

3

COMMERCIAL AREAS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



Rockaway Beach. *The new General Plan should provide more opportunities for higher-density, mixed-use development.*

Analysis for the General Plan update found a total of 330 acres of vacant or under-utilized land zoned for non-residential development. The site of the former Rockaway Quarry represents nearly a third of this land (94 acres). Much of the remainder may be considered “under-utilized,” at shopping centers and small commercial districts.

Based on current zoning and typical development densities, this land could accommodate an estimated 2.1 million square feet of commercial development. However, the quarry site accounts for four-fifths of this development capacity (1.7 million square feet) following the proposal described in the Rockaway Beach Specific Plan.

Because the quarry site may not be readily developed, or may develop with less commercial space than considered in the Specific Plan, it may be important for the city to provide increased development potential at other sites. The new General Plan should also provide more opportunities for higher-density, mixed-use development on commercial sites. Compact, mixed-use redevelopment would accomplish a range of goals: the creation of districts conducive to specialty retail, activity centers with critical mass, more housing choices, better transit service, and more walkable areas.

3.1 LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT TYPES

Mixed Use and Commercial Designations

The existing General Plan Land Use map provides the following *non-residential* designations: Agriculture, Commercial, Mixed Use, Public or Semi-Public, Utilities, Beach and Commuter Parking, Parks, Greenbelts, Prominent Ridgelines, Sandy Beach, and Special Area.

The one current Commercial designation is not adequately descriptive of the variety of development contexts and to which it applies. This Workbook presents five new designations to replace Commercial:

- Retail Commercial
- Office Commercial
- Service Commercial/Industrial
- Hotel/Visitor Commercial
- Commercial Recreation

These additional designations allow the General Plan to more precisely establish a vision for the future role of each commercial area.

Mixed Use (MU)

The Mixed Use designation provides for a combination of residential and commercial uses, either arranged vertically within buildings or horizontally across sites. This designation exists in the current General Plan.

Retail Commercial (RC)

The Retail Commercial designation is meant to apply specifically to areas where retail (stores, restaurants, gas stations, etc.) is the primary intended use. Single-story buildings with surface parking would be the norm. This and the four designations that follow would be applied mainly to a subset of land currently designated as Commercial.

Office Commercial (OC)

The Office Commercial designation is meant to apply where office development is to be facilitated. Offices uses may be developed in combination with retail, either in separate buildings or different levels of buildings.

Service Commercial/Industrial (SC)

This designation would specify land intended for uses such as auto repair and parts shops, storage units, and transfer stations.

Hotel/Visitor Commercial (VC)

The Hotel/Visitor Commercial designation would be mapped where the City would like to concentrate visitor-oriented uses: hotels, inns, conference centers, and special visitor attractions, as well as retail.

Commercial Recreation (CR)

The Commercial Recreation designation would be intended for land that would remain in a primarily undeveloped state but would accommodate commercial establishments supporting recreational uses such as horseback riding and enjoyment of beaches and open spaces.

The Quarry Site

Much of the quarry is identified on the current General Plan land use map as a “Special Area.” The site is the subject of a Specific Plan, whose primary goal is to stimulate high-quality private development. Both the Specific Plan and the General Plan recommend a mixture of uses on the site, with a principal focus on visitor-serving commercial development. The General Plan recommends high-density residential use on portions of the site. However, a ballot measure passed in 1983 determined that any residential development on the quarry site shall require a public vote.



Mixed Use Buildings. Buildings with retail uses on the ground floor and having on upper floors could be a basic element of future mixed-use districts.



Office Buildings. Pacifica should encourage 2- and 3-story office buildings that relate to the street and district (higher buildings may be found to be acceptable, too.) Office buildings may have ground-floor retail uses (this example from Mountain View.)



Visitor Attractions. A special visitor attraction would provide a valuable anchor for an enhanced commercial district in Pacifica. This might be an "ocean discovery center," a visitors' center, or one of any number of other possibilities.



Shopping Centers. Additions and renovations to existing shopping centers should improve the visual quality of buildings and landscaping, and emphasize pedestrian access to the surrounding neighborhood.



Boutique Hotels. Small inns and hotels (as pictured here, in Healdsburg) would be an excellent addition to mixed use districts in Pacifica.



Civic Buildings. Pacifica should expect to replace its current libraries and city offices during the coming years with new facilities. (Pleasant Hill's City Hall is shown here.)



Main Street Retail. New retail development along Palmetto Avenue or other commercial streets should reinforce a pattern of street-facing buildings. Active ground-floor uses, ample window area, and design variety are encouraged, as in this example from Mountain View.



Resort Hotels or Conference Centers. The market assessment conducted for the General Plan update concluded that Pacifica has the potential to have one luxury or resort hotel. Another model, represented by Asilomar in Monterey, is a conference center with unique lodging.

3.2 THREE ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS

Key Objectives

Increased economic activity would help Pacifica achieve fiscal sustainability. Office and retail development could improve quality of life by bringing jobs and generating hubs of activity. Higher-density, mixed use centers could help the city meet the need for a greater variety of housing types, at a range of income levels and for an aging population. These objectives are summarized below.

Spur Economic Development, Emphasizing Tourism and Place-Making

The market assessment completed for the General Plan update concluded that Pacifica's greatest economic potential lies in visitor-oriented and specialty retail and boutique or high-end lodging. While there will be little demand for new retail in the conventional format, a "main street" environment with attractive qualities would create a potentially successful niche.

Facilitate Shopping Area Revitalization and Mixed-Use Development

Pacifica has some shopping centers that struggle with vacancy or appear to be poorly-maintained. Vacant sites and spaces exist along Palmetto Avenue and elsewhere. The General Plan update must facilitate revitalization and development in these areas. This may take the form of renovations and retail additions, redevelopment with higher-density and mixed-use buildings.

Determine Community Vision for Quarry Site and Old WWTP Site

The Specific Plan governing the Rockaway Quarry site calls for development of a mix of retail and office buildings and hotels, with upland portions of the site left undeveloped. Pacifica residents passed legislation requiring that inclusion of any residential use on the quarry site requires a vote by the people. After years of no development, it is important to gauge what the

community will support on this site. The outcome will also depend on whether the site is considered by the Coastal Commission to be an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area.

Identify Elements and Preferred Site for Potential New Civic Center

The City has studied the need and potential locations for a new civic center for local government operations. A civic center could be developed in relation to other elements such as a new public gathering space and a new library, and may function as a nucleus for a city center.

A New City Center or a Multi-Centered City?

The question of whether Pacifica should have a clear center or multiple centers with distinct identities is of critical interest.

Determine Long-Term Best Use for Industrial Land and Location for Industrial Uses

The industrial land along Palmetto is noteworthy for its oceanfront location and visibility. If this land is considered appropriate for other uses, what would they be? What other land would be best-suited to heavy commercial uses?

The Alternatives Workbook provides three alternative scenarios for achieving these goals for commercial areas. The approach of each alternative is described here.

Alternative A: Strong Center at Quarry Site

In Alternative A, Pacifica gains a new city center on the Quarry site, extending from the Rockaway Beach district and including a new civic center. This alternative assumes the greatest amount of development on the Quarry site, and the least amount of redevelopment elsewhere. Palmetto Avenue develops as a main street, and mixed-use redevelopment occurs at Park Mall.

Rockaway Beach and Quarry

In Alternative A, a new city center is created on the site of the Rockaway Quarry. The “Flats” portion of the Quarry site is developed with a compact mix of offices and housing over retail leading north from the Rockaway Beach district. A new civic center including city offices and a library/learning center is built west of the Reina del Mar intersection, near the Water Recycling facility and the Police station. This civic area meets the mixed use development at a new city park bordering the Calera Creek greenway. Also relating to this park is a Visitors’ Center, with immediate access to both the new shopping district and the regional trail system. The “Pad” portion of the site is reserved for a resort hotel/conference center, with views along the coast and down to the expanded Rockaway Beach district. The remainder of the Quarry uplands is permanently conserved as open space, with public trail access to Mori Point and beyond.

Across Highway 1, new mixed-use and high-density residential development takes place along lower Fassler Avenue.

West Sharp Park

The new center at Rockaway is balanced by intensified districts to the north in West Sharp Park and to the south in West Linda Mar. Palmetto Avenue continues to develop as currently envisioned, with streetscape improvements helping to stimulate mixed use development on vacant and under-utilized sites. The fishing pier, the revitalized Palmetto shopping area, and a new park and boutique hotel on the site of the Old Wastewater Treatment Plant draw locals and visitors to West Sharp Park.

Pedro Point, Park Mall, and Pacific Manor

Multi-family housing and a park are added at the Calson site, helping support additions to Pedro Point Shopping Center.

Park Mall is redeveloped with a mixture of uses.

At the City’s northern end, a renovated Pacific Manor shopping center provides an improved local neighborhood focus.

Gypsy Hill

The upper portion of the Gypsy Hill site, along Sharp Park Road, is slated for an inn, resort, or retreat center, while the lower portion retains Open Space Residential designation.

Industrial Area

The stretch of Palmetto currently occupied by auto repair, storage, and waste transfer uses continues to be Pacifica’s industrial/service commercial district.

Alternative B: Multi-Centered, West Sharp Park Emphasis

In Alternative B, West Sharp Park and Rockaway Beach provide two centers for Pacifica, the former with a civic focus and the latter more oriented to visitors. More of the quarry site is conserved for habitat compared to Alternative A, and more commercial and mixed use development is shifted to other sites. In addition to Palmetto Avenue and Park Mall, redevelopment sites include Pacific Manor, Eureka Square, and Crespi Drive shopping areas.

West and East Sharp Park

In Alternative B, West Sharp Park is the primary civic neighborhood. New City offices are developed on the existing site and adjacent parking area, incorporating the Little Brown Church. A new library/learning center on the site of the Old Wastewater Treatment Plant provides a strong presence on Palmetto Avenue, while its other side faces a new civic park and the promenade. Mixed-use buildings are developed on infill sites along Palmetto Avenue, which becomes a primary shopping street.

Palmetto’s success is bolstered by an increased population of workers in offices developed along Francisco and Oceana, on both sides of Highway 1, including at a redeveloped Eureka Square.

Rockaway Beach and Quarry

The Rockaway Beach district expands onto the Quarry site, and balances West Sharp Park as a commercial center. New development on the Quarry site is comprised of hotels, visitor-oriented retail, and offices, with no residential. Two-thirds of the site is conserved as open space. Primary access to both the city and the regional trail system is provided from a new Visitors' Center.

A resort hotel/conference center could be developed either as part of the Quarry redevelopment or on the Sea Bowl site, across Highway 1. As in Alternative A, mixed-use and high-density residential development takes place on lower Fassler Avenue.

Pacific Manor and Pedro Point/Linda Mar

The primary districts of West Sharp Park and Rockaway Beach are balanced by improved neighborhood centers at Pacific Manor and Linda Mar/Pedro Point.

Pacific Manor Shopping Center is redeveloped with housing over retail. This area becomes a local-oriented activity center.

At the south end of the city, the Calson site is developed with multi-family housing as well as a hotel, building on the popularity of Pacifica State Beach. The Linda Mar Park-and-Ride lot across Highway 1 and the commercial uses along Crespi Drive are redeveloped as mixed-use, transit-oriented development.

Park Mall

As in Alternative A, Park Mall is redeveloped with compact mix of uses and becomes a neighborhood center for Park Pacifica.

Gypsy Hill

The part of the Gypsy Hill site close to Sharp Park Road is developed with multi-family housing, clustered to preserve open space. The steeper and less accessible portions of Gypsy Hill retain Open Space Residential designation.

Industrial Area

The currently industrial stretch of Palmetto Avenue is gradually redeveloped for retail use. Industrial uses relocate to the east frontage of the Coast Highway opposite the Quarry.

Alternative C: Conservation and Redevelopment

In Alternative C, a balance is created between four smaller centers in a sequence along the Coast Highway: Pacific Manor, West and East Sharp Park, Rockaway Beach, and Linda Mar/Pedro Point. Each has a distinct identity. Most of the Quarry site is conserved. In addition to the sites brought into Alternatives A and B, Pedro Point and Linda Mar shopping centers experience redevelopment.

West and East Sharp Park

As in Alternative B, a new civic center is developed at the site of the current City offices. In this alternative, a Library/Learning Center is developed across Highway 1, and linked by a new pedestrian bridge, improving the connection between East and West Sharp Park and creating a strong civic identity along Highway 1.

The new Library is part of a mixed-use redevelopment of Eureka Square. Mixed use development also occurs along Palmetto Avenue, as in the other alternatives. Here it is anchored by a visitor attraction such as an Ocean Discovery Center at the site of the former Treatment Plant.

Rockaway Beach and Quarry

In Alternative C it is assumed that only minimal development takes place on the Quarry site, with the great majority conserved as habitat. The Rockaway Beach district expands slightly to the north with visitor-oriented uses and a Visitors' Center with primary access to the regional trail system. A resort hotel is developed at the Sea Bowl site, with a pedestrian bridge across the highway to the Headlands providing trail access to both Rockaway and Pacifica State Beach. The area has a clear tourism focus.

Pedro Point/Linda Mar

Pedro Point Shopping Center becomes a potential hotel site, with direct access to Pacifica State Beach and visibility from the highway. To the west, compact mixed-use development with public open space takes place at the Calson site. Across Highway 1 in Linda Mar, mixed-use transit-oriented development occurs on both sides of Linda Mar Boulevard and on Crespi Drive. Pedestrian-oriented retail settings are created to take advantage of the visitor presence at the beach, and higher-density housing is developed at this accessible and desirable location.

Pacific Manor

Pacific Manor Shopping Center is redeveloped as an office district, with a smaller amount of retail serving the neighborhood. New medical and professional offices could be clustered here, where they have the greatest visibility and access to the largest population.

Park Mall

As in the other alternatives, Park Mall is redeveloped with compact mix of uses and becomes a neighborhood center for Park Pacifica.

Gypsy Hill

All of Gypsy Hill is treated as an area for flexible, planned development, to include an inn, hotel, or the like; clustered housing; and preserved open space.

Industrial Area

Industrial users along Palmetto are encouraged to relocate across Highway 1, or to the east frontage of the Coast Highway opposite the Quarry. Parcels between Palmetto and the Ocean are designated for Commercial Recreation, facilitating expansion of the neighboring campground or a similar use, with new setback requirements from the ocean.

3.3 FOCUS AREAS

The three alternatives should be seen for their overall vision, but also compared in terms of their approach to specific sections of the city. The eight focus areas are summarized below.



Rockaway Beach and Quarry. The 90-acre Quarry site could be a new town center, a moderate extension of the Rockaway Beach district, or left nearly undeveloped. Open space and habitat protection would be critical to all alternatives.



Pacific Manor. Pacific Manor is seen as a potential site for mixed-use or office redevelopment in Alternatives B and C. Alternative A would retain it as a shopping center.



Park Pacifica Stables. The proposed General Plan designation would match the current use of this property in the back of the San Pedro Valley.



West and East Sharp Park. Mixed-use revitalization of Palmetto Avenue (pictured) is a feature of all three alternatives. The alternatives are distinguished by development proposed for the Old Wastewater Treatment Plant site, Eureka Square Shopping Center, and Francisco and Oceana Boulevards.



Pedro Point and Linda Mar. The undeveloped property west of Pedro Point Shopping Center could include some combination of housing, mixed-use development, a hotel, and a pocket park. The Pedro Point and Linda Mar shopping centers and the small commercial area along Crespi Drive could be maintained (Alternative A) or have higher-density or visitor-oriented development, as suggested in Alternatives B and C.



Gypsy Hill. Vacant land along the north side of Sharp Park Road is envisioned to hold an inn or retreat center, multi-family housing, or a combination of the two. Steeper portions of the site would be reserved for open space and very low-density residential.



Gra Ridge. In Alternatives B and C, alternatives are proposed for the oceanfront industrial area along Palmetto Avenue, as well as an undeveloped site across Highway 1 at the base of Milagra Ridge. Alternative A would maintain the status quo.



Park Mall Area. All three alternatives envision mixed-use redevelopment of Park Mall, including a mix of retail and multi-family housing.

3.4 COMMUNITY PREFERENCES

Workshop participants were asked to rank their preferences for the three alternative commercial area concepts both overall and by focus area. The results are shown in Table 3-1, based on 73 responses. Alternative A was the first choice of the greatest number of participants as an overall concept, but only by a small margin: 35 percent vs. 29 percent each for Alternatives B and C. Both Alternatives A and C were listed as third choice or given no rank by many participants, indicating that these alternatives had significant opposition. The “Points” column in Table 3-1 is intended to account for both support and opposition, by assigning 5, 3, and 1 point respectively to 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices. By this measure, Alternative B receives the highest score, indicating that it may provide a good balance.

Of the six focus areas where alternatives were provided, Alternative A was the clear favorite for Gypsy Hill and received the greatest number of first-choice preferences for all but one, Northern Palmetto/Base of Milagra Ridge, where Alternative B received slightly more support. In many cases, preferences were nearly even between Alternatives A and B. For most focus areas, Alternatives A and C were selected either as the first or last choice, while Alternative B was most frequently ranked second. For the two focus areas where only one approach was proposed, the approach received broad support.

The following text summarizes comments provided by workshop participants concerning each focus area, as well as table discussion notes. Individual worksheet comments are included in their entirety in the Appendix B, table notes are in Appendix C, and additional responses are in Appendix D.

Rockaway Beach and Quarry

PREFERENCE: ALTERNATIVE A

Nearly half (49 percent) of those who ranked preferences for Rockaway Beach and Quarry preferred Alternative A. The signature element of Alternative A—“full” development of the quarry site with habitat and open space conservation in upland and wetland areas—was more popular than Alternative A as a whole. Using the points system, Alternative A edges the others for this focus area.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

Comments on the worksheets suggest that participants who supported Alternative A on the Quarry site were mostly in favor of higher-density, mixed-use development, including upper-floor residential. One participant felt that open space should be designated where sea level rise may be an issue. Multiple comments noted that civic uses need not or should not be a part of Quarry site development.

Three comments by supporters of Alternative B for this focus area (23 percent of the total) also indicated that the inclusion of a civic center was not desired. Two comments indicated preference for Alternative B but with residential. One commenter noted that mixed use development should require 50 to 60 percent commercial space to ensure it isn’t just a nominal part of a residential development. Two respondents wrote that office uses were probably inappropriate, and visitor-serving commercial and mixed use development extending from the Rockaway Beach district should be emphasized.

Comments by participants who chose Alternative C for Rockaway Beach and Quarry (22 percent of the total) consistently desired no development or very little development at the Quarry site. Most pointed to habitat issues; some called for revitalizing existing development or building more densely in already-developed areas. Some participants wrote to strongly reject Alternative A as unrealistic based on what is known about environmental constraints. The occurrence of threatened and endangered species on portions of the Quarry, as documented in past studies,

TABLE 3-1: PREFERENCES FOR PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES FOR COMMERCIAL AREAS

Alternative	Approach	Preference				Points ^b
		1	2	3	None ^a	
OVERALL						
Alternative A	Strong Center at Rockaway Quarry	39%	11%	39%	11%	102
Alternative B	West Sharp Park Emphasis	26%	47%	5%	21%	106
Alternative C	Conservation and Redevelopment	26%	18%	37%	18%	85
Focus Area						
1 ROCKAWAY BEACH / QUARRY						
Alternative A	Full Development	49%	4%	36%	11%	204
Alternative B	Limited Development	23%	44%	11%	21%	181
Alternative C	Minimal Development	21%	21%	41%	16%	149
2 WEST / EAST SHARP PARK						
Alternative A	Commercial, Mixed Use	43%	13%	33%	10%	200
Alternative B	Office, Civic Center	35%	30%	14%	20%	193
Alternative C	Mixed Use, Civic Center	17%	23%	38%	22%	134
3 NORTHERN PALMETTO / BASE OF MILAGRA RIDGE						
Alternative A	Maintain	33%	17%	42%	8%	171
Alternative B	Retail, Office	38%	32%	14%	17%	197
Alternative C	Recreation, Industrial	23%	24%	35%	18%	146
4 PACIFIC MANOR						
Alternative A	Improve Existing	42%	20%	30%	7%	208
Alternative B	Mixed Use	36%	33%	13%	17%	203
Alternative C	Commercial, Office	20%	23%	41%	16%	146
5 PEDRO POINT / LINDA MAR						
Alternative A	Commercial, Residential	35%	19%	33%	13%	167
Alternative B	Hotel, Commercial, Mixed Use, Residential	33%	37%	11%	19%	181
Alternative C	Mixed Use, Hotel	25%	19%	32%	24%	136
6 PARK MALL AREA						
Alternative A/B/C	Mixed Use	89%	2%	0%	9%	253
7 PARK PACIFICA STABLES						
Alternative A/B/C	Maintain	95%	0%	0%	5%	260
8 GYPSY HILL						
Alternative A	Hotel, Residential	54%	5%	25%	16%	189
Alternative B	High Density, Open Space Residential	5%	34%	33%	28%	98
Alternative C	Planned Development	20%	30%	28%	23%	131

Source: Dyett & Bhatia, 2011.

Notes:

^a Where participants marked a preference for at least one alternative, any alternative that was not marked is considered to potentially indicate a negative response.

^b This point system assigns 5 points to every first choice, 3 points to every second choice, 1 point to every third choice, and 0 points where an alternative was not ranked..

is of greatest concern. The California Coastal Commission and other regulatory agencies are expected to be highly critical of any development proposal.

Two respondents looked beyond the Quarry site and noted that the proposal in Alternatives B and C to designate the Sea Bowl site for hotel/visitor commercial was good, and suggested that a “view restaurant” would be most appropriate on the adjacent site at the southeast corner of Highway 1 and Fassler Avenue.

The same respondents disagreed with the proposal in Alternatives B and C to designate the east side of Highway 1 between Fassler and Reina del Mar for service commercial/industrial uses, noting that this could require costly infrastructure improvements.

TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES

Of the eight comments on table discussion notes that indicated a preference, five preferred Alternative A for the quarry site, two preferred Alternative B, and one preferred Alternative C. Three comments noted that civic uses weren’t desirable for the site, and two called for more housing. Some argued that nothing could be done until habitat and infrastructure issues are resolved.

West and East Sharp Park

PREFERENCE: ALTERNATIVE A OR B

Both Alternatives A and B received stronger support for this focus area than they did as a whole, with Alternative C dropping. While Alternative A was the top choice for slightly more participants, it was also more likely to be the last choice. For West and East Sharp Park, Alternatives A and B are nearly tied using the scoring system.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

On the Old Wastewater Treatment Plant site, Alternative A supporters suggest mixed use development, a hotel, or an Ocean Discovery Center. Alternative B supporters mention an Ocean Discovery Center or a civic center and library/learning center (as proposed in the alternative).

Several comments are in favor of mixed-use and retail development along Palmetto, in West Sharp Park generally, or at Eureka Square. Three comments indicate approval for the idea of a library as part of redevelopment of Eureka Square (as in Alternative C, the lowest-scoring alternative).

The comments reveal a level of confusion about the alternatives. Some supporters of Alternative A noted that it should include a civic center (making it more like B or C), or that office-oriented mixed-use would be appropriate along Francisco and Oceana (as in B or C).

TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES

Table discussion notes did not indicate a clear preference for one alternative. Several comments showed support for a civic center and/or library as well as mixed-use development at the Old Wastewater Treatment Plant site. Other comments were in favor of keeping the civic core of Pacifica in West Sharp Park in general, or at the current City Hall site. Commercial revitalization and mixed-use development along Palmetto Avenue seem generally supported. Some comments emphasized strengthening the commercial character of Francisco and Oceana, with visibility along Highway 1.

Northern Palmetto / Base of Milagra Ridge

Preference: Alternative B

Slightly more participants ranked Alternative B than Alternative A as their top choice in this focus area (38 vs. 33 percent) and with A receiving far more last-choice votes, Alternative B scores highest using the point system.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

Two comments by supporters of Alternative A express the desire to maintain the “status quo” here regarding industrial uses; two others approve of retail development, perhaps referring to the commercial designation proposed for Oceana. Supporters of Alternative B, which would convert northern Palmetto from industrial to retail commercial, make comments concerning the threat of erosion, though

this is not specifically addressed in Alternative B. Alternative C is chosen by the fewest participants, but these supporters make the most comments. Their comments are focused on coastal erosion, and approve of the idea of converting the west side of Palmetto to recreational use over the long term.

TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES

There were very few comments about this focus area in the table discussion notes. Of three tables that weighed in, two preferred Alternative A, or “keeping as is” and one liked shopping and mixed use, more like Alternative B.

Pacific Manor

PREFERENCE: ALTERNATIVE A OR B

For the Pacific Manor focus area, Alternatives A and B are very close in terms of first-choice ranking (42 and 36 percent, respectively) and overall points (virtually tied.) Alternative A would maintain and upgrade the existing shopping area, while Alternative B would bring mixed-use redevelopment.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

Comments by supporters of Alternative B generally approved of the option of higher-density redevelopment. Some supporters of Alternative A indicated that it should remain a shopping center, while others called for mixed-use—these respondents presumably should have supported B or C. One Alternative B supporter promoted office uses to match the freeway access, echoing the rationale for Alternative C.

TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES

Four table groups had notes indicated a preference for Pacific Manor. Two preferred maintaining and improving the existing shopping center, as in Alternative A. Two liked providing the opportunity for higher-density mixed-use development, as in B or C. The difference between B (residential/retail mixed use) and C (office/retail mixed use) was not discussed.

Pedro Point and Linda Mar

PREFERENCE: ALTERNATIVE A OR B

Here, Alternatives A and B received nearly the same number of first-choice rankings (35 and 33 percent.) A was slightly behind B based on the scoring system due to a higher number of last-place rankings. Alternative A would facilitate residential development on the Calson site and foster shopping center upgrades. Alternative B calls for residential and visitor uses on the Calson site, and some mixed-use redevelopment along Crespi and Linda Mar.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

The two main subjects of comments on the Worksheets were development on the Calson site and the suitability of the Pedro Point area for a hotel. Comments by supporters of Alternative A indicate that the residential designation of the Calson property was the primary appeal of that option. Multiple comments stated a preference for minimal or low-density development there, in some cases out of concern for erosion and sea level rise. Some comments express support for mixed-use development either on the Calson site or the Pedro Point Shopping Center property. There is mixed reaction to a hotel, with some comments strongly against and some in support, especially for boutique or bed-and-breakfast-type businesses.

Comments reveal that some participants misunderstood the alternatives. A supporter of a hotel along Highway 1 chose Alternative A, and an opponent of any hotel on Pedro Point choosing Alternative B, in both cases contradicting their comment.

TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES

Three of the four comments in table discussion notes show a preference for “a bit more development,” redevelopment of shopping centers including Linda Mar, and redevelopment of beachfront commercial districts. Two comments are against the addition of a hotel in this area; one comment would accept a hotel

but be unhappy with other development on the Calson site.

Park Mall Area

SUPPORT FOR PROPOSED APPROACH

For the Park Mall Area, only one alternative was offered: mixed use development. The approach received broad support, reinforced in comments on the worksheets. Some comments were generally in favor but concerned about the potential over-concentration of seniors in this area, with one person suggesting converting the Sanchez branch library to a senior center if a new central library is created. Others pointed out the need to protect steelhead habitat along the creek. One respondent proposed adding a park or community garden. Some comments were in support of retaining commercial designation here and upgrading the shopping center. Table discussion notes echoed the concern about over-concentration of seniors, as well as a concern about traffic.

Park Pacifica Stables

SUPPORT FOR PROPOSED APPROACH

Just one alternative was presented for the Park Pacifica Stables land: a Commercial Recreation designation that would enable continuation of equestrian use. There was strong agreement with this designation, echoed in the comments. Some comments suggested the potential to pursue public access or open space preservation, and some suggested that low-density residential development could be appropriate here. Table discussion notes affirmed support for the proposed approach.

Gypsy Hill

PREFERENCE: ALTERNATIVE A

For Gypsy Hill, Alternative A was the clear favorite, ranked first by over half (54 percent) of those who provided a response. This was the only focus area for which Alternative A received fewer last-place rankings than Alternative B. Alternative A would designate the property along the ridge for Visitor Com-

mmercial use such as an inn or conference center, with Open Space Residential on the less accessible portions of the property.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

Several supporters of Alternative A made comments about preventing ridge top development or maintaining open space. An unusually high number of participants did not rank the alternatives for this focus area. Some of these participants voiced doubt about the viability of a hotel, and concerns about access from Sharp Park Road, and felt that only very low density could be supported here.

TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES

Two table notes showed support for a hotel or conference center, but also noted concerns about visual impact along the ridge and traffic access from Sharp Park Road. One table called for maintaining current zoning.

General Comments

Some themes from the table discussions about commercial area development are general, or speak of taking an approach not captured by any of the alternatives. Some questioned the idea that new building should take place in Pacifica, and would have preferred a “no change” alternative. Some wanted a focus on improving existing commercial development. Some felt the alternatives should emphasize more transit-oriented, mixed use development.

Others felt they were not given the information needed to make a good choice between the alternatives: a “highest and best use” study, an analysis of tax revenues, and analysis of transportation impacts were suggested. Some pointed out that there seemed to be a mismatch between the commercial alternatives and the proposed coastal development policies, or suggested that alternatives should focus more on areas east of Highway 1. Finally, additional uses or activities were identified that were not well-accounted for in the alternatives: outdoor recreation, an entertainment district, medical facilities, and low-income housing.