are available to all the sites. For the eight-year planning period covered by this Housing Element, the 2009 survey referenced above indicated that adequate land is available for Pacifica to meet its regional housing needs. Many of the sites are easily served with utilities and roads, are close to community services and shopping, have no major physical hazards, would be consistent with adjoining development, and are zoned for residential development. These sites can also accommodate housing for all income levels. For a discussion of farm worker housing, see Section II.6.H.

It should be noted that the survey did not include second unit potential or density bonuses. Significant variability in the factors contributing to eligibility and suitability for second units and density bonuses made such analysis infeasible. Therefore, the potential number of new units presented for each site could be higher than the range of units presented in the survey.

At the time of adoption of the 2015-2023 Housing Element, the City was in the process of updating its General Plan, including the Land Use Element. Some General Plan land use designations affecting housing may change if the City Council adopts the draft Land Use Element of the General Plan in its current form. Notably, the residential component permissible in all "Commercial" designations in the current General Plan may be consolidated within new mixed use designations in the draft Land Use Element of the General Plan. The result would be that housing would be allowed in fewer areas of the city but at higher densities. In order to circumvent the need to amend the Housing Element after adoption of a new Land Use Element, the Housing Element contains two maps and two tables of potential housing development sites. The first map/table set identifies sites suitable for housing

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

development under the current Land Use Element of the General Plan, adopted in 1980. The second map/table set identifies sites suitable for housing development under the draft Land Use Element of the General Plan if it is adopted in its current form (March 2014 version). The City will take appropriate steps to ensure General Plan consistency and RHNA accommodation within the Housing Element if there are any changes to the draft Land Use Element of the General Plan that affect the housing sites identified below.

Figure III-1 displays the locations of potential housing sites suitable under the current Land Use Element of the General Plan, and Table III-1 summarizes site-specific details pertaining to the development potential of these sites. The City has identified sites capable of accommodating 434 housing units.


(Continued on Next Page)

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023



FIGURE III-1

POTENTIAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SITES:
1980 GENERAL PLAN



City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

TABLE III-1

Potential Housing Development Sites – Current General Plan¹⁸

| Site | APN | Location/ Condition | Zoning | General Plan Designation | Lot Area (Acres) | Allowable Density | Allowable Units (#) | Existing Use |
|-------------|--|--|---------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | 009-412-060 | Hack's Auto Body/Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .230 | 21.8 du per acre | 5 | Commercial |
| 2 | 009-132-020 | Rainbow Island Restaurant/Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .18 | 21.8 du per acre | 4 | Commercial |
| 3 | 009-132-030 | Pacifica Tribune/Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .23 | 21.8 du per acre | 5 | Commercial |
| 4 | 009-132-040 | Pacific Manor Multi-tenant Commercial/ Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .32 | 21.8 du per acre | 7 | Commercial |
| 5 | 009-132-050 | U Save Liquors & Pamper Me Nail Spa/Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .20 | 21.8 du per acre | 4 | Commercial |
| 6 | 009-134-330 009-134-340 009-134-350 009-134-360 009-134-390 009-134-400 009-134-410 009-134-520 | Pacific Manor Shopping Center/Flat | C-1 | Commercial | 2.1 | 21.8 du per acre | 46 | Commercial |
| 7 | 009-162-590 | Save More Meat Market/Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .157 | 21.8 du per acre | 3 | Commercial |
| 8 | 009-381-010 | Monterey & Norfolk/Flat | R-3 | LDR | 1.0 | 8.7 du per acre | 9 | Vacant |
| 9 | 009-253-280 | Spanky's Restaurant/ Partially Flat & Partially Moderate slopes | C-2 | Commercial | .662 | 21.8 du per acre | 14 | Commercial & Vacant |

¹⁸ The height limit for all potential housing development sites is 35 feet above grade.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Potential Housing Development Sites – Current General Plan¹⁸

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|--------------|------------------------------|------|---------------------------------|----|-----------------|
| 10 | 009-245-010 | Oceana Blvd & Connemara Dr/Moderate slopes | C-1 | Commercial | 2.67 | 21.8 du per acre | 58 | Vacant |
| 11 | 009-320-200 | Oil Changers/Flat | C-1 | Commercial & MDR | .512 | 21.8 du per acre/15 du per acre | 9 | Commercial |
| 12 | 016-041-090 | El Grano de Oro Restaurant/Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .119 | 21.8 du per acre | 3 | Commercial |
| 13 | 016-041-100 | 1750 Francisco Blvd/Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .183 | 21.8 du per acre | 4 | Commercial |
| 14 | 016-032-310 | Palmetto Ave & Santa Maria Ave/Flat | R-3 & C-1/CZ | Commercial & HDR | .360 | 21 du per acre | 8 | Vacant |
| 15 | 016-050-050 | Salada Ave b/t Beach Blvd & Palmetto Ave/Flat | R-2/CZ | MDR | .207 | 15 du per acre | 3 | Vacant |
| 16 | 016-060-110 016-060-120 | Pacifica Thai Cuisine/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use (HDR & Commercial) | .135 | 21 du per acre | 3 | Commercial |
| 17 | 016-191-320 | Seahorse Saloon/Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .186 | 21.8 du per acre | 4 | Commercial |
| 18 | 016-192-320 | Montecito Ave & Palmetto Ave/Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .31 | 21.8 du per acre | 7 | Vacant |
| 19 | 016-204-020 016-204-999 016-294-620 | 2212 Beach Blvd/ Flat | P-D/CZ | Mixed Use (HDR & Commercial) | 3.5 | 21 du per acre | 74 | Public Facility |
| 20 | 016-211-180 | Hilton Way & Francisco Blvd/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use (HDR & Commercial) | .117 | 21 du per acre | 2 | Vacant |

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Potential Housing Development Sites – Current General Plan¹⁸

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------------|--------|------------|------|------------------|----|------------|
| 21 | 016-400-280 | 7-Eleven Sharp Park/Flat | C-1/CZ | Commercial | .23 | 21.8 du per acre | 5 | Commercial |
| 22 | 016-355-150 | Clarendon/Flat | R-1 | LDR | 1.35 | 8.7 du per acre | 12 | Vacant |
| 23 | 022-012-020 | Rock/ Moderate slopes | C-1+ | Commercial | 2.87 | 21.8 du per acre | 63 | Vacant |
| 24 | 022-042-260 022-043-010 022-043-020 022-043-200 022-043-220 022-045-010 022-045-999 | Fassler Ave/Moderate slopes | C-1 | VLDR | 2.65 | 2 du per acre | 5 | Vacant |
| 25 | 022-142-140 | 575 Crespi Drive/Flat | C-1 | Commercial | .36 | 21.8 du per acre | 8 | Commercial |
| 26 | 023-222-080 | Adobe/Flat | R-3-G | HDR | .418 | 21 du per acre | 9 | Vacant |
| 27 | 023-593-140 | Sanchez Library/Flat | C-1 | Commercial | 2.77 | 21.8 du per acre | 60 | Library |

Source: City of Pacifica, 2015; San Mateo County, 2009; Dyett & Bhatia, 2009.

Note: Maximum building height for all sites is 35 feet under current zoning.

Figure III-2 displays the locations of potential housing sites suitable under the draft Land Use Element of the General Plan (March 2014 version), and Table III-2 summarizes site-specific details pertaining to the development potential of these sites. The City has identified sites capable of accommodating 494 housing units. These sites will not take effect in the Housing Element unless and until the City Council adopts an updated Land Use Element so designating the sites in Table III-2.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023




FIGURE III-2

POTENTIAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SITES: DRAFT GENERAL PLAN

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

TABLE III-2

Potential Housing Development Sites – Draft General Plan¹⁹

| Site | APN | Location/ Condition | Zoning | Draft General Plan Designation | Lot Area (Acres) | Allowable Density | Allowable Units (#) | Existing Use |
|-------------|--|--|-----------------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 009-132-020 | Rainbow Island Restaurant/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .18 | 26 du per acre | 5 | Commercial |
| 2 | 009-132-030 | Pacifica Tribune/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .23 | 26 du per acre | 6 | Commercial |
| 3 | 009-132-040 | Pacific Manor Multi-tenant Commercial/ Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .32 | 26 du per acre | 8 | Commercial |
| 4 | 009-132-050 | U Save Liquors & Pamper Me Nail Spa/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .20 | 26 du per acre | 5 | Commercial |
| 5 | 009-134-330 009-134-340 009-134-350 009-134-360 009-134-390 009-134-400 009-134-410 009-134-520 | Pacific Manor Shopping Center/Flat | C-1 | Mixed Use Neighborhood | 2.1 | 26 du per acre | 55 | Commercial |
| 6 | 009-162-590 | Save More Meat Market/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .157 | 26 du per acre | 4 | Commercial |
| 7 | 016-032-310 | Palmetto Ave & Santa Maria Ave/Flat | R-3 & C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .360 | 26 du per acre | 9 | Vacant |
| 8 | 016-050-050 | Salada Ave b/t Beach Blvd & Palmetto Ave/Flat | R-2/CZ | MDR | .207 | 15 du per acre | 3 | Vacant |
| 9 | 016-060-110 & 016-060-120 | Pacifica Thai Cuisine/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Center | .135 | 50 du per acre | 7 | Commercial |

¹⁹ The height limit for all potential housing development sites is 35 feet above grade.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Potential Housing Development Sites – Draft General Plan¹⁹

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------------------|--------|------------------------|-------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 10 | 016-220-150 | U.S. Bank/Flat | P | Mixed Use Center | .322 | 50 du per acre | 16 | Commercial |
| 11 | 016-191-320 | Seahorse Saloon/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .186 | 26 du per acre | 5 | Commercial |
| 12 | 016-192-320 | Montecito Ave & Palmetto Ave/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .31 | 26 du per acre | 8 | Vacant |
| 13 | 016-204-020 016-204-999 016-294-620 | 2212 Beach Blvd/Flat | P-D/CZ | Mixed Use Center | 3.5 | 50 du per acre | 84 ²⁰ | Public Facility |
| 14 | 016-211-180 | Hilton Way & Francisco Blvd/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .117 | 26 du per acre | 3 | Vacant |
| 15 | 016-400-280 | 7-Eleven Sharp Park/Flat | C-1/CZ | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .23 | 26 du per acre | 6 | Commercial |
| 16 | 016-355-150 | Clarendon/Flat | R-1 | LDR | 1.35 | 9 du per acre | 12 | Vacant |
| 17 | 022-042-260, 022-043-010, 022-043-020, 022-043-200, 022-043-220, 022-045-010, 022-045-999 | Fassler Ave/Moderate slopes | C-1 | LDR | 2.65 | 9 du per acre | 24 | Vacant |
| 18 | 022-142-140 | 575 Crespi Drive/Flat | C-1 | Mixed Use Neighborhood | .36 | 26 du per acre | 9 | Commercial |
| 19 | 022-162-350 022-162-380 | Crespi Storage/Flat | C-3 | Mixed Use Center | 1.357 | 50 du per acre | 68 | Commercial |

²⁰ The City Council's approval on September 23, 2013, limited the site to no more than 84 housing units, less than the maximum permissible General Plan density.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Potential Housing Development Sites – Draft General Plan¹⁹

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----------------------------|-------|------------------------|------|----------------|----|------------|
| 20 | 022-171-190 | Crespi Shopping Center/Flat | C-1/P | Mixed Use Center | 1.51 | 50 du per acre | 76 | Commercial |
| 21 | 023-222-080 | Adobe/Flat | R-3-G | HDR | .418 | 21 du per acre | 9 | Vacant |
| 22 | 023-593-140 | Sanchez Library/Flat | C-1 | Mixed Use Neighborhood | 2.77 | 26 du per acre | 72 | Library |

Source: City of Pacifica, 2015; San Mateo County, 2009; Dyett & Bhatia, 2009.

Note: Maximum building height for all sites is 35 feet under current zoning.

A. Environmental and Physical Constraints

Environmental constraints known to the City that could affect residential development in areas planned for such use are the potential presence of the San Francisco garter snake and the California red-legged frog. These species are present in various locations throughout Pacifica, and only site-specific biological analysis can confirm their presence. When biological investigations for earlier developments have located populations of these species, the City has worked with developers to provide mitigation by protecting potential affected areas of habitat for these species. Mitigation has included altering development plans so as not to disturb site areas comprising habitat. Although the City does not consider the presence of these species a significant constraint to the accommodation of the City's share of regional housing needs, identification of these species at any given housing development site could be quite impactful on an individual project basis.

Physical constraints to housing development in Pacifica include hillside erosion, coastal erosion, and seismic hazards. Landslides and slope failures can result from any of the listed hazards and have presented serious problems in the past. The City is unaware of any immediate or direct threat to any of the identified housing sites from these constraints, but further geological analysis as part of a development review process could jeopardize initial site plans. Unstable or unsuitable soils for development could reduce maximum density at housing sites. It is possible, however, to address most physical constraints of this sort through enhanced engineering techniques and appropriate residential design. The trade-off to this approach is greater development expense, which can jeopardize housing affordability. None of the sites identified for residential development during the planning period are within known hazard areas. Seven of the selected sites, however, are identified in the Open Space Task Force report as candidates for preservation. These parcels include the Calson, Fish, Hacienda Court/Place, Lower Gypsy Hill, Rock, San Pedro Road, and Zebros properties. Although these properties have been identified in the Open Space Task Force report as candidates for preservation, they have not been designated as open space and there are no development limitations imposed on these properties.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

All sites identified for residential development are within existing service areas for water, sewer, and electrical utilities. The City is unaware of any service limitations that would affect any of the residential development sites.

B. Zoning Appropriate to Accommodate Lower Income Housing

Government Code Section 65583.2 provides two options to demonstrate zoning appropriate to accommodate housing affordable to lower income households. A jurisdiction may provide an analysis demonstrating how identified zoning and densities encourage and facilitate the development of housing for lower income households, or may utilize a default density deemed appropriate for the jurisdiction. State law specifies the default density for Pacifica as 30 units per acre based on its “metropolitan” location within a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) with a population of 2,000,000 or greater. However, Pacifica’s highest density residential designation allows 16-21 units per acre, less than the State’s default density. Therefore, the City will not rely upon the default density method, and instead will conduct the alternative analysis.

The following analysis, based on factors including market demand, financial feasibility, and development project experience, will demonstrate Pacifica’s existing adopted densities are appropriate to accommodate housing affordable to lower income households, including those with extremely low, very low, and low incomes.

As indicated above, the City is relying primarily on sites with High-Density Residential (HDR) and Commercial land use designations within its General Plan. The corresponding zoning for these sites is R-3, R-3-G, C-1, or C-2. The HDR land use designation has a minimum density of 16 units per acre. When combined with R-3 zoning, R-3/HDR sites allows up to 21 units per acre, the maximum permissible density under the HDR designation. Sites with Commercial land use designations have no minimum residential density. The maximum density of Commercial sites with C-1 or C-2 zoning is 22 units per acre. The calculated maximum densities for each site in Table III-1, above, are realistically attainable, as will be shown in the analysis that follows.

Affordable housing developers have stated that Pacifica’s adopted densities are appropriate for the City and that several developments at similar densities have been constructed in jurisdictions similar to Pacifica. The City evaluated its current multi-family development standards and on-site improvement requirements (e.g., setbacks, building height, parking and open space requirements, commercial component requirement in commercial zones), and determined that maximum densities could be obtained in R-3, R-3-G, C-1, and C-2 zones. As an example, using a typical site plan design for a three-story mixed-use development on a .96-acre site with a 35-foot building height requirement, 2 parking spaces per unit parking, and 450 square feet per unit open space requirement, maximum densities of 21 or more units per acre can be achieved.

Supporting the realistic capacity estimates are the high land costs. For example, residential parcels in Pacifica in 2014 cost over \$1,000,000 per acre, with associated construction costs exceeding \$150 per square foot (Section II.7.B). These costs promote development at maximum densities to make multi-family residential development economically feasible by maximizing the number of residential units per acre.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

In addition, a review of recent multi-family residential developments approved and constructed reveal that multi-family developments, as a result of incentives for housing affordable to lower income households and a local density bonus, achieved densities greater than the maximum density of 21 units per acre. This is a direct result of City efforts to assist developers in making residential development economically feasible in a high cost area by maximizing density. See Table III-3.

TABLE III-3

| Actual Build-out Density | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|
| Name | Zoning | Site Acreage | Allowable Density Per Acre | Approved/Constructed Units Per Acre | Allowable Units at Site | Approved/Constructed Units at Site |
| Casa Pacifica | R-3 | 2.25 | 21 | 45 | 47 | 101 |
| Cypress Walk | P-D | 10.34 | 21 | 9 | 217 | 95 |
| Oceano | R-3 | 1.334 | 21 | 31 | 28 | 42 |
| Ocean View | R-3 | 1.51 | 21 | 66 | 32 | 100 |
| Pacific Oaks | R-3 | 3.965 | 21 | 26 | 83 | 104 |

Source: City of Pacifica Planning Department, 2014

In addition to State Density Bonus Law, the City's Density Bonus Ordinance offers the incentive of increased density and flexibility in development standards in exchange for housing which will help meet the City's need to provide rental housing and housing affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes. Multi-family residential projects can exceed their maximum density if provision is made for rental housing, affordable housing, housing for seniors, or housing for persons with disabilities. The amount of the density bonus ranges from 15 percent for entirely rental housing to 50 percent for housing affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes, seniors, or persons with disabilities. The ordinance allows, in addition to a density increase, a reduction in the floor area of affordable units and a relaxation of City parking standards. This has resulted in densities that exceed those allowable under the density bonus alone.

Commercially Zoned Sites

As discussed earlier, the City's Commercial-zoned sites will accommodate a majority of the housing need for lower income units based on the minimum and average expected densities. The City based this conclusion upon two assumptions: First, most sites identified in districts allowing mixed-use (C-1, C-2 and C-R), will be developed with residential components, and second, developers will build to the average expected densities for each of these districts.

The first of these assumptions is prudent in light of recent trends. As shown in Table III-4, all recently proposed mixed use projects in Commercial zone sites were almost exclusively residential use projects.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

The commercial to residential ratios show that the developments were more residential and commercial uses were only proposed on ground floors that faced a major street. Additionally, every project listed in Table III-4 exceeded the average allowable density of the zone it was located in.

TABLE III-4

| Recent Mixed-Use Developments | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Address | Commercial Area (sq. ft.) | Residential Area (sq. ft.) | Commercial-to-Residential Ratio |
| 1267 Danmann Ave | 800 | 3,600 | 18% |
| 1275 Danmann Ave | 800 | 1,700 | 47% |
| 411 Dondee Way | 1,158 | 3,118 | 27% |
| 2270 Palmetto Ave | 1,235 | 3,246 | 27% |
| 2304 Palmetto Ave | 650 | 3,480 | 16% |
| 2307 Palmetto Ave | 3,245 | 4,969 | 39% |
| 2310 Palmetto Ave | 605 | 1,390 | 30% |
| 2318 Palmetto Ave | 2,018 | 4,056 | 33% |

Source: City of Pacifica Planning Department, 2014

There are several other reasons why the majority of commercial sites are likely to develop as mixed-use projects during the planning period:

1. Mixed use zones have minimal commercial component requirements.
2. The City supports housing in the City's mixed-use areas.
3. The General Plan supports residential development in mixed-use areas with incentives and programs for reduced parking and other cost-reducing measures.
4. The majority of mixed-use sites are not prime corner sites favored by commercial establishments.
5. The sites are located in close proximity to other sites where new residential development has been built or approved.

Thus, it is reasonable to assume that while not all future mixed-use sites will be developed as majority residential-use projects, the vast majority of them will be developed as such with densities at or above the average allowable densities. As mentioned previously, high land costs in Pacifica will require developers to maximize density in order to ensure sufficient returns on their investments. Finally, the City's Draft General Plan amendment that is underway also suggests increasing housing densities to as many as 50 units per acre in one of the new mixed-use designations that would be created.

Small Sites

Many of the available vacant sites identified by the City are located on smaller parcels. While it can be difficult to develop housing affordable to lower income households, the City has provided incentives and assistance resulting in such affordable housing on small sites. For example, the City approved an affordable 10-unit project on a small 11,831 square foot lot that provides rental housing for families. Three of the units are marketed to low-income families whose incomes are at or below 40 percent of the Area Median Income. Five of the units are offered to low-income families whose incomes are at or

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

below 50 percent of the Area Median Income, and the remaining two units are leased to families whose incomes are at or below 60 percent of the Area Median Income. This project, Pacifica Pines Apartments, was financed by HOME funds, tax credit equity, and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. Based on this example, it is clear that delivering affordable housing on small lots is feasible in Pacifica. As listed in Table III-1, the Fish site is comprised of eight small parcels ranging from 3,920 to 6,818 square feet. An opportunity exists to promote parcel consolidation to ensure that minimum densities are achieved and integrated site planning occurs by working in partnership with affordable housing developers to develop a Priority Lot Consolidation List with the goal of creating a list of “ready to go” development sites that can be shown to potential developers. The list should:

1. Prioritize sites located in General Plan land use areas designed for multi-family residential development (High-Density Residential and Commercial sites);
2. Consider common ownership patterns, the physical condition of existing buildings, on-site constraints, and the Assessor’s ratio of improvement value to land value – an indicator of underutilization of land; and
3. Focus efforts on specific geographic areas with the greatest development potential according to the latest development trends and expressed developer interest, further identifying sites that may be candidates for the Affordable Housing Overlay District designation. The identified sites should be ideally located to meet the criteria for affordable housing grants and financing.

Vacant and Underutilized Properties

While the recycling (redevelopment) of sites would be new to the community, there are several examples of existing mixed-use developments in Pacifica. The mixed-use aspect of such developments is not only consistent with the City’s policies, but also recent trends throughout the County and neighboring jurisdictions.

The City will assist developers in the redevelopment of nonvacant sites with residential uses by:

1. Providing regulatory incentives;
2. Developing and distributing promotional materials and public outreach;
3. Tracking and monitoring the redevelopment of nonvacant sites identified in Table III-1 to identify best practices and cite examples of successful redevelopment to residential uses; and
4. Review and revise programs as necessary if monitoring reveals that residential development of nonvacant sites is not occurring and if residential development on the sites is not resulting in appropriate affordable units to accommodate the City’s housing needs for each income group, specifically those with extremely low, very low, and low incomes.

The City will also:

1. Contact owners of contiguous vacant and underutilized sites and introduce them to the idea of parcel consolidation; explaining the City’s regulations and how standards may be modified to make site assembly feasible and the use of affordable housing resources for financial or technical assistance;

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

2. Conduct outreach to affordable housing developers informing them of development opportunities in the City through targeted mailings, emails and phone calls;
3. Provide information on these “ready to go” sites on the City’s website and in response to inquiries by interested prospective affordable housing developers;
4. Sharing examples with housing developers of successful development projects in the City on consolidated parcels;
5. Offer incentives to developers to promote parcel consolidation, such as:
 - a. Density bonuses;
 - b. Priority permit processing;
 - c. Exemptions for zoning requirements;
 - d. Ministerial review of lot line adjustments;
 - e. Deferred development fees; and
 - f. Other incentives under the proposed Affordable Housing Overlay Zone program.

The City’s analysis of vacant and undeveloped sites identified approximately 926 acres of undeveloped land within City limits. Underutilized sites were identified by using a ratio of the assessed value of improvement to the assessed value of land (AV ratio). Parcels with an AV ratio of less than 1.0, where the value of the building is less than the value of the land, were assumed to have redevelopment potential. Parcels zoned for single-family residential use were not included in this analysis; neither were protected open space, churches and institutional uses, or sites in public ownership. The analysis found 121 acres of “underutilized” land in Pacifica in designations other than agricultural, public, community, or institutional use.

City-owned Sites

City-owned housing sites provide unique opportunities to maximize the affordability of new housing. This is especially important when considering how to accomplish development of housing for extremely low income (ELI) individuals and families. Development of ELI housing is challenging given the lower financial return to developers. Without appropriate incentives, developers typically target affordable units to very low or low income categories.

When it owns a development site, the City may offer additional incentives if a development proposal satisfies a special housing need or a special affordable housing need, including ELI units. The City-owned Sanchez Library site shown in Table III-1 is zoned C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) and may provide an opportunity for ELI unit development. This site was originally developed in the early 1960’s with a relatively low intensity, single-story library use. While the site houses an existing library, the use will be discontinued if a new library is constructed elsewhere in the city, leaving the site available for potential redevelopment. The site is near both residential and commercial areas, and has existing infrastructure (water delivery and sewage treatment). These factors make the site available and attractive for new and more intensive residential redevelopment. The development of this site in a

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

mixed-use configuration, consisting of commercial and residential uses, would be consistent with the City's economic and land use development strategies.

The Sanchez Library site holds additional promise as an affordable housing site in that the City, as property owner, will possess greater control of its development potential. At the Sanchez Library site, the City can exert leverage on any developer to encourage to the maximum extent practicable the development of housing affordable to those with ELI. The City's leverage may include an appropriate array of development incentives, contributions from the housing trust fund, fee waivers, or other incentives. The City will consider extending this philosophy to other sites it owns should their development or redevelopment occur during the planning period.

Developable Units

As noted above, the majority of the affordable units constructed in the City are located in the R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) district which allows for a density of 16-21 dwelling units per acre. A total of five projects with 357 affordable units have been developed at this density. Another 15 acres of vacant or underutilized land is within the R-3 zone. Based on this land availability, there is a possibility for development of another 315 units at existing General Plan densities.

Further, approximately 95 acres of vacant or underutilized land exists in the C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial), C-2 (Community Commercial), and C-R (Commercial Recreation) Districts. These commercial zoning districts provide an opportunity for extremely low, very low and low income housing. In the commercial districts density is controlled by a minimum lot area per dwelling unit of 2,000 square feet. Sites available within these zoning districts have the potential for an additional 2,069 residential units at maximum density.

(Continued on Next Page)

IV. GOALS, QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES TO MAINTAIN, PRESERVE, IMPROVE AND DEVELOP HOUSING

1. Purpose

The City has a number of ongoing policies and ordinances guiding its actions related to housing development. These resulted from past efforts and completed programs from prior housing elements. Policies in this section are integrated into the everyday activities of the City, and support the development and preservation of housing at all income levels. In certain cases, however, the City's existing policy and legal framework are inadequate to fully support and foster housing development.

State Housing Law requires each housing element to document such situations where a local agency must undertake additional policy or legislative actions related to the need to maintain, preserve, improve and develop housing. The following section identifies these shortfalls, identifying action programs with quantified objectives the City will undertake during the planning period. Specifically, California Government Code, Article 10.6, Section 65583, states that the Housing Element shall include:

"an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing..."

The following complies with state law, and also provides an analysis of Pacifica's success in achieving the objectives identified in the 2007 Housing Element. The "2007 Objectives" are stated with a brief overview of accomplishments, followed by new "2015 Objectives."

2. Overall Goals

Pacifica's General Plan contains overall goals that are applicable to each of the General Plan's 12 elements. Goals most relevant to the Housing Element are as follows:

- Strive to provide a decent home and satisfying environment for each resident.
- Protect the social mix, variety, and fundamental character of each neighborhood by providing for the safety and welfare of all residents equally.

3. Quantified Objectives

The goals, objectives, and programs contained in the City of Pacifica Housing Element strive to encourage and incentivize the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing affordable to persons of all income levels and special needs categories. Actions to be undertaken by the City during the planning period seek to address City processes and policies (governmental constraints) and external factors such as development costs (nongovernmental constraints) to reduce barriers to the development of housing affordable to those with extremely low, very low, or low incomes.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Based on its goals, objectives, and programs outlined in the Housing Element, the City expects its combined efforts and resources to achieve the following quantified objectives during the planning period:

TABLE IV-1

Quantified Objectives

| Income Category | New Construction (Development) | Rehabilitation (Maintenance & Improvement) | Conservation (Preservation) |
|------------------------|---|---|--|
| Extremely-low | 60 | 95 | 101** |
| Very-low | 61 | 158 | 93* |
| Low | 68 | 135 | 5 |
| Moderate | 70 | 72 | 8 |
| Above Moderate | 154 | 80 | 16 |
| TOTAL | 413 | 540 | 223 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | 1,176 | |

Source: City of Pacifica Planning Department, 2014

* Includes preservation of 93 mobile home units at Pacific Skies Estates. All of these units are subject to the provisions of Pacifica Municipal Code Title 9, Chapter 1, Article 2 "Rent Stabilization Regulations."

** Includes preservation of 101 senior housing units at Casa Pacifica.

4. Ongoing Policies

The City of Pacifica embraces the need to maintain, preserve, improve, and develop housing for persons at all income levels and for persons with certain special housing needs. As a result of its past efforts, including action programs in previous housing elements, the City has incorporated various activities related to housing best practices into its standard policies and operations. The following summary lists the City's orientation to the four key aspects of housing element actions: maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development. The list is not inclusive of all housing policies of the City, but rather is representative of Pacifica's supportive orientation to housing projects. Some of the items listed were previous action programs that the City accomplished, and it is no longer appropriate to list them as action programs during the planning period. Other items listed do not have a timeline for implementation given their ongoing nature, making it inappropriate to list them as action programs during the planning period in response to SB 375's requirements pertaining to action programs. Such items included in this list may lack specific beneficial impacts and a defined date for accomplishment

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

given the uncertain nature and timing of applications for housing-related permits. Nevertheless, the items below are best described as ongoing policies which are in place to facilitate housing projects whenever necessary.

A. Maintenance of Housing

i. Implement the safe and sanitary criteria of the Housing Code.

To encourage Code compliance and rehabilitation of housing in a degraded condition, City staff will note Housing Code violations during all field inspections. Common inspections include those for building permits or investigative inspections related to code enforcement complaints. The emphasis will be on voluntary compliance; however, where violations include immediate threats to life, safety, or sanitary conditions, staff will implement immediate corrective actions to mandate compliance. Staff will coordinate with the San Mateo County Health Department whenever necessary to leverage maximum resources to quickly resolve unsafe conditions.

Specific Action - Document Housing Code violations during all inspections.

Responsible Agency - Building Division and Code Enforcement Division

This policy was Action Program No. 1 in the 2007 Housing Element. It had a continuous time frame for implementation, and is more appropriate as an ongoing policy. City staff contacted more than 298 property owners related to housing maintenance issues during the 2007-2014 planning period.

ii. Prevent blight and the deterioration of housing units resulting from deferred maintenance.

The City has a large housing stock but relatively few building inspectors and code enforcement officials. Therefore, staff is unlikely to proactively identify all blighted or deteriorated conditions that exist at housing units. Staff will continue to respond to resident complaints about such conditions in their neighborhoods, partnering with property owners to make needed improvements.

Specific Action - Document Housing Code violations during all inspections.

Responsible Agency - Building Division and Code Enforcement Division

This policy was Action Program No. 2A in the 2007 Housing Element. It had a continuous time frame for implementation, and is more appropriate as an ongoing policy. City staff responded to 209 complaints regarding blight and deterioration during the 2007-2014 planning period; staff resolved all cases with the completion of necessary upgrades to abate the blight and deterioration of the respective housing units.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

iii. Conserve energy through implementation of the California Green Building Code.

The City adopted the California Green Building Code on 12/25/2013. Building Division staff review all building permit applications for new construction and building alterations for compliance with the Green Building Code.

Specific Action - Adopt a Green Building Ordinance to assure that all new buildings and significant remodels incorporate green building practices and materials into the design.

Responsible Agency - Building Division

This policy was Action Program No. 4B in 2007-2014 Housing Element (and program accomplishment is demonstrated under Action Program No. 4 in this Housing Element). The City will continue to implement this policy on an ongoing basis.

B. Preservation of Housing

i. Smoke Detectors

In 1983, the City Council enacted Ordinance 363-C.S. requiring the installation of Fire Detection Systems in all housing units within the City. The Building Division verifies installations whenever there is an inspection related to other City permits. Otherwise, the Ordinance requires property owners to maintain smoke detectors as specified in Pacifica Municipal Code Article 4, Chapter 13.

Specific Action - During all building permit inspections, verify installation of smoke detectors in accordance with the City Ordinance.

- Issue correction notices and conduct follow-up inspections of housing units without required smoke detectors.

Responsible Agency - Building Division and Fire Department

This policy was Action Program No. 3 in the 2007 Housing Element. It had a continuous time frame for implementation, and is more appropriate as an ongoing policy. City inspectors conducted more than 2,254 building permit inspections at different housing units during the 2007-2014 planning period, verifying smoke detector installation in each case. The performed number of inspections – 322 – far exceeded the goal of inspecting 50 units per year.

ii. Conditions of Approval

As a condition of approval for housing developments dedicated to housing for seniors and/or lower income occupants and where the City grants a parking exception, parking waiver, or variance (typical Density Bonus Ordinance provisions), the City will impose a condition of approval requiring the developer to record a deed restriction on the property. The deed

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

restriction will place in the chain of title notice that approval of the development was based upon a waiver or exception from City standards and that conversion of such development from its originally approved purpose may be infeasible unless it meets all applicable standards.

Specific Action - Impose this condition of approval on all permits benefitting from a Density Bonus Ordinance approval or other projects receiving authorization to deviate from development standards in order to develop affordable housing types.

Responsible Agency - Planning Division

This policy was Action Program No. 5f in the 2007 Housing Element. It had a continuous time frame for implementation, and is more appropriate as an ongoing policy. The Casa Pacifica Apartments development received a variance during its development, and any subsequent use will need to comply with all City development standards or else apply for a new variance permit.

iii. Condominium Conversion

The City minimizes housing impacts to renters by regulating the conversion of rental apartment housing to condominiums. The City's Condominium Conversion Ordinance codified in Pacifica Municipal Code Title 9, Chapter 4, Article 24.5 requires an apartment property owner to demonstrate satisfaction of one of three pre-requisites prior to pursuing a conversion:

- a. Multi-family vacancy rates exceed 5 percent citywide; or,
- b. A super majority (75 percent) of existing tenants vote for conversion; or,
- c. The property owner agrees to sell or rent 40 percent of converted units at rates affordable to persons with low or moderate income.

Specific Action - Implement the provisions of the Residential Condominium Conversions ordinance to minimize impacts on low- and moderate-income persons.

Responsible Agency - Planning Division

iv. Designation of Historical Structures

The City supports and encourages property owner-designation of historic structures as set forth in Pacifica's Historic Preservation Ordinance. Enacted in 1984, one of the purposes of the Ordinance is to encourage preservation of historic structures. The Pacifica Historical Society has prepared a detailed inventory of historical and cultural sites and structures that would benefit from the appropriate designation. Additional structures and sites not included in the inventory are also eligible for designation subject to certain criteria.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

- Specific Action - City staff will educate and encourage property owners about the benefits of pursuing historic preservation designation, including tax benefits. The financial benefits of designation can help owners dedicate additional resources toward property maintenance and/or improvements.

Responsible Agencies - Planning Division, Pacifica Historical Society

This policy was Action Program No. 8 in 2007 Housing Element. It had a continuous time frame for implementation, and is more appropriate as an ongoing policy. The City has observed little interest from property owners in pursuing historical designations for their properties. Since 2010, only one site – the Dollar Radio Station – received a historical designation. Pacifica's ability to designate historical structures and sites is contingent upon property owner willingness. However, the City will continuously monitor opportunities to designate appropriate historical resources to protect and enhance their historical character, educating property owners about the benefits of historical designation. The City will strive to designate one site every other year.

C. Improvement of Housing

i. Engage with Property Owners of Deteriorated or Deteriorating Housing

City Building Division and Code Enforcement staff will respond to complaints of substandard housing and unsafe building conditions. Upon initiating contact, City staff will inform property owners of the funding resources available to assist lower income property owners with housing improvements. The City will pursue a collaborative code enforcement posture when investigating and resolving these types of complaints whenever possible, except where immediate life or safety issues are present.

- Specific Action - Respond to complaints pertaining to blight or deterioration of housing units, providing informational materials on programs and funding available to eligible property owners in order to restore substandard housing.

Responsible Agency - Building Division and Code Enforcement Division

See Section 4.A.i and ii for related policies.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

D. Development of Housing

i. Prioritize In-fill Residential Development

Specific Action - Discuss this option with individual developers on a project-by-project basis. Encourage inclusion of second floor residential units where feasible.

Responsible Agency - Planning Division, Economic Development Division

This policy was Action Program No. 9 in the 2007 Housing Element. It had a continuous time frame for implementation, and is more appropriate as an ongoing policy. The City has encouraged in-fill development in its meeting with developers. In 2013, the City encouraged infill within the Rockaway Beach neighborhood which resulted in the construction of three housing units in a mixed-use development on Dondee Way. The City will continue to work with property owners to facilitate mixed-use development on underutilized and vacant lots. However, the timing of individual development applications is difficult for the City to predict, and it is thereby difficult to establish a specific timeline and quantification for goal achievement. The main ways the City will prioritize in-fill development is by encouraging developers to intensify already developed sites with residential units above ground floor commercial spaces; by encouraging developers to develop vacant lots interspersed among developed sites, ensuring housing wherever possible; and, if the pace of development was to increase during the planning period, by ranking higher in the Growth Management Ordinance scoring process those developments planned for in-fill.

ii. Provide an Encouraging Environment for Construction of Second Units

City staff shall encourage and foster construction of second units when interacting with property owners and development professionals. Staff shall strive to find solutions to challenging development standards and to provide a clear explanation of necessary permit approvals required to construct a second unit, including estimated time frames and costs.

It is not possible to assess the number of second units that will be developed in the City. The amount of such development will depend on a variety of factors including the size of individual properties, the placement and design of structures on individual sites, and neighborhood acceptance. The Second Unit Ordinance is discussed further under Action Program No. 11.

Specific Action - Discuss this option with individual property owners. Explain and encourage the development of second units where feasible.

Responsible Agency - Planning Division

This policy was Action Program No. 10 in the 2007 Housing Element. It had a continuous time frame for implementation, and is more appropriate as an ongoing policy. Since 1982, when the

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

City of Pacifica passed a Second Residential Unit Ordinance, it has permitted construction of second units on single family properties. It is still confusing and intimidating for many property owners to consider construction of a second unit, however. Planning and Building Division staff shall reduce barriers to second unit construction whenever possible.

iii. Identify Opportunities to Include Housing Incentives in Development Applications

Despite the dissolution of redevelopment agencies in California, the City still has tools and programs available to encourage development of housing affordable to those with extremely low, very low, and low incomes. These include the inclusion of Section 8 units in new developments; granting additional density and relaxing development standards under the Density Bonus Ordinance; requiring affordable housing through the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance; allowing manufactured housing in residential zones; and, ensuring sufficient zoning for mixed-use development. City staff will seek all opportunities to encourage affordable housing development using these tools and others.

- Specific Action
- Train staff on available housing tools.
 - Require staff to identify opportunities to explain affordable housing incentives to prospective developers.

Responsible Agency - Planning Division

iv. Assist Affordable Housing Developers with Preparation of Funding and Development Applications

The City can assist with affordable housing development by providing nonfinancial support. City staff can provide assistance with affordable housing developer applications for government and nonprofit funding by serving as co-applicant or by endorsing applications. Staff can also assist developers to submit more complete planning applications by scheduling no-cost pre-application meetings to discuss City requirements and processes. More complete applications can undergo the City review process more quickly, thus saving time and money, and resulting in faster construction of affordable housing units.

- Specific Action
- Co-apply or endorse funding applications.
 - Provide no-cost pre-application meetings for affordable housing projects.

Responsible Agency - Planning Division

v. Require a Geotechnical Site Investigation Prior to Permitting Site Development

Some potential building sites in Pacifica have unknown geological hazards that only a geotechnical site investigation can uncover. The potential of these hazards to threaten newly developed housing units warrants a careful investigation of each proposed housing site prior to

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

granting development approvals. In most cases, appropriate structural engineering can allow a development project to proceed. However, in extreme cases, identifying geotechnical hazards will allow the City to prohibit development in hazardous areas, including flood zones.

Specific Action - Require geotechnical reports for all development applications where a property may be susceptible to hazardous impacts.

Responsible Agency - Planning Division, Building Division, Public Works Department

This policy was Action Program No. 19 in the 2007 Housing Element. It had a continuous time frame for implementation, and is more appropriate as an ongoing policy. The City has implemented expanded requirements for geotechnical investigation since 1999, and strictly applies the requirements.

vi. Reference the Open Space Task Force Report When Evaluating Development Proposals for Sites Identified in the Report

Open space preservation is an important community priority. In 1988, the City Council accepted a report prepared by the Open Space Task Force, a group comprised of Pacifica residents interested in protecting undeveloped lands within the City (the report was updated in 2000). While not regulatory in nature, the Open Space Task Force Report identifies sites within Pacifica where proposed development should receive enhanced review. The purpose of the enhanced review is to consider ways to achieve the goals of a developer while preserving the natural aesthetic of a site whenever possible.

Specific Action - Refer to the Open Space Task Force Report when reviewing residential development applications. Encourage developers to retain natural features of development sites whenever possible.

Responsible Agency - Planning Division

This policy was Action Program No. 14 in the 2007 Housing Element. It had a continuous time frame for implementation, and is more appropriate as an ongoing policy. The City will implement this ongoing policy as part of a broader framework of General Plan objectives and policies and Municipal Code ordinances that address development of open space areas.

vii. Encourage development of a shared living community (co-housing) in an appropriate location to provide diversity in housing opportunities.

The City has included this action program in at least its previous two housing elements (covering 20 years or more). During this time, no shared living/co-housing communities have been developed in Pacifica. However, the Planning Commission and some members of the community believe this remains an important type of development that the City should

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

encourage. The City's existing Zoning Code could accommodate such a development if proposed.

Specific Action - Discuss the potential for development of a co-housing project with owners, prospective developers, and organizations specializing in shared living communities. Encourage applications in appropriate locations.

Responsible Agency - Planning Division

This policy was Action Program No. 17 in the 2007 Housing Element. It had a continuous time frame for implementation, and is more appropriate as an ongoing policy.

5. Housing Maintenance

A majority of residents in Pacifica live in high-quality, safe housing. The City strives to keep the good condition of the housing stock by promoting property maintenance. It is far less expensive to maintain housing units than it is to build new housing or to renovate substantially deteriorated housing. Therefore, maintenance is an essential aspect to providing adequate, affordable housing. However, there are housing units in Pacifica that require rehabilitation. The City's Building Official estimates that approximately 3 to 5 percent of all units within the City need rehabilitation.

A. Policies, Programs and Objectives to Maintain Housing

POLICIES - ENCOURAGE UPGRADES TO AND MAINTENANCE OF THE CITY'S EXISTING HOUSING UNITS;

- IMPROVE NEIGHBORHOOD AESTHETICS;

(Continued on Next Page)

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 1

Advertise available grant and loan funding for lower income property owners to rehabilitate substandard housing units.

- Specific Action - Display program literature at the Planning Department counter and website.
- Distribute program literature to potential participants identified during housing-related inspections.
- Responsible Agency - Building Division; Code Enforcement Division; San Mateo County Housing and Community Development Division
- Financing - Community Development Block Grants, California Housing Finance Agency, Federal Housing Authority
- 2007 Objectives - Continue to assist the San Mateo County Housing and Community Development Division with advertisement of their programs on the City's web site and by distributing literature from the County at the Planning Department, Sharp Park Library, Sanchez Library, Pacifica Resource Center, City Community Center, and other public locations while decreasing the 18 unit per year rehabilitation goal to 2 units per year. In addition, the City will explore the feasibility of applying for housing rehabilitation funds.
- Accomplishments - Distributed more than 75 program brochures throughout all City facilities.
- The San Mateo County Housing Authority Rehabilitation Program rehabilitated 37 Pacifica housing units between 2007-2014 with approximately \$105,000 in funding.
- 2015 Objectives - The City has observed little interest from residents to apply for housing rehabilitation loans. Additionally, County program staff has indicated that budget reductions have impacted its ability to administer the program, resulting in a lower program capacity to assist Pacifica residents. The City will, however, continue to market the County's rehabilitation program to provide the opportunity to apply to any interested residents. The City will strive to refer enough residents to ensure two residents will successfully apply for the program each year.
- Time Frame - 1/31/2015 through 12/31/2015: Two applicants
- 1/1/2016 through 12/31/2016: Two applicants
- 1/1/2017 through 12/31/2017: Two applicants
- 1/1/2018 through 12/31/2018: Two applicants
- 1/1/2019 through 12/31/2019: Two applicants
- 1/1/2020 through 12/31/2020: Two applicants
- 1/1/2021 through 12/31/2021: Two applicants
- 1/1/2022 through 1/31/2023: Two applicants

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 2 (formerly Action Program No. 4A in 2007-2014 Housing Element)

Reduce potential loss of life and property damage from earthquakes by requiring seismic upgrades (structural strengthening and hazard mitigation) to unsafe buildings, which includes unreinforced-masonry buildings and soft-story buildings (those with ground floors having a lateral stiffness significantly less than that of the stories above).

- Specific Action - Consider development of a mandatory seismic upgrade ordinance.
- Develop long-term funding sources to assist property owners with the expenses of upgrading housing units.
- Responsible Agency - Building Division
- Financing - City funds; Grant funding from federal or state agencies, or nonprofit organizations.
- 2007 Objectives - Develop funding sources to minimize the financial impact of retrofits on low- and moderate-income residents.
- Accomplishments - The City has not enacted a mandatory seismic upgrade ordinance. Therefore, it has not developed a funding program to implement an ordinance. The City continues to consider whether such an ordinance and funding program are feasible. In the meantime, property owners may perform seismic upgrades on a voluntary basis and obtain private financing for the work. Since 2007, zero property owners have performed voluntary seismic upgrades.
- 2015 Objectives - Continue to distribute program literature.
- Successfully refer five households per year.
- Time Frame - 12/31/2016: Determine whether development of a mandatory seismic upgrade ordinance and sourcing of sufficient funding to implement upgrades are feasible.
- 12/31/2017: If feasible, complete enactment of ordinance and implementation of seismic upgrade funding program(s).

6. Housing Preservation

Development of rental housing affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes in Pacifica has lagged behind demand for affordable units for many years. Therefore, preservation of existing affordable units is essential to meeting affordable housing demands. The loss of any affordable units due to preventable circumstances would exacerbate the housing affordability problem in Pacifica. A continued supply of affordable rental housing is important to meet the housing needs of Pacifica's population.

Rental housing, dedicated housing for lower income persons, seniors, and persons with disabilities, as well as mobile homes all provide vital affordable housing. The City has many market rate apartment developments, several dedicated senior housing developments, and a 93-unit mobile home park. All of these units are essential to a mixed, affordable housing stock. Yet, units of this sort are particularly threatened by potential decisions of property owners to pursue market rate returns. Apartment owners could pursue conversion to condominiums to generate immediate capital from the long-term value of their properties. Owners of subsidized developments could choose to terminate their participation in the programs, triggering a chain of events leading to displacement of long-time low-income tenants. Additionally, the mobile home park operator could seek to develop other housing types at the site, causing the relocation of low-income tenants with existing support systems in place in the community.

There are three main ways to preserve existing rental housing affordable persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes in Pacifica: a) to monitor rental units developed with a density bonus or other development concessions; b) to regulate conversions of rental housing to condominiums; and, c) to monitor long-term plans for the mobile home park operator. The Density Bonus Ordinance permits certain housing projects (see Section 7.D.ii) to exceed the maximum density designation for a site and also to develop the site with relaxed standards. The City grants these allowances subject to the continued affordability of units for a defined period of time. The City must monitor housing units to ensure property owners are operating the sites in conformance with their development approvals.

Conversions of apartments to condominiums can also result in significant losses of rental housing when market conditions are suitable for conversion. When conversions occur, many renter occupants are unable to obtain financing necessary to purchase their units, which can lead to their displacement. The City has enacted an ordinance regulating condominium conversions, and limits conversions to a defined set of circumstances.

The Land Use Element recognizes the importance of preserving the mobile home park. Accordingly, the City adopted an ordinance in 1990 which regulates conversion of mobile home parks to other uses. The ordinance provides procedures and standards for closure of the mobile home park to mitigate adverse impacts of displacement of existing residents while providing economically viable and reasonable use of the land.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

A. Preservation of Housing Affordability

POLICY - PREVENT THE CONVERSION OF EXISTING AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS TO LESS AFFORDABLE HOUSING TYPES

Action Program No. 3

Develop programs to help preserve the "at risk" units at Casa Pacifica senior housing complex.

- Specific Actions
- Contact the Casa Pacifica owner to inquire about ongoing intentions to continue participation in the Section 8 program. The property owner is currently bound by a five year program participation agreement. Any decision to end program participation would require a notice by 1/31/2019.
 - Respond to any notice of intent required by Government Code Section 65863.10 or federal law, and send copies of any notice received to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
 - Upon any indication of owner intent to end Section 8 program participation, partner with HCD and other county, state, federal, and nonprofit partners to assess potential impacts and to formulate a strategy to mitigate any negative impacts on apartment residents.
- Responsible Agency - Planning Division
- Financing - City funds
- 2007 Objectives - The 2007 Housing Element did not contain clear objectives related to this goal. The intent of the action program was to preserve affordability of the Casa Pacifica Apartments.
- Accomplishments - Casa Pacifica Apartments continued its participation in the Section 8 subsidy program throughout the 2007-2014 planning period.
- 2015 Objectives - Monitor Casa Pacifica Apartments for any indication of intent to cease participation in the Section 8 program. Formulate a comprehensive response with affordable housing partners to any notice of intent to cease Section 8 participation.
- Time Frame - 12/31/2018: Contact property owner to inquire about long-term intentions for the site. Due to the length of the current participation agreement (1/31/2015 through 1/31/2020), a single inquiry will suffice during the planning period.

Additional Discussion: The 2007 Housing Element contemplated a variety of potential responses to a notice to cease participation in the Section 8 program at Casa Pacifica Apartments. Those responses follow, for future reference:

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

- Help finance project buyout by nonprofits or other public entities through equity or gap financing, advancing purchase-option funds, carrying of second mortgages, interest write-downs, issuance of tax-exempt bonds for financing acquisition or rent reductions.
- Help finance project buyout by nonprofits or other public entities through equity or gap financing, advancing purchase-option funds, carrying of second mortgages, interest write-downs, issuance of tax-exempt bonds for financing acquisition or rent reductions.
- Provide grants and/or low interest or forgivable loans to potential purchasers to finance preliminary feasibility studies of acquisition.
- Provide financial relocation benefits for households dislocated from units with terminating affordability controls.
- Provide grants to create tenant management groups and/or local nonprofits capable of acquiring and managing the project.
- Where public acquisition on a permanent basis is not feasible, assist a public entity or nonprofit in purchasing the project on a temporary basis until a qualified long term owner can be found.
- Provide rent subsidies to ensure continued affordability by lower income tenants.
- Assess a conversion "impact fee" or "in-lieu contribution" for projects that convert to market rate rents.
- Adopt conversion protections, e.g., develop stricter condominium standards, require one-for-one replacement of units converted to market rate rents, where not preempted by State or Federal law.
- Enact some form of rent control, unless preempted by State or Federal law.
- Require owners of "at-risk" units to provide relocation assistance for displaced tenants where not already required by federal, state, or local statute.
- At such time as the project owners file a notice of intent, provide tenant and community education by involving affected constituencies in assessing the preservation problem, and provide information required for legally valid notices of intent and Plans of Action (POA) submitted by project owners, through local workshops. Include Casa Pacifica owners whenever possible.
- Submit comments on a proposed POA for the Casa Pacifica Apartments and communicate the City's concerns to HUD throughout the application process.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Advise tenants of the Casa Pacifica Apartments immediately upon receipt of a POA. Also, upon receipt of a POA, hold a public hearing pursuant to Government Code Section 65863.10.

Action Program No. 4

Encourage preservation of the existing mobile home park as an important source of low- and moderate-income housing.

- Specific Actions
- Contact mobile home park operator to inquire about ongoing intentions to maintain the use. The City has an established relationship with the operator of the 93-unit Pacific Skies Estates mobile home park on Palmetto Avenue. The operator recently made substantial investments into park improvements, and has stated its intention to operate the mobile home park on a long-term basis.
 - Maintain in effect the mobile home park conversion ordinance (Ordinance No. 550-C.S.) and monitor the city's only mobile home park for any indications of a potential conversion.
 - Upon any indication of park operator intent to pursue site conversion, administer and enforce Ordinance No. 550-C.S. to regulate conversion of mobile home parks to other uses without relocation assistance to tenants and other mitigation measures.
- Responsible Agency - Planning Division
- Financing - City funds
- 2007 Objectives - Continue preservation of the existing 93 mobile home units.
- Accomplishments - The mobile home park is still in operation, providing a valuable source of housing for low- and moderate-income individuals and families. There were no applications for conversion of the mobile home park during the 2007-2014 planning period.
- 2015 Objectives - Monitor mobile home park operator's long-term intentions for the site, encouraging maintenance of the mobile home park use. Administer Ordinance No. 550-C.S. if necessary. Unless development of additional mobile home parks occurs during the planning period, the maximum performance related to this policy would be one mobile home park conversion.
- Time Frame - By 12/31 in 2017 and 2020: Contact property owner to inquire about long-term intentions for the site.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 5

Ensure proper marketing of housing affordability programs and groups by partner agencies, including the Reverse Annuity Mortgage (RAM) program, Human Investment Project (H.I.P.) Homesharing Program, Lease-Purchase Program, emergency shelters, Project Sentinel, and Center for the Independence of the Disabled. These programs and organizations assist lower income persons, seniors, and persons with disabilities to stay in their homes. Project Sentinel specifically, and other organizations generally, will provide fair housing services to the City's residents and property owners. Services may include:

- *Distributing educational materials to property owners, apartment managers, and tenants.*
- *Conducting public presentations with different community groups.*
- *Responding to complaints of discrimination (e.g. complaint intake, investigation, and resolution).*
- *Referring services to appropriate agencies.*

- Specific Action
- Periodically train City staff with frequent public interactions on available resources.
 - Periodically contact partner agencies to verify referrals and cross-referrals are ongoing.

Responsible Agencies - Planning Division; Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Department

Financing - City funds

2007 Objectives - One (1) home per year

Accomplishments - Despite repeated attempts, staff was unable to obtain performance data indicating the number of Pacifica residents enrolled in the RAM program and participating in the H.I.P Homesharing program.

2015 Objectives - Pacifica will change the focus of this goal to staff training and encouragement of partner organizations. City staff will train other staff on available housing referral resources, and will contact partner agencies to determine the level of service they are providing to Pacifica residents. The City has no control over the quantity of persons served by the referral programs, but can monitor the level of service being provided to residents.

Time Frame - Bi-annually by 12/31 in 2015, 2017, 2019, and 2021: Conduct training of Planning Division, Code Enforcement Division, and Parks, Beaches, and Recreation staff regarding available housing referral programs, services, and agencies.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

- Bi-annually by 12/31 in 2015, 2017, 2019, and 2021: Contact partner agencies to verify whether they continue to make referrals and cross-referrals to other assistance agencies.

The following is a summary of the above-mentioned housing referral programs and organizations:

The Reverse Annuity Mortgage (RAM) Program

This program allows people over 62 to borrow from their home equity at a fixed interest rate for up to 10-12 years. To qualify, RAM loan recipients must live in their homes and have little or no mortgage balance. The loans allow homeowners to live in their homes, and convert equity into income.

Human Investment Project (H.I.P.) Homesharing Program

H.I.P – funded through private and public sources – matches homeowners seeking housemates with tenants seeking housing. Income provided to senior and single-parent homeowners from renting a room in their home can help them to afford monthly housing payments. The H.I.P. program identifies and screens potential tenants for program participants. Although not explicitly limited by income, the program focuses on assisting lower income individuals.

Lease-Purchase Program

The California Home Source Lease-Purchase Home Ownership Program is a new tool for cities, counties, and other government agencies in the Bay Area to help their constituents achieve home ownership. The program helps individuals and families overcome the cash and credit barriers they often face when attempting to purchase a home. California Home Source is a service of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Finance Authority for Non-Profit Corporations. The program provides down payment and closing costs assistance to help working individuals and families with credit problems.

Project Sentinel

A program that advances fair housing by investigating complaints of discrimination in housing due to race, religion, marital status, sex or national origin.

Center for Independence of Individuals with Disabilities

An organization that provides services to persons with disabilities, including housing rehabilitation assistance and accessibility modifications.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 6

Create a reasonable accommodation program and procedures to allow deviations from zoning standards for projects that improve access for persons with disabilities.

- Specific Action - Adopt an ordinance with a reasonable accommodation program and procedures.
- Responsible Agencies - Planning Division
- Financing - City funds
- 2007 Objective - None. New program in 2015 Housing Element.
- Accomplishments - None. New program in 2015 Housing Element.
- 2015 Objectives - Adopt an ordinance by the end of 2016.
- Time Frame - 12/31/2016: Enact Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance.

7. Housing Improvement

There are many expenses associated with owning housing. Whether one owns a single-family home or a multi-family apartment complex, the challenges of paying monthly loans, annual taxes and insurance can leave few resources remaining to maintain the property. After extended neglect, many properties decline in exterior appearance and interior functionality. Neighborhood aesthetics and character can suffer as disinvestment by a single property owner can encourage disinvestment by others. Inside housing units, deterioration can lead to violations of building, health, and safety codes, creating substandard housing conditions.

Property owners, especially those with lower incomes, can feel trapped by declining properties. Unable to afford less expensive maintenance activities, many remain unable to afford costly repairs stemming from neglect. The result is the continued decline of distressed properties until they detract from neighborhood character and are unsuitable for habitation. Proactive measures are necessary to restore declining housing stock to a safe and attractive condition. To the maximum extent feasible, the City shall seek to leverage its own investments and available funding from external partners to improve the quality of its housing stock and neighborhoods. Energy conservation also can play an important role in improving housing. Less energy consumption means lower monthly utility bills, saving property owners money each month and allowing them to direct some of the savings towards improving their housing.

A. Policies, Objectives, and Programs to Improve Housing

- POLICIES - ENCOURAGE CODE COMPLIANCE THROUGH PROACTIVE ENGAGEMENT, EDUCATION, AND ENFORCEMENT;**
- LEVERAGE CITY INVESTMENTS TO IMPROVE THE CHARACTER OF NEIGHBORHOODS;**
- ENHANCE HOUSING AFFORDABILITY THROUGH ENERGY CONSERVATION AND OTHER STRATEGIES.**

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 7

Emphasize housing rehabilitation to forestall decline in the housing stock. Utilize government subsidies including Section 8 or other rental assistance programs to enhance owner affordability. Use the Code Enforcement process to refer owners to apply for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds for housing rehabilitation.

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Specific Action | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Distribute program literature to property owners contacted during deteriorated housing-related inspections.- Include rehabilitation program information on the City's website. |
| Responsible Agencies | - Building Division; Code Enforcement Division; San Mateo County Housing and Community Development Division |
| Financing | - Community Development Block Grants, California Housing Finance Agency, Federal Housing Authority |
| 2007 Objective | - Pacifica's goal is to increase awareness of the San Mateo County Department of Housing and Community Development's housing rehabilitation programs through more aggressive advertising on the City's web site and through the distribution of brochures at the City Hall (annex), Sharp Park Library, Sanchez Library, Pacifica Resource Center, community center and other public locations. Pacifica will modify its Action Program goal from 34 rehabilitated units per year to 10 units per year - 2 low-income rental units and 8 low-income owner occupied units. |
| Accomplishments | - The San Mateo County Housing Authority Rehabilitation Program rehabilitated 37 Pacifica housing units between 2007-2014. |
| 2015 Objectives | - Distribute rehabilitation and housing affordability program information to 300 property owners during building code or property maintenance code interactions with City inspectors. Building Division and Code Enforcement staff responded to 298 housing-related complaints between 2007-2014 (42 per year), and the City estimates the figure will remain consistent during the planning period. |
| Time Frame | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 1/31/2015 through 12/31/2015: Three referrals- 1/1/2016 through 12/31/2016: Four referrals- 1/1/2017 through 12/31/2017: Four referrals- 1/1/2018 through 12/31/2018: Four referrals- 1/1/2019 through 12/31/2019: Four referrals- 1/1/2020 through 12/31/2020: Four referrals- 1/1/2021 through 12/31/2021: Four referrals- 1/1/2022 through 1/31/2023: Five referrals |

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No.8 (formerly Action Program No. 7A in 2007-2014 Housing Element)

Establish an incentive program for voluntary housing rehabilitation.

- Specific Action - Review each development application for opportunities to improve community infrastructure and aesthetics. Pursue all available funding sources to upgrade and enhance infrastructure and public property/right-of-way aesthetics with improvements to streets, gutters, sidewalks, street trees, sewer laterals, and other infrastructure.
- Responsible Agencies - Department of Public Works; Planning Division
- Financing - Property owner funds; City funds
- 2007 Objectives - The City shall support voluntary housing rehabilitation by upgrading streets, gutters, sidewalks, street trees, sewer laterals, etc. Information will be provided to developers and homeowners on the City's web site by early-2011.
- Accomplishments - In 2008, the City developed a Palmetto Avenue streetscape improvement plan to underground utilities and improve the sidewalks, roadway, and landscaping between Paloma Avenue and Clarendon Road. The plan has multiple phases and timing of improvements is funding dependent. The City continues to seek funding to proceed with Phase I (Utility Undergrounding). Once completed, the project will mark a significantly improved aesthetic environment along Palmetto Avenue and should spur additional private investment in real estate improvements.
- The City Council in December 2011 enacted Ordinance No. 784-C.S. requiring inspection of sewer laterals concurrent with transfer of title to property, certain renovations, and in several other instances. Property owners must improve sewer laterals to reduce the likelihood of blockage or failure when inspections identify blockages or other substandard conditions. Since enactment, the Ordinance has led to nearly 1,000 sewer lateral inspections, of which almost two-thirds resulted in upgrades.
- The City Council took another infrastructure-related action in November 2012 with adoption of a resolution calling for complete streets throughout Pacifica. The resolution approved a new administrative policy emphasizing a connective street network and consideration of all modes of travel. Since adoption, City staff has conditioned seven development approvals to require installation of sidewalks and other pedestrian- and bicyclist-oriented improvements.
- 2015 Objectives - Continue implementation of Complete Streets policies. Condition all development approvals to require improvements infrastructure and multi-modal connectivity. Pursue funding to implement Phase I of the Palmetto streetscape improvements and planning for subsequent phases.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

- Time Frame
- 1/31/2015 through 1/31/2023: Condition 80 projects (10 per year) requiring Complete Streets improvements.
 - 12/31/2018: Secure sufficient funding to initiate Phase I improvements under the Palmetto streetscape improvement plan. Enhance the neighborhood quality of the 92 housing units in the vicinity of the streetscape improvements.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 9 (formerly Action Program No. 4 in 2007-2014 Housing Element)

Promote Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) Company's "Energy Savings Assistance Program." The program is free and helps income-qualifying homeowners and renters make vital energy saving improvements to their homes, including weatherstripping, caulking, insulation, minor home repairs, compact fluorescent bulbs, and appliance replacement.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Specific Action | - Display program literature at the Planning Department counter and Planning Department website. - Distribute program literature to potential participants identified during housing-related inspections. |
| Responsible Agency | - Building Division; Planning Division; PG&E |
| Financing | - City funds, PG&E funds |
| 2007 Objectives | - 35 units per year |
| Accomplishments | - Since 2007, PG&E has provided free weatherstripping, caulking, insulating, and minor home repairs to 882 low income Pacifica residents. These improvements have led to average energy savings of 391 kilowatt-hours (kWh) for single-family residential participants; 229 kWh for multi-family residential participants; and, 401 kWh for mobile home participants. Pacifica also obtained literature regarding the free weatherization/home repair program from PG&E and distributed the literature to all interested parties. |
| 2015 Objectives | - Continue to distribute program literature. - Successfully refer 35 households per year. |
| Time Frame | - 1/31/2015 through 12/31/2015: 32 applicants - 1/1/2016 through 12/31/2016: 35 applicants - 1/1/2017 through 12/31/2017: 35 applicants - 1/1/2018 through 12/31/2018: 35 applicants - 1/1/2019 through 12/31/2019: 35 applicants - 1/1/2020 through 12/31/2020: 35 applicants - 1/1/2021 through 12/31/2021: 35 applicants - 1/1/2022 through 1/31/2023: 38 applicants |

8. Housing Development

As discussed in Section 5 “Regional Housing Needs,” Pacifica must approve or develop an average of 52 housing units per year between 2015 and 2023 to meet its housing needs across all income levels. Categorized by income level, that equates to annual approval or development of 8 units each for extremely low-income and very low-income persons, 9 units each for low-income and median-income persons, and 20 units for moderate income persons. Considering the residential development trends in Pacifica in recent decades, the City faces significant challenges to meeting these needs. It must ensure to mitigate as many constraints as possible and undertake other activities to encourage and incentivize housing development.

A. Policies, Objectives, and Programs to Improve Housing

POLICY - PRIORITIZE MIXED-USE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON INFILL SITES.

Action Program No. 10

Prioritize in-fill mixed-use and residential development on underutilized sites and vacant sites interspersed with developed areas.

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Specific Action | - Encourage property owners to redevelop underutilized sites into mixed-use developments with housing. Also encourage property owners of vacant lots within developed areas to construct mixed-use or multi-family housing at these sites. |
| Responsible Agency | - Planning Division, Economic Development Division |
| Financing | - City funds |
| 2007 Objectives | - None. New program in 2015 Housing Element. |
| Accomplishments | - In 2013, the City encouraged infill within the Rockaway Beach neighborhood which resulted in the construction of three housing units in a mixed-use development at 411 Dondee Way. |
| 2015 Objectives | - Contact two property owners of identified underutilized sites per year to encourage redevelopment with higher density, mixed-use projects. |

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 11

Encourage and facilitate construction of second residential units on properties zoned for single-family residential uses in conformance with existing zoning regulations.

- Specific Action - The City should periodically evaluate the second unit requirements and review procedures to ensure minimal constraints exist to their construction.
- Responsible Agency - Planning Division
- Financing - City funds
- 2007 Objective - Encourage the construction of two second residential units per year. There is potential that approximately 14 second residential units will be developed during this planning period. To further encourage the development of second residential units, the City shall explore the feasibility of relaxing some of the development regulations such as on-site parking. Other incentives to encourage the development of second residential units may include fee reductions and priority permit processing.
- Accomplishments - Three (3) second units were constructed from January 2007 to December 2014, resulting in an 11 unit shortfall from its 14 unit goal. Pacifica currently promotes the second-unit program by providing property owners and developers development information about adding a second unit.
- 2015 Objectives - Encourage construction of two second residential units per year, or 16 second units during the planning period. Periodically evaluate the City's second unit zoning regulations and inquire with residents and construction professionals as to the perceived level of difficulty and expense associated with second unit construction. Where perceptions suggest second unit construction is difficult, develop strategies to revise the City's regulations, such as by relaxing second unit parking requirements.
- Time Frame - Bi-annually by 12/31 in 2016, 2018, 2020, and 2022: Review and revise, as necessary.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 12 (formerly Action Program No. 10A in 2007-2014 Housing Element)
Amend Second Unit Ordinance to incorporate updates in state law.

- Specific Action - Initiate the amendment of the Second Unit Ordinance to conform to state law.
- Responsible Agencies - Planning Division
- Financing - City funds
- 2007 Objective - Amend Second Unit Ordinance to comply with state laws by the end of 2011.
- Accomplishments - The City did not amend its Second Unit Ordinance as planned, but processed all second unit applications in accordance with state law notwithstanding the City's codified ordinance.
- 2015 Objectives - Amend Second Unit Ordinance to comply with state law by the end of 2016.
- Time Frame - 12/31/2016: Enact amendments to Second Unit Ordinance to conform to state law.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

**POLICIES - PROVIDE HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL INCOME GROUPS;
- PROVIDE A CHOICE OF HOUSING TYPES AND DENSITIES**

Action Program No. 13 (formerly Action Program No. 15A in 2007-2014 Housing Element)

Amend Density Bonus Ordinance to reflect updates to state law.

- Specific Action - Amendment the Density Bonus Ordinance to reflect the latest provisions of state law.
- Responsible Agencies - Planning Division
- Financing - City Funds
- 2007 Objective - Amend Density Bonus Ordinance to comply with state law by mid-2011.
- Accomplishments - The City did not amend its Density Bonus Ordinance as planned.
- 2015 Objectives - Amend Density Bonus Ordinance to comply with state law by the end of 2016. The City will process density bonus applications in compliance with state law until it amends the local code provisions.
- Time Frame - 12/31/2016: Enact amendments to Density Bonus Ordinance to conform to state law.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 14 (formerly Action Program No. 16A in 2007-2014 Housing Element)

Consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow Rooming Houses and Boardinghouses for farmworker housing as a permitted use in the R-3 (Multiple-Family Residential) District.

- Specific Action - Planning Commission shall discuss and consider whether to amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow Rooming Houses and Boardinghouses for farmworker housing as a permitted use in the R-3 zone.²¹
- Responsible Agency - Planning Division
- Financing - City funds
- 2007 Objectives - Consider the zoning amendment.
- Accomplishments - The City has not yet considered the described amendments to the Zoning Code.
- 2015 Objectives - Consider the zoning amendment and enact amendments if determined desirable and feasible.
- Time Frame - 12/31/2016: Complete consideration of the amendment.
- 12/31/2017: Enact amendments to Zoning Code, if determined desirable and feasible.

²¹ Farmworker housing for six or fewer occupants is already and will continue to be permitted in any residential zone as a residential use, subject only to those regulations that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type (e.g., single family, duplex, condominiums, apartments) in the same zone.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 15 (formerly Action Program No. 16B in the 2007-2014 Housing Element)
Amend A (Agricultural) Zoning District to allow farmworker housing.

- Specific Action - Amend the Zoning Code to comply with Health and Safety Code Sections 17021.5 and 17021.6 to allow housing for agricultural employees without discretionary approval.
- Responsible Agencies - Planning Division
- Financing - City funds
- 2007 Objectives - Amend A zoning district to comply with state law.
- Accomplishments - The City did not amend A zoning district as planned
- 2015 Objectives - Amend A zoning district to comply with state law.
- Time Frame - 6/30/2016: Enact amendments to Zoning Code.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 16 (formerly Action Program No. 16C in 2007-2014 Housing Element) *Amend Zoning Ordinance to allow Emergency Shelters, Transitional and Supportive Housing.*

- Specific Actions
- Amend the Zoning Code to comply with Senate Bill (SB) 2 to allow Emergency, Transitional and Supportive Housing without discretionary approval.
 - Create a definition of “emergency shelter” as “housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that is limited to occupancy of six months or less by a homeless person. No individual or household may be denied emergency shelter because of an inability to pay.”
 - Create a definition of “transitional housing” as “buildings configured as rental housing developments, but operated under program requirements that require the termination of assistance and recirculating of the assisted unit to another eligible program recipient at a predetermined future point in time that shall be no less than six months from the beginning of the assistance.”
 - Create a definition of “supportive housing” as “housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, and that is linked to an onsite or offsite service that assists the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community. For the purposes of this definition, “target population” means persons with low incomes who have one or more disabilities, including mental illness, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) or acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS), substance abuse, or other chronic health condition, or individuals eligible for services provided pursuant to the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Division 4.5, commencing with Section 4500, of the Welfare and Institutions Code) and may include, among other populations, adults, emancipated minors, families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people.”
 - Create a new permitted use in the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoning district, an overlay zone, or another zoning district to permit emergency shelters for up to 15 occupants, subject only to those development and management standards that apply to residential development within the same zone, except that the City may develop written, objective standards for those criteria identified in Government Code Section 65583(a)(4)(A).
 - Create new permitted uses in all residential districts and in commercial districts permitting residential uses to permit transitional housing and supportive housing as a residential use, subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type (e.g., single family, duplex, condominiums, apartments) in the same zone in accordance with

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Government Code Section 65583(a)(5). For example, transitional housing located in an apartment building is permitted in the same manner as an apartment building in the same zone or supportive housing located in a single-family home is permitted in the same manner as a single-family home in the same zone.

Responsible Agencies - Planning Division

Financing - City funds

2007 Objectives - Amend zoning ordinance to make explicit provisions for transitional and supportive housing, and emergency shelters. Develop objective standards to regulate emergency shelters as provided for under SB 2.

Accomplishments - The City's Zoning Code already permits by-right establishment of emergency shelters under the zoning classification "special care facility" in all residential districts. The by-right allowance pertains to facilities serving six or fewer individuals. The special care facility classification also allows shelters for "other need categories," which can include transitional and supportive housing. However, the City should consider enacting explicit authorization for these types of uses as well as development standards for their establishment and operations.

2015 Objectives - Amend the Zoning Code to create new definitions for emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing. Create new permitted uses for these types of facilities to clarify their treatment by the City. Create development standards for the establishment and ongoing operations of these facilities.

Time Frame - 9/30/2015: Develop and discuss at the Planning Commission potential development standards for emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing.

- 1/31/2016: Amend the Zoning Code to explicitly permit by-right emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Action Program No. 17 (formerly Action Program No. 16D in 2007-2014 Housing Element)

The City shall initiate contact with developers from the private and nonprofit sectors interested in development opportunities in the City of Pacifica for rental housing affordable to persons with extremely low, very low, and low incomes.

- Specific Action - Proactively engage for-profit and not-for-profit housing developers on a periodic basis. Consider hosting an annual developer roundtable to discuss development opportunities sites and other development issues. Provide permit material and information about the review process at the public counter explaining the various steps in the process.
- Responsible Agencies - Planning Division
- Financing - City funds, Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), Affordable Housing Innovative Program (AHIP) Loan Fund, Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME), Multi-Housing Program General Component (MHP-General) Fund, and Predevelopment Loan Program (PDLP).
- 2007 Objectives - Initiate meetings with developers from the private and nonprofit sectors interested in affordable rental housing on a regular basis. Consider hosting an annual developer roundtable to discuss development opportunities sites and other development issues. Provide permit material and information about the review process at the public counter explaining the various steps in the process. This includes what materials need to be submitted and when and how long review will take at each juncture, and support applications for funding.
- Accomplishments - The City frequently receives inquiries from developers of market rate and affordable housing. Staff provides them with information related to Pacifica's development process and encourages them to proceed with their projects.
- 2015 Objectives - Begin a bi-annual housing developer roundtable hosted by the City to provide factual information on development sites and the City's development process, as well as to demonstrate a strong City commitment to affordable housing development.
- Time Frame - Bi-annually by 12/31 in 2016, 2018, 2020, and 2022: Host developer roundtable.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

POLICY - MAINTAIN A BALANCED RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT WITH ACCESS TO EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND ADEQUATE SERVICES.

Action Program No. 18 (formerly Action Program No. 20 in 2007-2014 Housing Element)

Encourage development of housing for all income levels, including lower income individuals, in suitable areas to meet ABAG's projected housing need.

Specific Action - Prepare, publish, and distribute a regularly-updated inventory of available housing development sites to facilitate the housing development process.

Responsible Agencies - Planning Division

Financing - City funds

2007 Objectives - Pacifica will encourage annual development of three low-income housing units, five moderate-income housing units, and 30 above-moderate income housing units. The City will continue to update the inventory of sites for distribution to potential developers and other interested parties. The City will advertise its sites by posting a list on the City's web site and at the Planning Department, and by distributing hard copies to any persons interested in obtaining a list.

Accomplishments - Pacifica regularly updated its inventory of sites available for development. The City posted the inventory on its website and made the list available to persons interested in the list at its public counter.

2015 Objectives - Update available development site inventory annually to encourage development of housing units to satisfy the City's RHNA.

Time Frame - Annually by 12/31: Post updated inventory on City's website.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

POLICY - ACTIVELY MONITOR HOUSING ELEMENT IMPLEMENTATION.

Action Program No. 19 (formerly Action Program No. 26 in 2007-2014 Housing Element)

Form a committee to monitor housing trends affecting needs and development, as well as implementation of action programs. Devise strategies to accommodate housing needs that arise during the planning period that the Housing Element does not adequately address.

- Specific Action - Form a committee which includes members of the Planning Commission and housing advocates. Hold meetings to discuss implementation of the Housing Element. Review annual Housing Element Status and Annual Progress Report prior to City Council consideration.
- Responsible Agency - Planning Division
- Financing - City funds
- 2007 Objectives - The committee should be constituted and continue to hold meetings to discuss implementation of the 2007 Housing Element.
- Accomplishments - The City did not establish a committee to oversee 2007 Housing Element implementation.
- 2015 Objectives - Form a committee to assert more active oversight in Housing Element implementation. Review the draft Housing Element Status and Annual Progress Report prior to the public hearing and consideration by City Council.
- Time Frame - 8/31/2015: Establish a Housing Element implementation committee.
- Annually by 6/30: Planning Division staff conducts an internal review of implementation during first-half of year and projected implementation during remaining-half of year.
- Annually between 1/1 and 2/28: Hold a committee meeting to discuss prior year Housing Element implementation and to review the draft Housing Element Status and Annual Progress Report.
- Annually between 3/1 and 3/31: Present the Housing Element Status and Annual Progress Report at a City Council public hearing and seek Council approval and transmittal of the Report to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) by the April 1 deadline.

9. Discontinued Programs

The City of Pacifica is a dynamic place, continually evolving and changing over time. This evolution impacts the City across numerous dimensions, including the natural, built, political, legal, and financial environments. The result is that certain programs proposed or undertaken in previous housing elements are no longer relevant or feasible within the context of the current planning period. The following is a summary of discontinued programs, including a brief listing of their accomplishments (if any) during the 2007-2014 Housing Element planning period.

A. Discontinued Program Listing

i. Action Program No. 4B

Complete and Adopt Green Building Ordinance.

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Specific Action | Adopt a Green Building Ordinance to assure that all new buildings and significant remodels incorporate green building practices and materials into the design. |
| Reason for Discontinuance | The City enacted a local Green Building Ordinance on 12/13/2010, thereby establishing local standards for new and altered buildings. The City superseded its ordinance with the adoption of the California Green Building Code on 12/25/2013. The program is no longer necessary because the City completed this activity, achieving the desired outcome. |

ii. Action Program No. 11

Develop program for establishment of Housing Fund from tax increment revenues to increase and improve low and moderate-income housing.

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Specific Action | Develop a program which will set forth the means of distributing funds generated by the Redevelopment Agency. Establish priority system. |
| Reason for Discontinuance | In 2012 the California Legislature dissolved redevelopment agencies statewide with passage of Assembly Bill (AB) x1 26 and AB 1484. Dissolution of the City's Redevelopment Agency rendered this activity infeasible. |

iii. Action Program No. 13

Develop regulations to encourage density-open space trade-offs, such as clustering development, transferring development rights from sensitive to less sensitive land, and dedication of open space.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

Specific Action Amend Zoning Ordinance to include procedure for transfer of development rights. Prepare inventory of potential "receiver sites." Continue to administer open space dedication policies.

Reason for Discontinuance The City enacted an ordinance governing transfer of development rights in 1989 (Ordinance No. 539-C.S.). The City also already has development provisions within the P-D (Planned Development) zoning district that allow deviation from strict implementation of development standards in order to achieve clustered development when it would lead to superior site design. This program was carried forward erroneously into the 2007-2014 Housing Element.

iv. Action Program No. 13A

Encourage housing development in clusters.

Specific Action Review clustered housing standards for incentives to build housing development in clusters

Reason for Discontinuance The City already has codified development provisions within the P-D (Planned Development) zoning district that allow deviation from strict implementation of development standards in order to achieve clustered development when it would lead to superior site design. The P-D district regulations have existed in Pacifica since 1975, and this program was carried forward erroneously into the 2007-2014 Housing Element.

v. Action Program No. 15

Promote the Density Bonus Ordinance in all new multifamily residential development. Encourage a mix of rental and owner housing types, including senior, low income, moderate, above moderate income, and entry-level home ownership for teachers, City employees, and others in Pacifica's workforce.

Specific Action Discuss the ordinance with individual developers. Stress incentives for inclusion of affordable units.

Reason for Discontinuance Incorporated into ongoing policies related to Development of Housing (Section 4.D).

vi. Action Program No. 16

Encourage development of small houses which will fit more appropriately on small lots. Encourage development of small units in multi-family projects to provide more density without increasing massing. The market should limit cost of the units based on size.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Specific Action | Utilize the City’s Design Guidelines, design review process, and adaptable zoning provisions to encourage developers to build small units under appropriate circumstances. |
| Reason for Discontinuance | The City has reviewed its Zoning Regulations and procedures and believes they are sufficient to encourage small unit development without undertaking an additional housing element program. |

vii. Action Program No. 16E

Apply for State and Federal monies for direct support of extremely low-income housing.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Specific Action | The City shall consider applying for State and Federal monies for direct support of low-income housing construction and rehabilitation. The City shall assess potential funding sources, such as, but not limited to, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), and HOME. The City shall also seek State and Federal funding specifically targeted for the development of housing affordable to extremely low-income households, such as the Proposition 1-C funds. The City shall promote the benefits of this program to the development community by posting information on its web page and creating a handout to be distributed with land development applications. |
| Reason for Discontinuance | The City does not have a housing authority and does not have staff dedicated to housing programs. Given current budget constraints, establishment of such an agency with staff is infeasible. The San Mateo County Housing Authority administers the activities described in this action program and pursues funding on behalf of the City of Pacifica and other cities in San Mateo County. |

viii. Action Program No. 16F

Consider using redevelopment funds for affordable housing.

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Specific Action | Consistent with State law, the City shall consider directing 20 percent of the tax increment funds accruing to the Redevelopment Agency to affordable housing. If successful in receiving matching funds from other sources, the City shall encourage the Redevelopment Agency to work with affordable housing developers to utilize a portion of set-aside funds for development of housing affordable to extremely low-income households. |
| Reason for Discontinuance | In 2012 the California Legislature dissolved redevelopment agencies statewide with passage of Assembly Bill (AB) x1 26 and AB 1484. Dissolution of the City’s Redevelopment Agency rendered this activity infeasible. |

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

ix. Action Program No. 18A

Consider streamlining the permit process to expedite housing construction.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Specific Action | Ensure that projects are reviewed and acted on in the shortest possible time consistent with the City's interest in complete review. |
| Reason for Discontinuance | The City's permitting process has not caused delays to housing development in any fashion that would benefit from streamlining actions. Major delays to projects typically stem from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a state statute the City cannot affect with streamlining actions. |

x. Action Program No. 18B

Amend Manufactured Housing Ordinance regulations.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Specific Action | Initiate the amendment of the manufacture housing building regulations to comply with state law. |
| Reason for Discontinuance | The City has assessed its ordinance and believes it complies with state law. It allows manufactured housing to be installed in the R-1 zoning district subject to a non-discretionary building permit. |

xi. Action Program No. 18C

Consider streamlining the permit process to encourage and facilitate residential development on commercial sites (mixed-use).

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Specific Action | Ensure that commercial/residential projects are reviewed and acted on in the shortest possible time. |
| Reason for Discontinuance | The City's permitting process has not caused delays to housing development in any fashion that would benefit from streamlining actions. Major delays to projects typically stem from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a state statute the City cannot affect with streamlining actions. |

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

xii. Action Program No. 20A

Encourage development of lower and moderate income housing in suitable areas to meet ABAG's projected housing need.

Specific Action Prepare, publish, and distribute inventory of available sites.
Facilitate development process.

Reason for Discontinuance Action program combined with 2015-2023 Housing Element
Action Program No. 22.

xiii. Action Program No. 21

Continue to cooperate with the Pacifica Resource Center and emphasize its role in housing assistance.

Specific Action Refer interested parties to Center staff.

Reason for Discontinuance Action program combined with 2015-2023 Housing Element
Action Program No. 5.

xiv. Action Program No. 22

Promote the Human Investment Project's Shared Homes Program directed to seniors and single parents who are homeowners or tenants.

Specific Action Obtain literature for display and distribution. Refer interested
individuals to Project staff.

Reason for Discontinuance Action program combined with 2015-2023 Housing Element
Action Program No. 5.

xv. Action Program No. 23

Promote Project Sentinel, a program that investigates complaints of discrimination in housing due to race, religion, marital status, sex or national origin.

Specific Action Obtain literature for display and distribution. Refer interested
individuals to Project staff.

Reason for Discontinuance Action program combined with 2015-2023 Housing Element
Action Program No. 5.

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

xvi. Action Program No. 24

Promote the Center for Independence of Individuals with Disabilities, an organization that provides services to the disabled, including housing rehabilitation assistance and accessibility modifications.

Specific Action Obtain literature for display and distribution. Refer interested individuals to Center staff.

Reason for Discontinuance Action program combined with 2015-2023 Housing Element Action Program No. 5.

xvii. Action Program No. 25

Provide the opportunity for conversion of existing facilities to shelters for victims of family violence, or other special needs facilities.

Specific Action Advise interested individuals that Special Care Facilities which include shelters for victims of family violence, homeless persons, or “other needs categories” such as transitional housing and emergency shelters are permitted in the R-1 (Single-Family Residential) district.

Reason for Discontinuance The City’s existing Zoning Code permits by-right “special care facilities” for six or fewer persons in all residential zoning districts. The City does not need to pursue opportunities for conversion of existing facilities as this is already permitted.

V. COASTAL ZONE HOUSING

1. Purpose

The coastal zone in Pacifica is that area west of Highway 1 with a small extension east of the highway between Reina del Mar and Burns Court. Pacifica has six coastal neighborhoods, which include (from north to south) Fairmont West, West Edgemar/Pacific Manor, West Sharp Park, Rockaway Beach, West Linda Mar, and Pedro Point. The coastal zone contains 16 percent of Pacifica's land area but only 13 percent of its population.

State law includes several requirements for housing in the coastal zone. Specifically, Government Code Section 65588 calls for jurisdictions to include in their housing elements information on the following:

- The number of new housing units approved for construction within the coastal zone after January 1, 1982;
- The number of existing residential dwelling units occupied by persons and families of low or moderate income that have been authorized to be demolished or converted since January 1, 1982, in the coastal zone;
- The number of housing units for persons and families of low or moderate income required to be provided in new housing developments either within the coastal zone or within three miles of the coastal zone;
- The number of residential dwelling units for persons and families of low or moderate income that have been required for replacement or authorized to be converted or demolished. The review shall include the location of the replacement units in or within three miles of the coastal zone.

State law calls for replacement of demolished if determined to be feasible. In addition, all new development in the coastal zone is required to include low and moderate income units if feasible. Due to the small size of all new development in Pacifica's coastal zone, only one project approved since 1982 has included affordable units. Future projects within the coastal zone are also unlikely to yield affordable units unless they develop eight or more housing units, and which point they become subject to the City's Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance.

2. Housing Unit Construction, Demolition, and Replacement

During the 2007-2014 Housing Element planning period, 11 housing units were constructed in the coastal zone. When including areas in or within three miles of the coastal zone, the figure rose to 17 housing units (note: all developable areas of the City are located within three miles of the coastal zone).

During this same period, four housing units were demolished within the coastal zone. All four were moderate-income units. Three units have been replaced with above-moderate income units, with two of

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

these units underway in the construction phase. The replacements occurred on the same sites within the coastal zone. One unit, on Carmel Avenue, was not replaced.

While not demolished, other coastal zone housing units have been impacted during the 2007-2014 Housing Element planning period in such a way as to have the effect of demolition. The City's Building Official has determined that 20 rental housing units located at 320 Esplanade Avenue and 12 rental housing units located at 330 Esplanade Avenue (all 32 of which were affordable to low-income persons) are unsafe for habitation due to severe coastal erosion.²² The units have not been replaced, and it is unlikely they will ever be replaced on the same site. The City's opinion of conditions at the site is that coastal erosion is too severe and that future development at the site is unlikely, including remedial measures to make the buildings once again habitable.

Since January of 1982, a total of 25 housing units have been demolished in the coastal zone. Of these, 5 were low-income units, 17 were moderate-income units, and 3 were above-moderate income units. Two of these homes, located west of Beach Boulevard in West Sharp Park were lost in a storm. Another unit on Olympian Way in Pedro Point was demolished because it was threatened by a slide. Eight of the units demolished since 1982 did not suffer storm damage. One moderate-income structure on Salada Avenue was demolished because it was not up to Building Code standards. It was not replaced. Two moderate-income units on Francisco Boulevard were demolished because they were not up to Building or Fire Code standards. These units have not yet been replaced.

Additionally, in 1998 seven homes, located on Esplanade Avenue in Pacific Manor were lost in a storm. Another above-moderate income unit on Blackburn Terrace in Pedro Point was demolished. It was replaced in 1998 by an above-moderate income unit. Two above-moderate income units in the West Rockaway Beach area were also demolished.

Twenty-two mobile homes threatened by the 1983 storm were moved out of the Pacific Skies Estates Mobile Home Park on Palmetto Avenue. To date, 14 of the mobile homes have been replaced in the park and the park operator will continue to replace older mobile homes.

Nine structures outside the coastal zone have been demolished since January of 1987. Four destroyed in a 1982 storm included two on Valdez Way in Linda Mar and two on Oddstad Boulevard in Park Pacifica. Three other structures on Reina del Mar in Vallemar were demolished. They were replaced in 1984, 1998, and 2000, respectively. Another unit was demolished in 1999 on Crespi Drive in the West Linda Mar neighborhood. In 1992 a unit was demolished on Perez Drive in the Linda Mar area. The unit was replaced on-site.

No housing units for persons and families of low or moderate income were required to be provided in new housing developments either within the coastal zone or within three miles of the coastal zone during the 2007-2014 Housing Element planning period.

²² The Building Official notified tenants of 330 Esplanade Avenue December 17, 2009, and tenants of 320 Esplanade Avenue on April 29, 2010.

VI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

On December 16, 2014, the Planning Commission held a study session public review workshop to discuss the draft Housing Element and to solicit new ideas for policies and action programs from residents, housing advocates, and other interested parties. Additionally, on April 20, 2015, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider the Housing Element, including public testimony. The Planning Commission forwarded the Housing Element to the City Council with a recommendation of approval. The City Council held a public hearing on the Housing Element on May 11, 2015, again seeking public input from residents, housing advocates, and other interested parties. As the public review process progressed, the City posted a draft version of the Housing Element on the City's website, as well as on the "21elements.com" website for convenience of public review.

Notices of the study session workshop and public hearings were published in the Pacifica Tribune newspaper, e-mailed via the City's public information system, posted on the Nextdoor community engagement web platform, posted on the City's website, mailed to interested parties, and posted in the following locations:

1. Sanchez Library (Park Pacifica)
2. Pacifica Library (West Sharp Park)
3. Pacifica Community Center (Linda Mar)
4. Pacifica City Hall
5. Planning Department

Additionally, the City sent notices to 50 nonprofit housing organizations and service providers servicing special needs populations, including Bay Area Legal Aid, Center for the Independence of the Disabled, Center on Homelessness, Community Legal Services, Golden Gate Regional Center, HIP Housing, InnVision/Shelter Network, Mental Health Association of San Mateo County, and the San Mateo County Commissions on Aging/Disabilities.

VII. CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN

The City will review the Housing Element during the annual review of the General Plan to ensure consistency is achieved and maintained during the planning period with all other legally required elements, and revise as necessary. The City will consider whether major changes in objectives and policies are necessary to achieve its goals, and undertake revisions as necessary.

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Pacifica's population decreased by 3 percent between 2000 and 2010. In the last 30 years the largest population change occurred between 1980 and 1990, with an increase of 804 residents (+2.2 percent). The City is becoming more diverse as the white population shrinks and the Asian and Latino populations increase.

The City is no longer experiencing periods of rapid population growth as it did during the mid-twentieth century, and development of housing units has slowed as a result. Slowing development of housing units places greater emphasis on maintenance, preservation, and improvement activities by the City. Yes, development of new housing units will be critically important to meet the increasing needs of seniors and persons with disabilities. Maintenance, preservation, and improvement alone will not meet the housing needs of these groups and other lower income persons.

The City has identified sites where focused housing development can occur. Sufficient sites exist to meet the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the period from January 31, 2015, through January 31, 2023. The City has also identified certain programs and activities it can implement and undertake to encourage development of housing, or to enhance maintenance, preservation, and improvement of existing housing.

Constrained housing resources in a post-redevelopment environment will make development of affordable housing more challenging for Pacifica, but the City is determined to apply all available resources to meet the housing needs of current and future residents.

IX. CONTACT INFORMATION

The names, addresses and telephone numbers of the agencies named in this Housing Element are listed below. Whenever possible, the names of contact persons at the agencies are identified. Also listed are the Action Programs for which the agencies are responsible.

| <u>Agency</u> | <u>Action Program No.</u> | <u>Ongoing Policy No.</u> |
|---|--|---|
| Pacifica Planning Department, Planning Division 1800 Francisco Boulevard Pacifica, CA 94044 Lee Diaz, Acting Planning Director (650) 738-7341 | 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 | IV.4.B.ii, IV.4.B.iii, IV.4.B.iv, IV.4.D.i, IV.4.D.ii, IV.4.D.iii, IV.4.D.iv, IV.4.D.v, IV.4.D.vi, IV.4.D.vii |
| Pacifica Planning Department, Building Division 1800 Francisco Boulevard Pacifica, CA 94044 Liz Ryder, Building Official (650) 738-7344 | 1, 2, 7, 9 | IV.4.A.i, IV.4.A.ii, IV.4.A.iii, IV.4.B.i, IV.4.C.i, IV.4.D.v |
| Pacifica Planning Department, Code Enforcement Division 1800 Francisco Boulevard Pacifica, CA 94044 Lawrence Ngai, Code Enforcement Officer (650) 738-7343 | 1, 7 | IV.4.A.i, IV.4.A.ii, IV.4.C.i |
| Pacifica Fire Department 616 Edgemar Boulevard Pacifica, CA 94044 Rich Johnson, Deputy Chief (650) 991-8151 | | IV.4.B.i |
| Pacifica Public Works Department 155 Milagra Pacifica, CA 94044 Van Ocampo, Director (650) 738-3760 | 8 | IV.4.D.v |
| Pacifica City Manager’s Office, Economic Development Division 170 Santa Maria Avenue Pacifica, CA 94044 Anne Stedler, Econ. Development Manager (650) 738-7402 | 10 | IV.4.D.i |

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

| <u>Agency</u> | <u>Action Program No.</u> | <u>Ongoing Policy No.</u> |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Pacifica Finance Department 170 Santa Maria Avenue Pacifica, CA 94044 Lorenzo Hines, Assistant City Manager (650) 738-7409 | | |
| Pacifica Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Department 1810 Francisco Blvd. Pacifica, CA 94044 Michael Perez, Director (650) 738-7381 | 5 | |
| Housing and Community Development Division, County of San Mateo 264 Harbor Boulevard, Building A Belmont, CA 94002 (650) 802-5050 | 1, 7 | |
| Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) P.O. Box 997300 Sacramento, CA 95899 (877) 743-7782 | 9 | |
| Pacifica Resource Center 1809 Palmetto Avenue Pacifica, CA 94044 Anita Rees, Director (650) 738-7470 | 7 | |
| Pacifica Historical Society P.O. Box 752 Pacifica, CA 94044 (650) 359-5462 | | IV.4.B.iv |
| Abilities United 525 E. Charleston Road Palo Alto, CA 94306 (650) 494-0550 The Arc 1500 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94103 BRIDGE Housing 600 California Street, Suite 900 San Francisco, CA 94108 (415) 989-1111 | | |

City of Pacifica Housing Element: 2015-2023

| <u>Agency</u> | <u>Action Program No.</u> | <u>Ongoing Policy No.</u> |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Center for Independence of Individuals with Disabilities 2001 Winward Way, Suite 103 San Mateo, CA 94404 (650) 645-1780 | | |
| Human Investment Project ("HIP") 364 South Railroad Avenue San Mateo, CA 94401 Kate Comfort Harr (650) 348-6660 | | |
| Poplar ReCare 1764 Marco Polo Way Burlingame, CA 94010 (650) 259-8500 | | |
| Project Sentinel 1615 Hudson St., Suite A Redwood City, CA 94061 (650) 321-6291 | | |
| Puente Clinic 1950 Alameda de las Pulgas San Mateo, CA 94403 (650) 372-6117 | | |
| West Bay Housing Corporation 1390 Market Street, Suite 405 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 618-0012 | | |

Master Schedule of Fees and Charges 2014-2015

| | Fee Description | Adopted Fee 9/08/14 |
|--|--|------------------------|
| CITY CLERK | | |
| City Council Agenda Packets | | |
| | One meeting packet | \$45.00 |
| Photocopies (per page) | | |
| | | \$0.25 |
| Other | | |
| | Pacifica Municipal Code | \$181.00 |
| | Annual Code Maintenance Fee | \$90.00 |
| | Ordinances and Resolutions | \$0.25 |
| | City Council Agenda Packets | \$1,091.00 |
| | Appeal of Planning Commission Decisions to the City Council | \$100.00 |
| FINANCE | | |
| Bond Search Requests | | |
| | Current | \$60.00 |
| | Delinquent | \$60.00 |
| Fireworks Permit | | |
| | Part 1 | \$303.00 |
| | Part 2 | \$484.00 |
| Other | | |
| | Bond Reports | \$43.25 |
| | Business License: Penalty for False Reporting of Gross Receipts | \$500.00 |
| | Annual Financial Report | \$34.00 |
| | Computer Review | \$99.00 |
| | Non-Sufficient Funds Charge | \$26.00 |
| FIRE | | |
| Permits | | |
| | Annual Fire Code Permits (Each) | \$200.00 |
| | Permitted activities less than 90-days. Initial fee includes 1 hour; hourly charge thereafter. Temporary Permit Required. | \$140.00 |
| Plan Review Fire Sprinklers/Stand Pipes | | |
| | Alteration/repair of existing underground pipe systems. Includes underground, hydro/flush, rough and final. | \$345.00 |
| | Commercial underground pipe system installations. Includes underground, hydro/flush, rough and final. Hourly thereafter. | \$490.00 |
| | Fire sprinklers - tenant improvements. 9 or less sprinkler heads Unlimited head change-outs. (Permit required only). Initial fee includes 1 hour; hourly thereafter. | \$135.00 |
| | New commercial & residential sprinkler installations. First 3,000 sq. ft. Includes underground, hydro/flush, rough and final inspections. Hourly thereafter. | \$665.00 |
| | New manufactured home sprinkler systems. Includes underground, hydro/flush, rough and final inspections. Hourly thereafter. | \$455.00 |

Master Schedule of Fees and Charges 2014-2015

| | Fee Description | Adopted Fee 9/08/14 |
|--|--|--------------------------------|
| | Standpipe system installation, per standpipe and includes underground, hydro/flush, rough and final inspections. | \$595.00 |
| | Tenant Improvements - installation/alteration of 10 or more heads. (Head change-outs are not included in count). First 300 sq. ft.; hourly thereafter. | \$245.00 |
| | Plan Review General | |
| | Additional Plan review beyond the first 3000 sq. ft.; per hour. | \$104.00 |
| | Plan Check Re-Submittals; initial fee includes first hour; hourly charge thereafter. | \$135.00 |
| | Plan Review New Construction and/or Tenant Improvements | |
| | Additional plan review for major changes, additions, as-builts, or resubmittals; initial fee includes first hour; hourly charge thereafter. | \$140.00 |
| | Misc. items w/o sq. footage - e.g. Install hazardous material, storage tank, HVAC smoke detection, partition wall, etc. Initial fee includes first hour; hourly charge thereafter. | \$140.00 |
| | Subdivision map review; per hour fee. | \$150.00 |
| | Base rate - all occupancies. Initial fee includes first 3,000 sq.ft.; hourly thereafter, includes rough and final inspections. | \$350.00 |
| | Plan Reviews Fire Alarms | |
| | Existing Fire Alarm Panel Upgrades. Initial fee includes first 3,000 sq.ft.; hourly thereafter, includes rough and final inspections. | \$245.00 |
| | Installation of additional devices on existing system. Initial fee includes first 3,000 sq.ft.; hourly thereafter, includes rough and final inspections. | \$385.00 |
| | New installations. Initial fee includes first 3,000 sq.ft.; hourly thereafter, includes rough and final inspections. | \$455.00 |
| | New installations -- Other Fire Protection Systems. Initial fee includes first 3,000 sq.ft.; hourly thereafter, includes rough and final inspections. | \$700.00 |
| | Requested Services | |
| | All Other Reports. Cost per report. | \$38.00 |
| | Digital Photographs - CD, plus \$1 for CD cost | \$64.00 |
| | Digital Photographs - Print. Plus \$1.40 per photo cost. | \$69.00 |
| | Fire Code Variance Application; per request and none-refundable. | \$546.00 |
| | Fire incident reports (per report charge) | \$38.00 |
| | Inspection Outside Normal Business Hours (Per hour, OT rate) | O.T. Rate |
| | Non-Subpoenaed Fire Investigation Reports (per report) | \$38.00 |
| | Pre-Inspection / Consultation for daycare facilities, construction projects, etc. Initial | \$119.00 |
| | Pre-Inspection of care facilities with 25 or fewer occupants. (Flat Fee) | \$119.00 |
| | Pre-Inspection of care facilities with 26 or more occupants. (Flat Fee) | \$225.00 |
| | Processed Photographs, plus cost of developing | \$72.00 |
| | Subpoenaed Fire Investigation Report - through City Attorney's Office, plus attorney's fees per evidence code. | \$54.00 |
| | Site Inspections | |
| | Additional inspections beyond the first 3000 sq ft | \$104.00 |

Master Schedule of Fees and Charges 2014-2015

| | Fee Description | Adopted Fee 9/08/14 |
|--|--|--------------------------------|
| | Fire alarms - repair or exchange devices and radio transmitters; Initial Fee includes first hour; hourly charge thereafter. | \$135.00 |
| | Inspection for which no fee is indicated; Initial Fee includes first hour; hourly charge thereafter. | \$135.00 |
| | Installation of hazardous materials storage tank | \$178.00 |
| | Re-inspections; Initial Fee includes first hour; hourly charge thereafter. | \$104.00 |
| | Removal of hazardous material storage tank. Per tank charge. Temporary permit required. | \$135.00 |
| | Replacement of hazardous material storage tank piping, dispensers. Per tank charge. If piping work is done as part of tank installation, there is no charge. | \$178.00 |
| | | |
| | Penalties | |
| | Unpermitted construction work | Fee plus 2 times fee |
| | False Alarms - 1st Response | \$0.00 |
| | False Alarms - 2nd Response | \$283.00 |
| | False Alarms - 3rd Response | \$361.00 |
| | False Alarms - 4th+ Response | \$515.00 |
| | | |
| | ANNUAL Commercial Fire Inspection & Re-inspections | |
| | A 1 -4 Assembly Occupancies | \$158.00 |
| | B Business Office Occupancies | \$90.00 |
| | E Educational Occupancies | \$158.00 |
| | F Factory Occupancies | \$158.00 |
| | H Hazard Occupancies | \$158.00 |
| | I Institutional (Nursing Homes) Occupancies | \$158.00 |
| | M Mercantile Occupancies | \$118.00 |
| | M Mercantile Occupancies (Motor Fuel Sales) | \$131.00 |
| | R-1 Occupancies Hotels | \$158.00 |
| | R-2 Residential 3 to 20 units | \$80.00 |
| | R-2 Residential 21 - 40 Units | \$96.00 |
| | R-2 Residential 41 - 70 Units | \$118.00 |
| | R-2 Residential 71 - 90 Units | \$141.00 |
| | R-2 Residential 91 - 120 Units | \$186.00 |
| | R-2 Residential Over 120 units | \$233.00 |
| | R-3 Residential Care less than 24 hours | \$131.00 |
| | R-3.1 Licensed Residential Care 24 hour 6 or less | \$158.00 |
| | R-4 Residential care 6 or more | \$158.00 |
| | S Storage Facilities | \$131.00 |
| | U Utility Structures | \$131.00 |
| | POLICE | |
| | | |
| | False Alarms | |
| | First Response | No Charge |
| | Second through fifth responses | \$125.00 |
| | Six or more responses | \$195.00 |
| | | |
| | False Alarms without permit | |

Master Schedule of Fees and Charges 2014-2015

| | Fee Description | Adopted Fee 9/08/14 |
|--|---|--------------------------------|
| | First Response | No Charge |
| | Second through fifth responses | \$195.00 |
| | Six or more responses | \$195.00 |
| | | |
| | Photograph (digital) | |
| | First Page of Photographs (4 to a page) | \$22.00 |
| | Subsequent pages of photographs (4 to a page) | \$7.00 |
| | Disc of photos | \$30.00 |
| | | |
| | Arcade Permit | |
| | Annual Renewal Fee | \$49.00 |
| | Application Fee | \$29.00 |
| | | |
| | Block Party Permits | \$50.00 |
| | | |
| | Massage Parlor/Outcall | |
| | New | \$162.00 |
| | New - State Certified/Outcall | \$50.00 |
| | Renewal Fee | \$50.00 |
| | Renewal Fee - State Certified | \$25.00 |
| | | |
| | Masseur / Masseuse | |
| | New | \$331.00 |
| | New - State Certified | \$50.00 |
| | Renewal Fee | \$100.00 |
| | Renewal Fee - State Certified | \$25.00 |
| | Massage Trainee - State Certified | \$50.00 |
| | | |
| | Administrative Fee for Firearms (Per Penal Code 12021.3J1) | |
| | For release to owner | \$384.00 |
| | | |
| | Taxi Cab Operation | |
| | Permit / Background Investigation | \$129.00 |
| | Fingerprinting and Submittal to DOJ | \$94.00 |
| | Vehicle Inspection | \$99.00 |
| | | |
| | General | |
| | Case Reports (Per Public Records Act) | No Charge |
| | Good conduct letter for Visa (record review) | \$53.00 |
| | Bingo Permit: New | \$29.00 |
| | Bingo Permit: Annual Renewal Fee | \$29.00 |
| | Second Hand Dealers | \$130.00 |
| | Tow Service Contract | \$197.00 |
| | Massage Trainee | \$162.00 |
| | Alarm Permit | \$82.00 |
| | Alarm Permit Renewal | \$43.00 |

Master Schedule of Fees and Charges 2014-2015

| Fee Description | Adopted Fee 9/08/14 |
|--|--|
| Application for Concealed Weapon (To be paid to licensing agency) | \$100.00 |
| Application for Concealed Weapon: Renewal Fee (To be paid to licensing agency) | \$25.00 |
| Fortune Telling | \$58.00 |
| Audio / Video "CD/DVD" duplication | \$30.00 |
| Private Property abatement | \$220.00 |
| Vehicle Release Administrative Costs (all but victims) | \$133.00 |
| General Research | \$83.00/Per Hour |
| Storage of Property | \$1.00/Per Day |
| Tobacco Retailer License | \$76.00 |
| Police Officer Subpoena (Per G.C. 68097.2) | \$275.00 |
| Live Scan Fingerprinting | \$45.00 |
| Loud Party Response | \$179.00 |
| San Mateo County Booking Fee | Based on Current County Fee |
| DUI with Incident | Cost of hours and car |
| TapeTransaction | Cost of Outside Service |
| Dance Permit | \$49.00 |
| Repossession Fee (Per G.C. 26751) | \$15.00 |
| PLANNING | |
| Competitive Evaluation System Determination | |
| Competitive | \$29.00 |
| Non-Competitive | \$29.00 |
| Planning Commission Agenda Packet | |
| Full Packet | \$130.00 |
| Planning Commission Agenda | |
| Picked-up or stamped envelopes provided | \$22.00 |
| Mailed by the City | \$7.00 |
| Planning Commission Minutes | |
| Picked-up or stamped envelopes provided | \$197.00 |
| Mailed by the City | \$29.00 |
| Planning Commission Agenda or Minutes | |
| Email | \$115.00 |
| General | |
| Planning and Planning Related Documents | Actual Cost of Reproduction |
| Code Books or Other Technical Manuals | Publisher's Cost + 10% Handling Fee |
| General Research Fee | \$180, plus actual material cost |

Master Schedule of Fees and Charges 2014-2015

| Fee Description | | Adopted Fee 9/08/14 |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| | City Attorney's Review of Projects and Permits | Hourly cost of Contract Attorney |
| | Processing of all development applications; hourly cost plus materials | \$180.00 |
| | Study Sessions. Commercial projects or the commercial portion of a mixed-use project that received final building inspection approval shall be entitled to a refund. If the projects is 50% commercial, they should get a 50% refund for the study session; hourly cost plus materials. | \$180.00 |
| | Business License Request for zoning consistency and Building and Fire Dept Inspection | \$180.00 |
| | Home Occupation Permits | \$180.00 |
| | Minor Modifications and Other Administrative Permits; hourly cost plus actual material cost. | \$180.00 |
| PUBLIC WORKS | | |
| | Encroachment permits and inspection; hourly charge rate basis | \$180.00 |
| | Sidewalk repair and street openings by private contractor; hourly charge rate basis | \$180.00 |
| | Publication vending machine permit | \$413.00 |
| City Maps | | |
| | Black | Per Page Fee \$4/square foot |
| | Color | \$5/square foot |
| Photocopies | | |
| | 8 1/2" x 11"; \$0.25/black; \$1.00/color | Per Page Fee |
| | 8 1/2" x 14"; \$0.50/black; \$1.50/color | Per Page Fee |
| | 11" x 17"; \$1/black; \$2/color | Per Page Fee |
| | 24" x 36" or larger; \$20/black; \$25/color | Per Page Fee |
| Engineering Standard Drawing | | |
| | Picked up | Per Page Fee |
| | Mailed (Regular mail -Series 100) | Per Page Fee |
| | Mailed (Regular mail -Series 200) | Per Page Fee |
| | Mailed (Regular mail -Series 300) | Per Page Fee |
| Beach Parking | | |
| | Annual Permit | \$65.00 |
| | Day Pass | \$8.00 |
| | Four Hour Pass | \$4.00 |
| General | | |
| | Heritage tree removal, destruction, or substantially trim | \$271.00 |
| | General Engineering Development Application Reviews; hourly charge | \$180.00 |

Master Schedule of Fees and Charges 2014-2015

| | Fee Description | Adopted Fee 9/08/14 |
|--|--|---|
| | Final Subdivision Map Checking. Staff may require an initial deposit equivalent to 10 hours minimum. All costs for contract or consultant services including legal shall be charged separately to the applicant as additional cost and may require additional deposit. | \$1800 initial deposit \$180/hour |
| | Certificate of Compliance, notices of violation, property mergers, parcel map waivers, minor boundary line adjustments, reversions to acreage, and parcel map checking | \$2,250 initial deposit \$180/hour |
| | Street/curb openings by utilities; hourly charge | \$180.00 per hour |
| | Right of Way/Street Vacations. Staff may require an initial deposit equivalent to 10 hours minimum. All costs for contract or consultant services including legal shall be charged separately to the applicant as additional cost and may require additional deposit. | \$1,800 initial deposit \$180/hour |
| | Street Excavation Handbook | \$30.00 |
| | Block Party / Barricade Rental | \$118.00 |
| | Barricade Rental | \$7/pair; \$50 refundable deposit per 10 barricades |
| | Surface Mining and Reclamation Annual Inspection Fee; hourly charge | \$300.00 and \$180.00 |
| | Violation (found during inspection) | \$412.00 |
| | BUILDING | |
| | Building Standards Administrative Fee | \$1 per \$25000 |
| | Education Fee | \$2 per permit |
| | General Plan | 0.005% of construction value |
| | Archive Fee | \$15 |
| | Plan Check fee | 65% of Permit Fee |
| | SMIP (C) | 0.00028 of valuation |
| | SMIP (R) | 0.00013 of valuation |
| | Building Permit Fee (Based on Dollar Valuation) | |
| | \$0-500 | TBD |
| | First \$500 | \$51.50 |
| | \$501-\$2000 | |
| | First \$500 | \$51.50 |
| | Each additional \$100 or fraction thereof | \$3.61 |
| | \$2001-\$25000 | |
| | First \$2000 | \$105.58 |
| | Each additional \$1000 or fraction thereof | \$15.45 |
| | \$25001-\$50000 | |

Master Schedule of Fees and Charges 2014-2015

| Fee Description | | Adopted Fee 9/08/14 |
|------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | First \$25000 | \$460.93 |
| | Each additional \$1000 or fraction thereof | \$14.42 |
| \$50001-\$100000 | | |
| | First \$50000 | \$821.43 |
| | Each additional \$1000 or fraction thereof | \$8.24 |
| \$100001-\$500000 | | |
| | First \$100000 | \$1,233.43 |
| | Each additional \$1000 or fraction thereof | \$7.21 |
| \$500001-\$1,000,000 | | |
| | First \$500000 | \$4,117.43 |
| | Each additional \$1000 or fraction thereof | \$6.18 |
| \$1,000,001 and above | | |
| | First \$1,000,000 | \$6,692.43 |
| | Each additional \$1000 or fraction thereof | \$5.15 |
| | (N) Residential Bldg; cost per square foot | \$0.10 |
| | Electrical Services (<=200 AMP); cost for each | \$40.30 |
| | Electrical Services (<200 to 1000 AMP); cost for each | \$81.10 |
| | Electrical Services (<1000 AMP); cost for each | \$164.20 |
| | Residential Appliances; cost for each | \$6.30 |
| | (N) Multi-Family Bldg; cost per square foot | \$0.10 |
| | Signs, Outline Lighting and Marquees; cost for each | \$32.60 |
| | Misc Apparatus, Conduits and Conductors; cost for each | \$24.10 |
| | Light Fixtures (First 20 fixtures); cost for each | \$1.45 |
| | Light Fixtures (Additional fixtures); cost for each | \$1.00 |
| | Power Apparatus (Up to and including 1) | \$6.30 |
| | Power Apparatus (Over 1 and not over 10) | \$16.30 |
| | Power Apparatus (Over 10 and not over 50) | \$32.60 |
| | Power Apparatus (Over 50 and not over 100) | \$65.60 |
| | Power Apparatus (Over 100) | \$98.40 |
| | Receptacles, Switch & Light Outlets (First 20 fixtures); cost for each | \$1.45 |
| | Receptacles, Switch & Light Outlets (Additional fixtures) | \$1.00 |
| | Electrical Permit Issuance; cost for each | \$32.00 |
| | Electrical Permit Issuance (Special Cases) | \$11.30 |
| Mechanical | | |
| | Furnace (<=100k BTU) | \$22.00 |
| | Furnace (>100k to 500k BTU) | \$26.90 |
| | Appliance Vents | \$10.70 |

Master Schedule of Fees and Charges 2014-2015

| | Fee Description | Adopted Fee 9/08/14 |
|--|--|--------------------------------|
| | Boilers, Compressors, and Absorption Systems (<=3hp or 100k BTU) | \$20.80 |
| | Boilers, Compressors, and Absorption Systems (<=15hp or 500k BTU) | \$38.40 |
| | Boilers, Compressors, and Absorption Systems (<=30hp or 1000k BTU) | \$52.70 |
| | Boilers, Compressors, and Absorption Systems (<=50hp or 1750k BTU) | \$77.50 |
| | Boilers, Compressors, and Absorption Systems (>=50hp or 17500k BTU) | \$77.50 |
| | Hood | \$16.80 |
| | Air Handlers (<=10k CFM) | \$16.80 |
| | Air Handlers (>10k CFM) | \$26.80 |
| | Evaporative Cooler | \$16.80 |
| | Vent Fan (Single Duct) | \$11.20 |
| | Vent System | \$16.80 |
| | Incinerators (Residential) | \$16.80 |
| | Incinerators (Comm) | \$16.80 |
| | Miscellaneous Mechanical | \$16.80 |
| | Mechanical Permit Issuance | \$32.00 |
| | Mechanical Permit Issuance (Special Cases) | \$11.40 |
| | | |
| | Plumbing | |
| | Fixtures & Vents; | \$10.40 |
| | Fixtures & Vents (Repair/Alteration) | \$10.40 |
| | Cesspool | \$14.50 |
| | Sewage Disposal System | \$56.65 |
| | Grease Interceptors | \$9.90 |
| | Rainwater systems | \$14.50 |
| | Water Piping | \$14.50 |
| | Water heater | \$14.50 |
| | Public Spa | \$86.00 |
| | Gas Piping | \$7.40 |
| | Public Pool | \$129.30 |
| | Private Pool | \$86.00 |
| | Private Spa | \$86.00 |
| | Sewer | \$22.10 |
| | Backflow | \$14.50 |
| | Backflow device over 2" | \$14.50 |
| | Miscellaneous Plumbing | \$14.50 |
| | Plumbing Permit Issuance; cost for issuing each permit. | \$32.00 |
| | Plumbing Permit Issuance (Special Cases). For issuing each supplemental permit for which the original permit has not expired, been cancelled or finalized. | \$11.30 |
| | | |
| | Miscellaneous | |
| | Inspection. Hourly with a minimum 30 minutes. | \$114.30 |
| | Permits. Hourly with a minimum 30 minutes. | \$118.50 |
| | | |

Master Schedule of Fees and Charges 2014-2015

| | Fee Description | Adopted Fee 9/08/14 |
|--|---|---|
| | ANIMAL CONTROL | Fees shall be consistent with those charged by the San Mateo County Division of Animal Control Services. For a list of those fees, contact the County of San Mateo at (650) 363-4220. |
| WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT - SEWAGE CONNECTION FEES | | |
| | The sewage connection fee is based on a number of project specific factors; Please call the Wastewater Dept. (650) 738-4660 for your exact charge. | |
| | The average sewage connection fee for a new Single Family Residence is approximately: | \$3,200 |
| | The average sewage connection fee for a new Mixed-use Commercial Building is approximately: | \$15,000.00 |
| | Inspection and Review Charges | \$150/hour |