

MINUTES

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

August 19, 2013

7:00 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Absent: None

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Cooper

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director White
Associate Planner Diaz

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

The motion carried 7-0.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Noes: None

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES:
JULY 15, 2013** Commissioner Nibbelin moved approval of the
minutes of July 15, 2013; Commissioner Vaterlaus
seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
Nibellin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF AUGUST 26, 2013:

Planning Director White wasn't sure whether the Council was even having that second meeting in August since they normally cancel that meeting every year. They had reinstated that meeting, and he wasn't sure if it was actually being held. However, he didn't believe there were any Planning Commission items on the agenda even if it does occur.

CONSENT ITEMS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

**PSD-784-13
UP-028-13
CDP-338-13
PV-509-13**

ADOPTION OF A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, AND APPROVAL OF A SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, PSD-784-13, USE PERMIT, UP-028-13, COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, CDP-338-13, VARIANCE, PV-509-13 AND A WAIVER OF SPECIFIC PLAN DEVELOPMENT PROVISIONS REGARDING PARKING AND FLOOR AREA RATIO (FAR), filed by N. D. Patel, property owner, to expand an existing 38-room Holiday Inn Express located at 519 Nick Gust Way (APN: 022-024-250 & -270 & -280). A total of 44 guest rooms and 2,010 square feet of retail space would be added to the existing building. The existing parking garage would also be expanded to provide 24 additional parking spaces, nine bicycle parking spaces and four motorcycle parking spaces. Other improvements/additions include a meeting room, greet room, fitness area, storage facilities and new bathrooms. The overall height of the proposed addition would be approximately 44 feet, 7 inches. For aesthetic purposes, a tower on the corner of Rockaway Beach and Old County Road with an overall height of 50 feet, 3 inches is also featured. The project is located in the Coastal Zone. Recommended CEQA status: Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for adoption.

Commissioner Vaterlaus stated that, because of the proximity of her office to this project, she was recusing herself.

Assoc. Planner Diaz presented the staff report.

Commissioner Gordon asked whether the Coastal Commission would have a say in anything regarding the project once the Planning Commission and Council have approved the project.

Planning Director White clarified that, in this case, the Planning Commission was the City's decision making authority although it could be appealed to the City Council by an interested citizen or the Coastal Commission itself could appeal it to the Coastal Commission. He reiterated that there were two possible appeals at two different times and they occasionally find themselves in this situation.

Commissioner Gordon then assumed that, if the Coastal Commission appealed it to themselves, they would have a say over what happens with the project.

Planning Director White explained that there would be a public process to determine what their concerns were, and they would be doing this but in front of the Coastal Commission.

Commissioner Gordon stated that he was just trying to get a sense of the pecking order.

Planning Director White stated that it would get interesting if there was an appeal to both bodies, as it would happen during the same appeal period and they weren't sure how they would sort it out, but they would have to figure it out.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the previous project approved, which was an office development with 26 parking spaces that were approved. Now, they were asking for 34 on this application, which he concluded was part of the 26.

Planning Director White agreed that was what was approved but it was never built. They received a waiver for the 26 parking spaces and would have been required to pay an in lieu fee for them but it was never paid.

Commissioner Cooper acknowledged that the fee would have to be paid for those parking spaces. He asked where the fee went and how it was determined to spend the money.

Planning Director White explained that the fee would go into an in lieu parking fee fund and that money was intended to pay for or supplement efforts to increase public parking in the area.

Commissioner Cooper asked for confirmation that it specifically goes for parking in that specific area.

Planning Director White responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Cooper asked if there were funds in that current account.

Planning Director White did not know what the exact balance was at this time, but there were other projects that have paid in lieu fees.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that, while this might be more appropriately directed to the applicant, he referred to the specific plan for Rockaway Beach which includes a preference for development that provides public recreational opportunities and that this proposed hotel would provide visitor serving commercial uses. He asked what the current vacancy rates were for present facilities in the area.

Planning Director White agreed that the applicant would have better information.

Chair Evans referred to the staff report mentioning that the clock tower was at 54-foot height. He asked the height of the Lighthouse Hotel tower and Pacifica Motor Inn tower.

Assoc. Planner Diaz stated that the Pacifica Motor Inn tower was approximately 48 feet and, for the Lighthouse Hotel tower, he stated that the building at the top of the parapet was 45 feet and the tower was probably another 10-12 feet.

Commissioner Nibbelin mentioned that he had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Patel the previous Thursday and they spoke about the project.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he also had a conversation with N.D. Patel earlier in the afternoon regarding the project.

Jim Rato, RYS Architects, on behalf of N.D. Natubhai, more specifically Mr. N. D. Patel, owner. He briefly explained the history of Mr. Patel's dream to expand the hotel, giving some of the evolving considerations in regard to the creek and the community. It was communicated to Mr. Patel that it would be nice to do something about the property at the corner of Rockaway and Old County Road, as well as the wish of the hotel group that owns Holiday Inn Express to expand to more than normal size. He believed that the project will add to the beautification of the area and have the effect of improvement to the community. He explained their efforts in expanding parking, as well as the importance of retail being in the corner of the property to provide a recreational venue, mentioning businesses in the area that expressed excitement about leasing space. He mentioned that they intended to continue the same design that was there before, such as the gable roof and similar materials. He mentioned that the color could be adjusted. He concluded by stating that he was available for any questions.

Commissioner Brown referred to the issue raised of occupational rates, as well as the 24 parking spaces for 44 guest rooms in relationship to the ratio typically being 1 to 1. He asked for his thoughts on how the parking needs of the hotel will mesh with the rest of the community at Rockaway Beach.

Mr. Rato stated that the traffic engineer had requested a history of occupancy in the last three years, which averaged 60-70% throughout the year, with rare times of full occupancy. He stated that, historically, a successful hotel has to have an average of 60-80% occupancy and it takes time to get up to that level and harder following an economic downturn which we have had for the last few years. He added that Mr. Patel has been lucky that he has a premium spot, with the beach and the park attractive to loyal customers. They believe it will continue to generally be about 60-70% occupancy. They realized that they were providing a portion of a 1 to 1 requirement and should have as much parking as the 82 rooms. He stated that, at this point, Mr. Patel was requesting some in lieu fees. They have observed that the parking along the Old County Road remains mostly empty, especially in the evening since most of the businesses close at 5:00 or 6:00 p.m. when most customers are coming to the hotel. He also mentioned that many customers travel between the hotel and airport via shuttle or taxi, especially disabled customers. He also stated that this addition will upgrade the accessibility for disabled customers. He mentioned other possibilities, such as reciprocal agreements with neighbors with parking amenities or valet parking. He reminded them that there was a ramp up stage to new businesses which can range from six months to two years.

Commissioner Cooper asked if Mr. Patel was present.

Mr. Rato stated that he was present.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he spoke to him on the phone. He asked for an explanation of discussions they had with the retail portions of the project regarding what they will put there and the approximate square feet.

Mr. Rato stated that the retail space was approximately 2,000 sq. feet inside the walls. They have allotted six spaces per the Planning Code. He stated that Mr. Patel talked to a lot of the neighbors in the community. They also spoke with the Chamber of Commerce and other existing businesses. He thought the opportunity to grab the corner spot was strong because it was the gateway to the Rockaway community, mentioning some of the positive aspects. He mentioned proposed public signage with the hotel, a secondary signage, as well as a large video screen,

although it was deemed a possible distraction to fast moving traffic. He added that some of the business owners were present.

Commissioner Cooper asked, with this including retail, whether bike parking was included in the interior or exterior of the development.

Mr. Rato stated that they have provided parking spots in two areas of the entrances of new parking toward the northerly side and would accommodate 6-8 bicycles, which did not exclude adding more in other areas.

Commissioner Cooper referred to speaking to Mr. Patel on photovoltaic or green type construction, and he asked for an explanation of what was involved.

Mr. Rato stated that they were aware of Pacifica's green building code dictating the use of LEED rating at gold level. He felt it was a tough order, but Mr. Patel was committed to getting there. He mentioned that it required a much higher efficiency of energy usage, as well as generation of power within the property. He stated that the photovoltaic was possible on the roof, adding that there were other technologies that can be used to achieve the efficiency that the gold rating requires. He agreed that photovoltaic was possible, although they will probably run into not having enough roof space to take care of a good portion of the energy required to run such a business. He added that they have the natural enemy of the fog as an obstruction to the panel which would degrade the ability to produce power to a sufficient level.

Commissioner Cooper thought it sounded as though they have explored it and he wanted to be sure they had looked at that.

Mr. Rato responded affirmatively, adding that between LEED and Cal Green, they had explored everything they could put in the building.

Commissioner Cooper stated that he had a couple of concerns, although he acknowledged that they were in the early stages of the project. He referred to the runoff into the basins, and he was concerned that it was sufficient due to the increased building size to accommodate all the water coming off the roof.

Mr. Rato thought he could bring the civil engineer of the project, Javier Chavarria, to help answer that.

Javier Chavarria of JC Engineering, stated that the drainage solutions proposed have been thought through very carefully. He explained that the extensive amount of roof involved the creation of flow through planters, bioswells and holding tanks, and now San Mateo County required complying with a program called Bay Area Hydrology Model, which states that you need to put out as much water on the street post development as pre development, then mentioned some of the specific processes which minimizes the outflow.

Commissioner Cooper stated that, in the garage area, there was usually a lot of oil coming off the cars, and he asked if there was an oil/water separator.

Mr. Chavarria stated that, in the covered parking area, drainage will be minimum but any water generated would be separated.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the off street parking and use of the parking in the front of the building, and he asked if they were considering putting lighting to assist with pedestrian traffic during night time hours, or were they concentrated on only their project.

Mr. Rato stated that the Public Works staff commented that they should be providing a light pole near the corner of Rockaway and Old County Road. He thought it might make the corner so bright to have one on the Rockaway side. They thought there would be two light poles flanking the corner. He stated that they weren't required to do a photometric sight plan telling the light level. It was something they could do, but they thought at this point it would be adequate to add a light fixture to match.

Commissioner Cooper commented that they had proposed a bunch of bollard lighting along the sidewalk area to keep the pedestrian aware, as well as animals that are in the area.

Mr. Rato mentioned the northerly addition and thought that would be an opportunity to put sidewalk bollards.

Commissioner Campbell thought the project works in the space. He asked if they were familiar with the Calera Parkway proposed project.

Mr. Rato stated that he was not.

Commissioner Campbell stated that there was a potential for a 25-foot expansion of Highway 1 into the Rockaway business area, and he wondered what would happen to the potential parking spaces.

Planning Director White stated, for clarification, that they looked at the plans, which were conceptual drawings at this point, and the scale wasn't that useful relative to the project, but they looked at the area adjacent to and between the highway and the Old County Road where there were parking spaces. According to those plans, the improvements stopped short of those spaces and those spaces would presumably remain intact.

Chair Evans referred to 400 Old County Road where, in 1998, there were 29 spaces approved as a waiver, and he asked what building that was.

Assoc. Planner Diaz stated that it was a commercial building at the northern end of Old County Road that was constructed with no parking. He stated that it was the building where the Grape in the Fog was.

Chair Evans concluded that they were waived for the 29 spaces.

Assoc. Planner Diaz responded affirmatively.

Chair Evans opened the Public Hearing.

Jim Heldberg, 1335 Aspen, stated that he was the owner of the Segway store in Rockaway Beach. He stated that he had the pleasure of working with Mr. Patel for a couple of years. He didn't know about the building codes, but he felt that the work Mr. Patel has done with the hotel was nothing short of excellent, and they have a history of excellence for his work and they can judge

the future of his operation based on the excellence in the past. He was present to enthusiastically recommend that they approve this project. He also felt it matched the recommendations coming through the Economic Development Committee to turn Rockaway Beach into a center of activity for Pacifica. This project fits nicely there which was another good reason for approving it. He did object to the colors. He thought they might be able to find other, softer colors that might blend in nicer with the existing building.

Tom Clifford, 1122 Sheila Lane, stated that he was present to recommend that they go ahead with this project. He stated that he spent a great deal of time with Mr. Patel on his plans. He felt it was a good project. While there were some concerns about the tower and its height, he felt there were other towers in the area that added to the area so they don't wind up with a bunch of square boxes. He felt it was an architectural feature that should be kept with the project. Regarding the in lieu parking, he agreed that it was hard to understand but his clients were not going to be there at the same time that the other businesses were operating and felt the parking could be shared. He recommended that they approve the project.

Chuck Gust, 100 Rockaway Beach, of Nick's Restaurant, stated that they were in favor of the projects, adding that the aesthetics and color were what the Commission would have to deal with. He mentioned that they know Mr. Patel as a neighbor and they would like to see something happen on that corner. He referred to the past when the concept in Rockaway Beach was the tail wagging the dog as the quarry was going to be developed, and every project coming before the Commission and Council included in lieu fees. He thought that, over the past ten years, almost 50 parking spaces have been given up. He felt it was at a point where Rockaway was getting squeezed with Nick's winding up being the easiest target. He didn't want to see Rockaway turn into a gated lot, since we were the coast and people came here to get away from those situations. He stated that previously they had tried to put in second deck parking, but it went away. He stated that, with the Highway 1 widening, he would like to see this project be the last of the projects before the Highway 1 widening and someone proposes to add more parking on Old County Road. He stated that both of the parking lots in the north and south should take some of the TOT or in lieu fees and they should be lit up to allow people to walk across the bridge and stroll around the area. He stated that other coastal communities do it and there was no reason Pacifica can't do it, adding that on a gorgeous September/October night, we were as nice a place to be as any of the places down south.

Courtney Conlon, Chamber of Commerce, stated that, over the past few years, the Chamber has done everything to promote Pacifica as a tourist destination. They were proud of their efforts and felt it would be even more exciting. At this point Pacifica only has 290 hotel rooms for tourists and, with the proposed project, she felt it was exciting. The design was nice and it was equivalent to a beach community just as any other beach community, and we can definitely see a lot of things done right if we take a step back and look at what we want to do in promoting Pacifica. She stated that the consultants came back with an excellent report for the Economic Development Plan, with one recommendation being to promote Rockaway as a tourist destination. She added that it was our tourist hub and it goes in line with making the proposed retail space as a great use and the design will complement the area. She stated that, regarding the parking, in the big plan and looking at Rockaway Beach as a tourist destination, if adopted, both the north and south lots of Rockaway should be well lit, more accessible with better security so people will know when coming to Pacifica that Rockaway is the destination with a lot of parking. She was looking forward to being one of the first to take a sledgehammer to the old building.

Marty Cerles, 105 Rockaway Beach, stated that he was the General Manager of the Best Western Lighthouse Hotel. He mentioned that you would think he was there to vote against it, but he wasn't. He felt that Rockaway Beach and Pacifica need more hotel rooms. He mentioned that they have 97 rooms on the coast and do well, but they turn away people constantly on weekends and during the summer in general. He assumed everyone knows what the TOT tax does for the city, and it will increase dramatically with an extra 40 rooms. He also liked the idea of having retail with more reasons for people to come to Rockaway to shop. He agreed with most people about parking, adding that it will be an issue. He mentioned that his hotel has plenty of parking, but they do see people coming into their parking area. He hoped they would look at the parking for the future and increase it to make it more accessible.

Beth Lemke, Pacifica, stated that she did not prepare anything and was not as eloquent as Mr. Cerles but, as owner of Grape in the Fog, she was in support of the project. She also believes that the retail space was unparalleled for the location, and it was the perfect spot to attract tourists. She stated that about 50% of her customer base was visitors to Pacifica, adding that she gets many people discovering Pacifica for the first time. She stated that a number of people see that, being so close to SFO, it was a great place to stay overnight with all the amenities. She supports the project and agreed we needed more hotel rooms and we certainly need more of a tax base. She was also looking forward to the retail space being open.

Frank Vella, 263 Marvilla Circle, stated that he was a resident as well as a real estate broker. He stated that he has seen Mr. Patel's operation and thought he ran a great business. He was involved with the community in a positive way. He was the listing realtor for the property, mentioning that there was a lot of interest in the property with varying ideas, but no one was as qualified, experienced, or had as much ability or drive as Mr. Patel. He felt the project fits the property perfectly, was a great project and he encouraged them to move it forward.

Javier Chavarria, Pacifica, stated that, while he was the engineer on the project, he was not speaking as part of the development team but as a long-time resident of Pacifica. He thought Pacifica's most important asset was its beauty. He thought we should think of ourselves as a tourist destination to make our budget better. He asked what would be better than a project of this nature to help Pacifica achieve that goal. He felt more quality hotels located in an area such as Rockaway would be a tremendous improvement for our community and our economy and make us all proud. It has his support and hopes it has the Commission's as well.

Chair Evans closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Cooper thanked everyone for their comments, adding that it was wonderful to see neighboring businesses supporting a fellow business even though they were in competition. He also reiterated the importance of the parking situation. He acknowledged that there was parking available now, but he agreed with the speaker that mentioned that, with future development, there might not be so much free parking. He thought people would feel more comfortable using the other parking if they developed them from a safety standpoint.

Commissioner Gordon also thanked everyone for their comments. He stated that it was a big project with a lot of issues. He mentioned the Coastal Commission's concerns about the buffer zone between a riparian corridor such as the creek and new construction. He mentioned that with this, they had about a three-foot buffer. He mentioned the assisted living center project on

Oddstad which was an analogous situation with a creek next to a proposed construction with a lot of debate about the buffer zone. He didn't recall if they agreed on 50 feet.

Planning Director White stated that he thought it varied but, on average, it was less than 50 feet.

Commissioner Gordon commented that on this project, they have three feet, but it was a different project. He felt it was different because of the footprint that was already there with the Holiday Inn already abutting the creek with very little space. He mentioned that the yellow house that will be demolished was also up against the creek. He reiterated that this was a very different situation with preexisting structures. He mentioned that the negative declaration addressed mitigation, stating that they will take care of the creek. He thought, if the Coastal Commission felt strongly about it, they were the experts and can take it up themselves. He stated that he would not use that as a basis to object to the project. He was comfortable with the buffer zone even though it was only three feet. He agreed with everyone that the commercial space on the corner was a great idea, adding that he personally liked the colors of the project. He felt the biggest issue was the parking. He would have liked to have more parking provided and less rooms, but the issue for him was that the in lieu fees were so low. He felt the going rate was something like \$15,000 to \$20,000 in neighboring communities, adding that the reason we don't have it updated was because originally we didn't tie it to any inflation adjuster which he thought was a big mistake. He acknowledged that it was a City Council issue, but he felt they were missing out in at least \$300,000 of in lieu fees they would have had with an updated cost factor. He stated the applicant was getting a great deal. He was also troubled about the issue of the highway widening raised by Commissioner Campbell. He understood that it comes close but most likely will not affect the parking spaces but he felt the parking plan depended on those 17 spaces being available. He felt a concern for the businesses in Rockaway, if they approved the plan on the assumption of those spaces being available and then they are not. He was also concerned that the architect had not heard about the Calera Creek widening plan which he thought should be a contingency in the back of their minds. He then acknowledged that it was an area that sorely needed development, mentioning that they have been through this before with this parcel but the plans never went anywhere. He thought this was likely to get built and he was excited about it. He was strongly in favor of it even though it raises ancillary issues. He felt the City Council needed to look at the in lieu parking issue. He concluded that the project has his strong support.

Commissioner Brown agreed that the parking was an issue for the City. He would definitely see room for an analysis of the in lieu fees totalling 50 spots to date in Rockaway. He thought this was a great development, because this Holiday Inn Express has won awards for being well run and it was a local business investing more in Pacifica. He thought there might be room with the in lieu fees for a public/private partnership to address one of the concerns around addressing creating and enhancing public access, including what the property developer was doing with benches, etc. He thought there might be an opportunity for the City to enhance public access, such as with increased lighting. He mentioned the parking spots at risk because of Calera Creek, and he would like to see the City have a plan to ensure that, as they build out Rockaway as a focal point, there is parking to support that. Then, referring to the riparian setback, he recalled the Oddstad facility. If they followed the letter of the law, it wouldn't have been only that facility that almost couldn't be built because of the setback, but neighboring homeowners would have had to take action. He felt this was an impaired creek and he would like to see more effort going toward restoring the creek where possible and the main plan should be a 100 foot setback where possible. He acknowledged that there was already development that set a precedent. He didn't think this project was making it worse but had the potential to make it better where feasible.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he liked the project and will support it unless he hears something radically different. He mentioned that he was a commissioner when they had a study session and appreciated the efforts made toward creek protection. He thought the design was boxy at first but was now a more nuanced project, especially with the addition of the tower. He appreciated that and felt the study session really paid off. He thanked the applicant for taking some of the comments to heart during that study session. He noted that they have looked at this and thought it would not affect the parking spaces. He asked if they could take another look at it.

Planning Director White said that they could look at it further but reiterated that he actually looked at the plans today following their conversation. He agreed that they could and should look into it further because he agreed that it was in the City's interest to keep those spaces.

Commissioner Campbell didn't want to impede or cause more delay for this project, and he felt it was incumbent on the City to take a look at it. He mentioned that, looking at the plan and the Calera Parkway expansion, he thought that would go 20-25 feet. He mentioned the final EIR referring to other alternatives and they didn't know what alternative would get picked, but all go through the area and most will definitely go 20-25 feet into the frontage area in front of the hotel and could impact the parking spaces. He was also concerned about going further than the 20-25 feet and bumping in the parking spaces as well as Old County Road. He referred to the potential of 80 feet of concrete off the parkway and he didn't think that was where the City wanted to make its stand. They needed to look at vegetation and screening at the very least if this expansion happens, especially on the southern end because moving the highway closer to the rooms would not be a draw for tourists. He acknowledged that it wasn't the applicant's concern and he would be voting in favor of it, but he felt the City needed to mention these things to the applicant.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that he wouldn't reiterate all the comments already addressed. He was in support of the project, which he felt was a good project. He thought the staff report and negative declaration were put together well, and he appreciated the care in preparing the documents.

Chair Evans also thanked staff for an excellent report. He thought it was very detailed and was very helpful on a project with a lot of details. He was in favor of the project. He also met with Mr. Patel for a short meeting. He mentioned that the Planning Commission had approved a retail office complex a few years previously with waivers for parking. He felt this project meets the plan much better than the previous plan that was approved, so he didn't have any problem. He mentioned the TOT fees, and the fact that they were adding 100% more rooms which was a plus for the City as well as the hotel. He agreed that parking was an issue, but in the plan, they put as much parking as possible. He felt the applicant was stuck with what he has, and he agreed that the parking needs to be looked at later, but not with this project. He acknowledged that they were continually waiving parking spaces and Mr. Gust has a good point. He didn't want to see him being a cop so they needed to look at that. He also agreed that, if the parkway goes through, they will definitely need to look at it. He asked if they had answered the Coastal Commission's concerns.

Planning Director White felt they had made more than a good faith effort to respond, adding that whether the Coastal Commission felt they had adequately responded was the question. He mentioned that the comment period on the mitigated declaration was some time ago, and the time was spent responding to the concerns stated in the Coastal Commission's letter. He felt the true

test was going to be when the action was taken and they will see how adequately they felt their responses were.

Chair Evans commented that we had to make sure all our t's were crossed and i's dotted. He stated that their other concern was the height of blocking views from the highway. He didn't think it would change the height now, as there were already height issues and they cannot see the hotel next to it now. He didn't see that as an issue, and the tower was lower than the other two so that wasn't an issue. He wasn't going to repeat other Commissioner comments, and he was also in favor of the project.

Planning Director White stated that, before a motion was made, he called attention to the variance resolution where one line was omitted and he asked that Assoc. Planner Diaz read that finding so they have that in the record when the resolution is hopefully adopted.

Assoc. Planner Diaz proceeded to read the correct finding in the variance resolution.

Planning Director White clarified that it was the 5th whereas.

Commissioner Gordon moved that the Planning Commission **ADOPT** the attached resolution adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the expansion of the Holiday Inn Express attached as an exhibit and move that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** PSD-784-13, UP-028-13, CDP-338-13, PV-509-13, and waiver of Specific Plan development provisions regarding parking and Floor Area Ratio (FAR), subject to condition one (1) through thirty-seven (37) and **ADOPT** the findings contained in the August 19, 2013 staff report and incorporate all maps and testimony into the record by reference, and **ADOPT** the following resolutions: P.C. Resolution for Site Development Permit, P.C. Resolution for Use Permit, P.C. Resolution for Coastal Development Permit, P.C. Resolution for Variance, incorporating the amendment mentioned; Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell, Nibbelin and Chair Evans
Noes:	None
Abstains:	Commissioner Vaterlaus

Chair Evans declared that anyone aggrieved by the action of the Planning Commission has ten (10) calendar days to appeal the decision in writing to the City Council.

Commissioner Vaterlaus returned to the dais.

CONSIDERATION:

None.

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Gordon asked if looking at the in lieu parking fees could be a study session.

Planning Director White stated that they have had the conversation before, adding that he was startled when he came to Pacifica and learned that the parking in lieu fees were exactly the same as they were when he was an intern in Pacifica in the 80s. He agreed that, if they had attached a multiplier to the fees, they would be in much better shape. He also mentioned that fees hold a special status in the law and it wasn't a matter of saying that the parking space costs \$15,000 and make that the fee. He explained that they have to go through a nexus process to associate the fee with some nexus for cost relative to something such as infrastructural projects in the Rockaway area. He felt it was not a small undertaking, but it was something that he had been suggesting for a while and he hoped that it would get on the to do list for the Council and filter down to staff. He wouldn't forget about it because he felt the need to deal with it. He also felt it serves another purpose because it also requires the City to come up with a plan for parking as you have to be pointing to some infrastructural plan to have the nexus. It deals with both issues if done correctly.

Commissioner Gordon asked for his recommendation for a good next step.

Planning Director White thought perhaps to raise the issue when the Council does their goal setting discussion which they have every six months or every year. He felt it should have been on the list already, but they will keep asking for it to be on the list.

Commissioner Gordon asked if it would prompt things to have a non-binding resolution from the Planning Commission recommending that they do that.

Planning Director White thought it would be enough to have a letter from the Chair representing the wishes of the Commission and directed to the Council, but they could do one or both of those.

Commissioner Campbell thanked Commissioner Gordon for pursuing that and he urged the Chair to send something. He noted that the environmental impact report and environmental assessment for the state Route 1 Calera Creek Parkway Highway 1 widening project was out and he urged all Pacifica residents to look at it. He stated that it was on the Caltrans website, www.dot.ca.gov/district4. He asked staff if they had any agendaized hearing with regard to the Highway 1 widening project for the Planning Commission.

Planning Director White stated not that he knows of. He added that they had hard copies of the document, approximately 1000 pages, at various places in the City, including the Planning Department as well as a link to the final EIR on the City's website.

Commissioner Campbell asked if there was any movement for the Council to have the Planning Commission hear anything on this.

Planning Director White stated that he has personally not heard anything.

Commissioner Campbell asked if he had heard anything about the Council having any hearing on this.

Planning Director White stated that he has not heard about any agenda meetings at this point, adding that it was not necessarily that they were not in discussion, but he has not heard of them.

Commissioner Campbell stated that it was his hope that the Council would task the Commission to take a look at this important planning issue, if not the Council. He didn't want to tell them how to do their business, and he would leave it at that.

Chair Evans asked how they go about creating a letter.

Planning Director White stated that it was merely a matter of getting the consensus of the Commission with the nodding of four or more heads and then staff and the chair could work on it together.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked, if it was related to things that they have already discussed, whether it needs to be agenda per the Brown Act.

Planning Director White reiterated that they can do it anyway they like, such as agenda an item to discuss the contents of a letter or resolution if they would like, but he didn't think it was needed that at this point. He added that, given the concerns and discussions, there was probably enough to warrant drafting a letter. He stated that he worked at their pleasure and in whatever they felt was appropriate and comfortable to the Commission.

Chair Evans stated that he was fine with working staff on a letter.

Commissioner Cooper referred to working with Caltrans in the past on other projects, such as Devil's Slide and other projects, they have been really good to the communities to mitigate any impacts that they might have on some widening projects, but only if you get it in prior to the funding for the projects. He felt that, if they were going to impact the parking spaces, they could ask for some mitigation measures from them to get other parking spaces and provide infrastructure for that. He added that it needs to get in very quickly as they were far along in the process of the environmental impact report and they need some formal resolution saying what they want from them. He felt they tend to be fairly responsive.

Planning Director White stated that he has had the same experience.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Tom Clifford, Pacifica, welcomed to all the new Commissioners. He had a question on the vote of the minutes. He stated that he wasn't sure Commissioner Brown was present at the last meeting. He asked if he had missed that meeting.

Commissioner Brown stated that he missed the meeting but he did not vote.

Mr. Clifford stated that it came up on the monitor as him voting.

Commissioner Brown stated that, if he had inadvertently voted, he hadn't meant to because he definitely had not been in attendance at that meeting.

Mr. Clifford then stated that, in terms of parking, he can talk but the Commissioners cannot or they will get into a Brown Act violation. He stated that former Commissioner Leon and he have talked about this for years, with former Planning Director Crabtree, Planning Director White, the City Manager, and they were hopeful that something will happen. He understood that the central parking lot was closed at night, and he suggested placards distributed to the businesses to hang on windshields like a handicapped placard allowing them to park in that parking lot. He thought it would help with their in lieu parking problems with additionally spaces centrally located.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Gordon moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m.; Commissioner Brown seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Brown, Cooper, Gordon, Campbell,
Nibbelin, Vaterlaus and Chair Evans
Noes: None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director White