

MINUTES

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

April 1, 2019

7:00 p.m.

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

ROLL CALL: Present: Commissioners Berman, Rubinstein, Clifford, Nibbelin, Kraske, Bigstycyk and Chair Campbell
Absent: None

SALUTE TO FLAG: Led by Commissioner Berman

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wehrmeister
Sr. Planner Murdock
Assoc. Planner O'Connor
Police Chief Steidle
Dep. Fire Chief Lauderdale
PW Sr. Civil Engineer Donguines
Asst. City Attorney Bazzano

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA Vice Chair Clifford moved approval of the Order of Agenda; Commissioner Rubinstein seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Rubinstein, Clifford, Nibbelin, Kraske, Bigstycyk and Chair Campbell
Noes: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MARCH 18, 2019 Commissioner Nibbelin moved approval of minutes of March 18, 2019; Commissioner Kraske seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Rubinstein, Clifford, Nibbelin, Kraske, Bigstycyk and Chair Campbell
Noes: None

DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2019:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they would need a liaison because the ADU recommendation is going to City Council.

Commissioner Nibbelin volunteered.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None

CONSENT ITEMS:

1. File No. 2019-008 – Determination of status related to a City-initiated merger of Lots 4 through 12 of Block 25, Rockaway Beach Subdivision No. 1 (RSM 6/53).
Recommended CEQA Action: Exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3).

2. File No. 2019-009 – Determination of status related to a City-initiated merger of Lots 45 through 48 of Block 25, Rockaway Beach Subdivision No. (RSM 6/53).
Recommended CEQA Action: Exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3).

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they can act on them together without a presentation.

Commissioner Nibbelin moved that the Planning Commission approves Consent Items 1 and 2; Vice Chair Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Rubinstein, Clifford, Nibbelin, Kraske, Bigstycyk and Chair Campbell
Noes: None

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

3. TA-114-19

File No. 2019-003 – Text Amendment TA-114-19 to amend Article 49 of the City of Pacifica Zoning Regulations (Title 9, Chapter 4 of the Pacifica Municipal Code (PMC), as well as other articles of City of Pacifica Zoning Regulations, to increase the maximum number of allowed marijuana retail operations in the Rockaway Beach and Sharp Park Marijuana Operation Overlay Districts; to amend regulations related to: testing and manufacturing operations findings for approval of use permits, prioritizing certain lottery list applicants, cannabinoid extraction by manufacturers, parking standards for marijuana operations and other administrative amendments to create efficiencies in the permitting process and conform with State law amendments.
Recommended CEQA status: Exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3).

Assoc. Planner O'Connor presented the staff report. She concluded by stating that Police Chief Steidle and Tim Cromartie, consultant from HdL, were present to answer any questions.

Chair Campbell stated that he watched the meeting and he thought the ethanol provision runs a little far afield for a Planning Commission to be tackling. He asked if a health and safety type of regulation was something they would normally be looking at.

Assoc. Planner O'Connor stated that she wasn't intending for them to look in the health and safety or review fire code requirements, adding that the zoning amendment is intended to establish boundaries for particular uses.

Chair Campbell assumed the fire marshal looked at it, but he asked if it will run through the state, etc.

Assoc. Planner O'Connor stated that applicants would have to get state licenses through the California Dept. of Public Health as well as obtain building permits which are reviewed for meeting fire code as well as building code.

Chair Campbell concluded that it was the beginning of the process.

Commissioner Nibbelin knew that this specific issue of ethanol came up because the public had raised it as a concern in making the ordinance more business friendly and reflective of a process they wanted subject to various approvals they needed to get to do it. He asked if the commenters were involved in the work done over the last few weeks to see if this will address what they are trying to accomplish.

Assoc. Planner O'Connor stated that they followed up with them after the meeting and they provided staff with educational materials of what they hoped to accomplish as well as a written description of their process and staff took that into consideration when drafting the amendments.

Commissioner Nibbelin thanked staff for using terms he could grasp and understand what the technology was supposed to do.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that it looked like they had a representative from the fire department and he would ask them some questions if possible.

North County Fire Authority Dep. Fire Chief Shane Lauderdale introduced himself.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that he knew they had an annual business fire inspection, and he asked if this would fall under that in terms of an annual inspection for the ethanol being safe or would the inspections be more frequent.

Dep. Fire Chief Lauderdale anticipated that it would be at least annual. He stated that, as mentioned earlier, this was the first stage in approving a process which was why the language was carefully looked at. As an entity comes into the community and suggests how they would like to do something, they would evaluate that with the fire codes and building codes and collaborate to ensure that they address all the safety standards. He stated that 30 gallons of ethanol is a very low threshold and it gives them comfort that they will be able to find those solutions.

Chair Campbell opened the Public Hearing.

Adam Zollinger, applicant, stated that he was one of the applicants next in line for a third permit in Sharp Park. He thanked everyone for the hard work as he knew what it took to get the text amendment up, working on it and getting it ready for passing. He hoped there will be no issues with the passing of this. He stated that the manufacturing thing held up the retail last week, and with one of the minutes from a prior meeting, Council requested that manufacturing not hold up any of the retail stuff. He hoped this would get passed at this meeting and they can begin working together to bring much needed tax revenue for the city.

Chair Campbell closed the Public Hearing.

Commission Nibbelin stated he was ready to make a motion if there was no discussion.

Chair Campbell stated that, while he didn't want to get in the way of the motion, he thought he would be "outgunned" on this. He stated that, after looking at the text amendment and the previous meeting, he was not in favor of so many cannabis businesses in the overlay district and will probably be voting no.

Commissioner Nibbelin moved that the Planning Commission FINDS the proposed ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; ADOPTS the resolution included as Attachment A to the staff report to initiate the text amendment and recommend approval to the City Council; and INCORPORATES additional change to Pacifica Municipal Code Section 9-4.4803(d)(3) IV as quoted by staff earlier and have with them and incorporate all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Bigstycck seconded the motion.

The motion carried **4-3**.

Ayes: Commissioners Clifford, Berman, Nibbelin and Bigstycck
Noes: Commissioners Kraske, Rubinstein and Campbell

- 4. PSD-815-16** File No. 2016-003 – Site Development Permit PSD-815-16, Use Permit UP-79-16, Sign Permit S-121-16 and Parking Exception PE-170-16 for demolition of an existing one-story, 2,992 square-foot (s.f.) commercial building and construction and operation of a new three-story, 18,034 s.f., 31-room hotel with a freestanding sign at 699 Oceana Boulevard (APN 009-253-280).
UP-79-16
S-121-16
PE-170-16
Recommended CEQA status: Class 32 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15332.

Sr. Planner Murdock presented staff report.

Commissioner Bigstyk referred to the parking space being made bigger to be a regular parking space, and asked if that was the same number of parking spaces overall.

Sr. Planner Murdock responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Bigstyk commented that sometimes when a relative comes to visit, he will visit them in their hotel room which means he needs a parking space upon arrival and he asked if they had taken into account people visiting guests such as there should be more parking or specifically on street parking. He mentioned that three spaces were taken out so when leaving the driveway they don't crash into oncoming traffic which he thought was a great idea, but he wanted to be sure there was enough parking available for visitors of guests. If that was taken into account, he asked if they had come to any conclusions.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they evaluated the proposed project against the parking requirements in the municipal code and on that basis the proposed project would provide one more space than required by the zoning. They anticipate, as do many hotels, that they don't operate at full occupancy and with that in mind, the number of spaces provided would be for less than the full number of rooms. They believe that the parking required by the code and provided in excess by the applicant should be sufficient for the project. He added that staff has not identified anything unique to this project to require additional parking beyond the zoning requirement.

Commissioner Bigstyk wanted it clear that there won't be a permit required from the hotel to be able to park in the parking lot.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the applicant has not proposed any such permit parking requirement, adding that it might be appropriate to ask the applicant if he has that information about the operator.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that, before going further, he wanted to acknowledge that of the 19 members who put this project together, he has worked with four of them. He stated that he has no interest in this project and is certain that he can render unbiased opinions on it.

Commissioner Nibbelin assumed that there was no bar service proposed for this hotel.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that there has been no alcohol service described in the material submitted to staff, suggesting that if that was a concern they could discuss adding a condition that explicitly states that.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that he was interested in any services, whether food, banquet, bar that might cater to non-guests as he thought that could have impacts they would want to think about if that were part of the plan.

Sr. Planner Murdock agreed, adding that the applicant can probably articulate more fully the type of operation proposed. He stated that there has been nothing in the material submitted to staff that would suggest that it was designed for non-guest customers. He stated that the breakfast service and juice bar have been described to the city as being an amenity for the guests only, not for offsite customers to stop at the hotel.

Commissioner Nibbelin hoped that the presentation will touch on that.

Patrick Mora, architect, stated he was representing Sam Devdhara, the owner, who was present to answer any questions about the operations of the hotel. He also had the traffic engineer, soils engineer and Brian Gadder the landscape architect who were also available to answer questions. He stated that the project has been in the works for many years, with many changes in regard to parking, landscaping, retaining walls, etc. He stated they have tried to address most of the questions from neighbors, specifically the owner of the property in the back at 624 Edgemar with whom they met and verified the elevation of the house, addressing all their issues, such as possible impaired views, etc. He stated that there was a letter from the Connemara neighbors. They tried hard to correlate their concerns with the staff report, such as children, traffic and trails to Milagra Ridge. He tried to find an answer to these concerns wanting to work positively with all of them. He stated that there was nothing written by an expert that could confirm that these concerns were 100% valid. He stated that he would like to get together with them to work further to mitigate some of the concerns. He stated that the comments are very valid but they were willing to work with them if that was the case as they did with neighbors in the back at 624 Edgemar. He stated that he would show a few graphics indicating they worked hard to make it simple and easy to maintain and stay away from property lines as much as possible and provide parking in a setting that is quiet. He stated that they have a vegetated wall which was a new system and the effect was not that big. He stated that the site was sad because of everything happening there. He thought the sooner they get rid of the existing building, the better for the neighborhood. He recalls going to the coffee shop with his children for breakfast on Sundays and it was exciting for the kids but it was decaying and eventually they closed and it has been closed for years. They were looking forward to replacing it with something that can provide amenities to the community and income for the city. He pointed out the impact of the cut into the hill and the vegetation that will be partly removed. He stated that, even though there is no biological impact, they wanted to show what the existing building on the left looks like in terms of footprint and on the right the new building. A plan requested by Planning shows the accessibility for ADA, etc. He stated that the floor plan on the ground floor shows the lobby, big atrium with the large skylight on top in the lighted area. He mentioned the question whether the breakfast would be big enough for people to come and have breakfast on Sundays and thought it might. He described the specifics of the floor plan and building design, as well as mentioning that the landscape has gone through several variations which the landscape architect could explain. He stated that he would be glad to call the consultants to answer any of Council's questions.

Vice Chair Clifford referred to the living retaining wall and stated he has never worked with this and would like more detail on how it works to make sure the area is sound and safe once it is excavated.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked staff about the business plan pertaining to the potential operations, such as the juice bar and breakfast because he didn't understand what was said. He was curious to the extent that non-guests will be able to access them or if the operator has plans for services made available for non-guests.

Mr. Mora stated that he can call the owner to give them an idea of the operations.

Sam Devdhara, owner, stated that it was a 31-room limited service hotel and no proposed food or beverage services, with breakfast served for the hotel guests only.

Commissioner Nibbelin referred to the conference room, and asked if that will not be a conference room used by non-guests.

Mr. Devdhara stated that there will be a meeting space available for anyone who wants to rent the meeting space, but there is no food service there.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked how many people the conference room would accommodate.

Mr. Devdhara stated that he didn't have the square footage.

Mr. Mora stated that it would be for about 15-20 people.

Mr. Devdhara stated that it was basically a boardroom.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that he asked because of the parking capacity and the potential trip generation capacity when added to the guests.

Mr. Devdhara stated that he operates other hotels and with a 31-room hotel, from the operational side, 20 parking spots would be sufficient to run the 31 rooms. He stated that even when the hotel is full, not every guest will bring their cars as they use other means of transportation so 31 is a decent size parking space number.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if there will be any permitting system for parking or can anyone drive up and park.

Mr. Devdhara stated that it will be hotel guest parking only and they will use some sort of service to identify that their vehicle is a hotel guest vehicle.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that anyone visiting a guest will not be allowed to park in that parking lot.

Mr. Devdhara stated that there will be some sort of system in place that they will utilize.

Commissioner Bigstyk assumed it would be a casual permitting process.

Mr. Devdhara agreed.

Commissioner Bigstycck referred to mention of the neighbor at 624 Edgemar, and he asked if there was any followup from people at the residence that they were satisfied with what they did or any further feedback from them.

Mr. Mora stated that he showed her the corridors and the further away from the building you are, the building shrinks and the more you can see. He thought she was okay with it, but she is present and they can ask again.

Vice Chair Clifford referred to guest breakfast, and he asked if it was a full breakfast or a hotel continental breakfast.

Mr. Mora stated that he has not made arrangements to put an exhaust hood in the building yet, but when construction documents come, they can put a shaft and someone can be frying eggs, etc., and he guarantees it will be a better breakfast.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that he was asking in terms of guests wanting to have outside people come and have breakfast with them versus the continental breakfast where you take it back to your room.

Mr. Devdhara stated that it will be a hotel guest only breakfast and they aren't confirmed on the setup but it will be more like what he mentioned of a continental breakfast for hotel guests only. He stated that, if they allow outside people to have breakfast, that would be a food service requirement and they aren't proposing any food service at all.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that he wanted to have a chance to talk with the soil or structural engineer about the retaining wall as his earlier question disappeared. He stated, if either is available, he would like to have more information on the retaining walls which are new to him.

Mike O'Connell, Civil Engineering Consultant, stated that, while he is not the soil or structural engineer, he did know a lot about the walls. He stated that they are common and have designed and built them up to 30-40 feet. He stated that they did some 25-foot walls recently in San Jose on a landfill with terrible soil conditions and they were stable. He stated that the technical term is "mechanically stabilized earth walls" and they have a very wide structural footprint with reinforced geogrades and very safe and feasible.

Vice Chair Clifford thanked him as he needed an explanation.

Commissioner Berman referred to the parking, stating that they mentioned that one stall will be dedicated to the manager of the hotel, and she wondered, if additional employees are anticipated, such as cleaning staff, where they would park. She asked if they would park on the street. She stated that the area does have open street parking but she would like to understand how many employees might be working at one time, if known.

Mr. Devdhara stated that, from the operation standpoint, typically if the hotel is 80% occupied, about 75-80% of those guests would show up after 6 p.m. for check in, although the usual check-in time for hotels is 2 p.m. He stated that housekeeping staff is there in morning times. On a front desk for 31 rooms, they usually expect one front desk person with the manager on duty 9 a.m.-5 p.m. They don't expect to have more than a couple of vehicles from employees during the peak hours.

Commissioner Berman asked if it was considered in the traffic impact analysis (TIA) traffic study.

Mr. Mora stated he would call the traffic engineer to answer that question.

Kirman Chiu, DKS Assocs., stated they are a traffic engineering firm. He stated that the original traffic impact study was done by RKH Civil Transportation Engineering and his company was hired to conduct a peer review based on the direction of the city to make sure the applicant's traffic study conformed to the typically used practices in the traffic engineering profession. He stated that, regarding parking, in addition to meeting the zoning code requirements, the applicant consulted a parking generation manual published by the Institute of Transportation engineers. He stated that, based on a 32-room motel in the traffic impact study, an 85th percentile parking demand was found to be 28 spaces. He stated that, with traffic engineering, they typically go off the 85th percentile rule, i.e., you don't design your roadway to serve black Friday traffic for a few times a year, but the 85th percentile which was 28 spaces in this project and thus the parking will meet the 85th percentile demand most days and would account for the manager, desk person and cleaning staff.

Commissioner Berman referred to mention of a bench at the front of the hotel and wondered where the nearby bus stop was, would there be lighting at night to turn away unwanted overnight guests on the bench.

Mr. Mora thought that was a good comment, stating that lighting was an issue. He stated that they normally try to not direct any lighting away from the subject, but the drawings were preliminary in preparing the presentation to Council. He stated that, when they address the construction documents and Planning will review the drawing and they will make sure everything is done correctly.

Commissioner Berman referred to the existing landscaping area at the top of the slope and was anticipated to remain, and she asked if there was an opportunity to enhance the planting for the residents behind the property as they will be overlooking the property and there might be an opportunity to plant more aesthetics.

Mr. Mora called the landscape architect to answer the question.

Brian Gadder, landscape architect, stated he was working with Mr. Mora on this. He stated that there were plants in the plans now for the top of the wall and they could look at enhancing it further if there was a desire by the neighbors.

Chair Campbell asked what type of clientele they anticipate will be staying at the hotel.

Mr. Devdhara stated that it was a more boutique hotel and they expect both leisure and corporate travelers to stay there who don't want to be in downtown San Francisco with all the traffic. He stated that Pacifica is underserved in terms of hotels from an operations or financial standpoint. He will have an occupancy report from Pacifica on how the hotels are doing which will tell the story of why it is underserved.

Chair Campbell referred to his mentioning that he operates other hotels, and he asked if there were any in the vicinity that they would know about.

Mr. Devdhara stated that they have several hotels in San Francisco including in Union Square, and he also has some in Marina near Monterey, Sebastopol, and El Dorado Hills town center.

Chair Campbell stated he was curious and asked which hotel he ran in Union Square.

Mr. Devdhara stated it was the Holiday Inn Express.

Commissioner Kraske asked if they considered the building materials used to be compatible to the harsh climate in Pacifica.

Mr. Mora stated that most materials they will be using will be easy to maintain and durable. He stated that the concrete will be smooth and metal in concrete will show rust but in this case it will be smooth and sealed and preserve the face of the concrete and the metal will be anodized or stainless on the window frames and the rest is durable redwood.

Commissioner Kraske asked about the awnings.

Mr. Mora stated that the awnings will be some canvas with a durable finish on an aluminum frame, something light.

Chair Campbell opened the Public Hearing.

Jeannine Menger, Pacifica, stated that this is in her back yard and she was in favor of this project as losing Spanky's has created a blight in the neighborhood and she sees this as something in favor of Pacifica. She stated that she thought there are a lot of properties that need to be developed and is a gem waiting to be polished and this was an example. She heard rumbling from her neighbors and she was dying to hear what they have to say about too many or not enough motels. She hopes this is considered carefully when deciding on this project as to how many motels we have. She was in favor of it for the city from a revenue point of view. She did want to mention the intersection of Milagra and Oceana, and thought it won't create a huge problem because there are only a small number of people relative to the numbers that came from Spanky's when it was open and she thought it might be more but the intersection could take a few more cars. She stated that it was busy now, but she hoped there would be a stop light put in, particularly when it is a northbound entrance to Highway 1. She referred to Ms. Berman's question, stating that there is a bus stop at the corner by the Chevron's station for 110 and 118. She stated that she was putting an ADU over her garage and she wants to see what their process is like for doing that, adding that she hoped it was good.

Deeg Gold, Pacifica, stated that she was one of the signers of the letter from the Connemara neighbors and agreed with the points they make. She was concerned that this becomes a justification for creating an on ramp on Milagra. She received a notice of this hearing because she lives within specific feet of the project and is in her back yard. She didn't want an on ramp at Milagra and went to the Planning Commission to oppose that project and if this becomes a justification for it, that is another reason to oppose it. She was concerned that they say they are designed for 85% capacity but she stated that hotels tend to run at high capacity and low capacity and she didn't think there was adequate parking planned, was not within appropriate height limits,

and, while it cannot be used for this project, she thought the Planning Commission was going in the wrong direction as we need low cost residential housing. She stated that, if there are lots in the city to build on, they should be building public housing and she thought it sounds like a crap hotel. She stated that she was familiar with the Holiday Inn Express in San Francisco, but she didn't think this was an addition to our city that should be approved. She felt it requires more study and investigation and get away from the hand waving about the parking spaces and height.

Blue Murov, Pacifica, stated that she lives on Manor and was close to where this is being planned. She thought it belongs in an industrial park, not a mid-city residential neighborhood. She thought they have hotels in Pacifica to accommodate tourists and we need developers willing to build low income and affordable housing which is the real problem in Pacifica.

Julie Starobin, Pacifica, stated she is also opposed to the project as she doesn't think the developer has addressed the concerns of the neighborhood. She mentioned a neighborhood meeting in January that she didn't hear about where they talked about things. She didn't think the concerns were addressed but the developers just went and did what they wanted. She was worried about parking as she felt there was no parking available on Oceana during the day, mentioning all the students, customers, etc., traveling there and stating it wasn't a big street and having that extra traffic on a two-lane road does not make sense to her. She added that you can't widen Oceana and she wouldn't want to anyway, and they will have extra cars going in and out. She referred to the comment that employees won't be there when the hotel guests are there, but she thought that was ridiculous as housecleaning doesn't go away in the early morning and hotel guests don't go away in the early morning. She referred to the comment that not every guest will have a car but anyone coming to Pacifica will have a car because there is no bus service. She stated that the hotels in Rockaway and Francisco have places to walk to, but not on Oceana and Milagra as it is a residential neighborhood. She agreed to tear down Spanky's and put something there, but not build a hotel that will add the extra traffic, people, pollution from the cars.

Victoria Becker, Pacifica, stated she was present for Pacifica Social Justice. She lives two blocks away from the site. She asked, in the midst of a statewide housing crisis where teachers, seniors, veterans and working people can no longer afford to live in Pacifica, what Pacifica was doing about the crisis. She stated that it was being discussed on a statewide level, and they are making a 31-room hotel overlooking the freeway and Chevron station. She finds it outrageous and she felt Pacifica needs low income housing, affordable housing which has been discussed over and over, and there are state grants being proposed for such things and Pacifica has done nothing to look into this. She stated that they are always talking about hotels. She is outraged beyond all the many things talked about the impact on the neighborhood. She stated she would put up with noise of construction if it was making places for people to live. She stated that the Planning Commission was charged with figuring that out as the planning committee.

Michael Vezzali, Pacifica, stated this is also in his backyard and he and his wife are opposed to the project because they believe it is out of scale for that space. They agree and have signed the Connemara letter that it was out of scale for the neighborhood, although zoned commercially. He stated that they weren't opposed to every development, but a better fit might be some of the examples already on Oceana Blvd, such as a dental office that have normal business hours and won't have people coming and going all day and night as a hotel is a transient population with no investment or connection to the neighborhood. He stated that he is a high school teacher and this is the only place he has to go. He was one of the anchors in the community and he wants to stay close to the place where he teaches. He stated that there are four schools nearby and he wishes he

had heard about the January meeting. He thought they have done a lot of work on the design, but he didn't know about the January meeting until he got the letter about this meeting. He stated that there are four schools and looking at some of the exemptions being applied for tells them the story, as if there are so many exemptions needed, it was not a fit for the location. He asked if anyone lives next to a hotel, and if so, he would like to know what it is like, including asking if any of the developers lived next to a hotel.

Amsalo Dabola Biketi, Pacifica, stated she lives within the 500 feet of the proposed project, and she has signed two letters in opposition, and she will share thoughts in addition to that in the two letters. She stated that they cannot understate the traffic congestion impact. She understood that the applicant's analysis was based on an outdated traffic study and the firm assigned to do a peer review didn't suggest that they did their own analysis but analyzed old data. She stated that, from her experience of living in Pacifica for two years, there was a lot of congestion on that block of Oceana on both sides of the hotel site, as well as a lot of foot traffic from pedestrian including children from the schools. She referred to comments about the housing shortage in Pacifica, as well as in California and across the country, and stated that there are over 300 Airbnb rooms available in Pacifica and any hotel operating at less than desirable occupancy rate was not necessarily going to be a great investment and source of revenue. She mentioned that Holiday Inn Express was a 3-star or 2-star establishment and she can't imagine it being more desirable than some of the higher end Airbnb rentals, and she asked why we should put a giant hotel that will not be at 85% occupancy most days and is a waste of space. She felt there were other services that could be considered for which the property was currently zoned.

Lailey Oliva, Pacifica, stated that she has lived in Pacifica for 15 years. She stated that her first concern about this proposal was primarily related to traffic congestion and parking on the street, but in the last two years, the traffic on Oceana has exploded. She is not sure if it is increased occupancy in general for homeowners, renters or people needing housing versus Starbuck's, etc., but something has changed. She understood that the traffic assessment done was initially in 2015. She stated that the next speaker has more data on the objective concerns. She stated that, having two children at Ocean Shore, this project is .3 miles from that school and Good Shepherd and a bit further from the high school. These students are walking on Oceana during school hours and she was concerned about traffic, congestion but also concerned for public health safety issues. She acknowledges that the site needs to be updated, renovated and turned into something, but she hoped some type of small business or housing, mentioning their thinking on housing for teachers in the back of Pacifica, but she thought this spot would be perfect for something like that.

Christine Fagan, Pacifica, stated she was a resident of the Conamara housing community. She referred to the letter that was sent to the Planning Department, and stated that she had a new letter that was prepared after Planning released the staff report and that she will be submitting with 30 more signatures and she was speaking on their behalf. The letter was to formally notify Planning Department and Planning Commission that the residents of the Pacific Manor community strongly objecting and disapproving the proposal of the hotel development permit at 699 Oceana Blvd, with specific objections of non-conforming zoning standard, giving some specifics.

Chair Campbell said that she had exceeded her three minutes.

Ms. Fagan stated that she needed more time and became disagreeable. Chair Campbell stated that he was sorry but it would not be fair to the other speakers. Others in the audience spoke up and created a condition where the meeting could not continue.

Chair Campbell called a recess then reconvened the meeting, requesting that the audience refrain from shouting, clapping and speakers to stay within their 3-minute time limit in fairness to the rest of the audience and speakers before and after. He stated that, if anyone wishes to speak who has not spoken they can fill a card, hand to staff and will have three minutes to speak.

Mark Nicodemus, Pacifica, stated they were directly behind the property. He stated that everyone knows this site is too small for the hotel, explaining because you have to cut 40 feet into the side and 20 feet into the back. He stated you can't go around the hotel and they have to cantilever the second story to get underneath the hotel and park under the hotel, and they don't have enough parking, and he was going to speak on his issues. He thought the architect did a great job proposing a hotel. He thought the hotel was beautiful and he looked at their concerns, but he stated that they have other concerns. He talked with the landscape architect, because that was his problem. He stated that they were cutting into their property and were blocking his ocean view which is why he lives in Pacifica. He stated that they were also taking away their privacy, because instead of their ocean views, the hotel people will be looking into their bedrooms. He stated that, if this is going forward, there has to be a way to mitigate privacy, trees, landscaping, etc. They were proposing a wall to block some of the pollution, light, noise, etc. He stated that the biggest part was the land with two hills coming together and they were cutting 40 feet into one side and 20 feet on the other side and backing up to their property. He stated that, if he walks their dogs or kids, they won't fall into the parking lot because they are putting a 40-inch metal fence that will stop everything. He stated that the entire hill and all the water flows into the property and it has been eroding for years and he was concerned that no one has looked at the hills itself. City staff worked great explaining the process but they are concerned about what is going on with the property, privacy, losing the view and what will happen to the hill.

Jean Strohbeck, Pacifica, stated that she lives within 300 feet of the proposed hotel, and she just heard about it recently. She was distressed that she didn't get a mailing in January to come and get more of a heads up. She stated that it seemed to be an unlikely and inappropriate location and turning an area of natural beauty into a business park. She questioned their success rate and asked what they will do in a few years when they realize they can't fill the room, and questioned if the building will be another rusty building. She asked that they sell the property to the GGNRA. She asked why they would want to build a hotel next to a fire department along a path of three schools and she thought it didn't sound like the height level was not legal. She asked the owner what he meant about Pacifica being underserved by hotels, and she disagreed and felt we have many hotels and there always seem to be a vacancy.

Felipe Lazaro, Pacifica, stated that like others he is late to this, and he didn't have all the engineering, etc., clearly and was going to the basics. He asked what the neighbors in the area get out of this, how is it different which takes things away without giving back to the community and the neighborhoods. He stated that the owners said they would have very few staff. He stated that they already have parking issues, and he asked about the revenue. He has not been a resident for very long in Pacifica but he has seen prices skyrocket. He thought the revenue will not improve Pacifica. He didn't see trees. He mentioned that the architect came to Spanky's on Sundays and residents will have no access to this since it is only for guests. He again asked what the

community was getting out of this. He felt the need for people to stay overnight was not in that part of Pacifica and they were carving into a quiet, tranquil neighborhood to bring something that did not provide a new restaurant or services that will benefit the residents.

Vivien Zielin, Pacifica, stated that she didn't hear anything about the January meeting and she was concerned that this will be a shoo-in for the roadway which they hear about and there was some opposition to that. She uses the 110 bus and 118 because she happens to be a pedestrian who enjoys walking in the area and is out of her car. She felt it was a beautiful neighborhood in terms of friendliness and children and she felt it adds nothing and was not suitable for the space. She was amazed that no one has mentioned the hospice which is alongside of it and she asked what affect it will have on the patients in the hospice.

Chair Campbell asked the next speaker to state her name.

Christine Fagan gave her name then referred to the retail use for this project.

Chair Campbell stated that he will allow Ms. Fagan to speak again in this one case but when time's up, time's up.

Ms. Fagan stated that it was retail commercial and the land use designation was not tourist serving commercial which allows hotels and motels and other tourist serving businesses. She stated that the C2 zoning was community commercial, and the conditional use was allowable motel conditional use and she didn't think it applies, and it was a hotel and a hotel and motel are not interchangeable and two definitions in this section 9.2 of the municipal code. She didn't want to get too much into it. She then referred to land use, i.e., not utilized visitor serving commercial land use, i.e., hotels and motels, and other tourist serving business, stating that the coastal zone has about 110 acres of underutilized land for this designation, 155,000 square feet for non-commercial kind of development.

Chair Campbell stated that her time was up.

Ms. Fagan stated that they were all in the Rockaway Beach area.

Christopher Tung, Pacifica, stated he lived at the intersection of Milagra and Edgemar, next to the fire station and pretty close to the hotel. He had three points to make. He has not seen a valid or any business case for having this hotel in this place. He stated that he came to the first meeting a few years ago where the plans were presented. He posed a question to the Planning Commission who he thought should know the answer when he asked what the occupancy rate in Pacifica and they looked at him like he was asking a strange alien question. He has not seen any business case made that they have so many people coming in that they need a hotel and they need to build one. He has heard no quote on occupancy rate and he guesses that it is not close to 100%. He is a parent and his kids have gone to three of the schools close by, Ocean Shore, Good Shepherd and Oceana. He drops them off at school, and he sees the traffic. He stated that cars are parked on the sidewalk and they have ameliorated any of the traffic issue. He stated that he was at the last Planning meeting for the proposed new traffic light and highway work. He reiterated that there were no traffic mitigation measures and actions taken. He was concerned that they are bringing more people in who are transient and will contribute to the traffic issue as well as the safety of their children who walk, cycle, skate to school and he questioned how they could even let it get this far.

Inna Gorsky, Pacifica, referred to the general plan with a section of community design element. She stated one part is to preserve the unique quality of the neighborhood. She thought the proposed development does not comply with that. She stated that another item is establish development standards that would keep open the steep slopes and visually prominent ridge lines, which she thought was overlooked with this proposed development. She then mentioned the traffic concerns, and stated that the traffic impact analysis prepared by the applicant's consultant for the project was dated May 4, 2015. She stated that city's consultant performed a peer review and issued its findings in a letter dated August 10, 2016. She stated that the applicant's consultant amended the TIA to correct typographic errors and inconsistencies and expanded analysis completeness and issued a revised TIA dated November 9, 2017. She stated that this outdated TIA does not reflect the current increased traffic pattern which Caltrans has concluded. She stated that the TIA didn't include a consideration for public transit and peak hours that specify. She stated that the table did not take the traffic into consideration from the three neighboring schools, especially from 1:00-4:00 p.m., when the traffic increased 4-5 times. She stated that the TIA analysis does not mention this. She stated that the TIA traffic impact based on estimated traffic generated by the project and compared to the condition of the vicinity of the project, using the level of service method. She stated that, with the current increased traffic, this level of service designation will change, making the intersection operate below the city's standard. She stated that there was a backup of 12-20 vehicles traveling on Oceana Blvd. She stated that the traffic increased during the peak hours when school sessions ended, and you could make the 12-20 vehicle multiplied by five.

Mr. Devdhara stated that he was in the hotel business and operating several other hotels, and he stated it was a safe and sound business as hotels are required in every community. He stated that it will be designed to fit a boutique type nature of this town. He stated that they have been working on it for quite a few years. He stated that the reason it was not in front of them was that they wanted to make sure they met every ordinance that a town requires and they have gone through that. He stated that the hotel will create several jobs, over 16 jobs directly at the hotel and several indirect jobs. He stated that it will generate transient occupancy tax revenue for the city north of \$200,000 a year. It will generate property tax north of \$90,000 a year. He stated that there are several benefits that town and community will enjoy. The transient guests are those who come and spend in various towns including many in Pacifica and they will be eating at local restaurants, filling the gas at the next door Chevron stations. He stated that there are many other benefits associated with this project. He was looking for approval to move forward with this project.

Chair Campbell closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Campbell referred to having a study session on a hotel on this site about 4-5 years ago. He asked if this was the same applicant/owner.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he was not entirely sure if the owner was the same although the concept was generally similar but very many of the specifics of the building layout and site layout have changed in response to comments at the study session, implementation of city code requirements, design suggestions from staff and members of the community.

Chair Campbell stated that he asked because he recalled the parking being a big issue at that time and the applicant was talking about having valets, moving their car into the neighborhood. He

stated that there was no commissioner in favor of that and it was a back to the drawing board moment, and he wondered about the parking situation at this time. He asked if there was a need for more parking even though they are meeting the code.

Sr. Planner Murdock recalled that there were fewer spaces proposed in the earlier version of the project, and it sounds like the applicant took to heart the concern about the number of spaces. He stated that colored staff's analysis of the request for the parking exception and, in the staff report, although the proportion of compact spaces would be exceeded, it seems that the applicant was striving to provide the number of spaces that would be needed to park at the project on site and it sounds as though, in an attempt to exceed the zoning requirement by one space, the applicant was seeking this parking exception. He stated that, as far as a requirement for more parking than the zoning would require, they have not identified any evidence that would support that request at this time.

Vice Chair Clifford referred to the height issue, and the 32 feet to the top of the plate was an unusual thing to come forward, as generally speaking it was from the lowest point to the highest point, then they have a parapet on top of that that apparently goes from 2 feet, 6 inches to five feet and he would like to know if there was any particular reason that they couldn't reduce the heights of the first floor and each of the additional floors. He stated that they have a 14 ½ foot tall first floor and the second and third floors are 9 feet each in terms of the interior. He asked if there was a way to reduce each by 6-8 inches and get them closer to the 35 feet.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that, to start off, he thought it was best to have the applicant address the impacts to the constructability or desirability of the operation. He thought many people will recognize that tall ceiling heights make a space more inviting and comfortable, particularly the ground floor of a motel where they have a lobby function where people will be spending time gathering as they wait to check in or out or enjoy the breakfast service. He stated that a 9-foot ceiling height is not particularly high and the more that you lower it, the more you impact the feeling of the size of the rooms to make them feel cramped with too low a ceiling height. He stated that the applicant was best situated to discuss that. He referred to the height and agreed that it was a bit unusual for them to reflect height to the top of plate, and explained that they did that because of the variability of the roof line. They wanted to indicate what the actual building mass itself had in terms of height. He stated that the height goes above the 32 feet stated on the plans on Sheet A7 in Packet page 288. He agreed there was a parapet surrounding the roof which is allowed to exceed the height limit, although he didn't believe that was the case for the vast majority of the perimeter of the roof as that was indicated to be approximately two feet, six inches in height above 32 feet and less than the zoning height limit of 35 feet. He stated that there is a portion of the building which goes above 35 feet, at the central art feature prominent on the front elevation on Packet page 288. He stated that it was a very small portion of the horizontal and vertical component of the building. He stated that comparatively on sheets A7 and A8. He stated that front elevation is in the central portion and, if you look at the proposed self-side elevation on packet page 290, you see that very small portion on the top left of that drawing and that height in excess of 35 feet would comprise to be fair, just because it is a small amount does not make it code compliant and in staff's analysis of the project, Municipal Code Section 9-4.2501, allows certain types of architectural features to exceed the zoning height limit. He then read the section. He stated that, as noted in the staff report packet, this project has requested a site development permit and the appropriate authority to exceed the 35 feet is provided. He stated that it was staff's opinion that the code provides broad discretion about the types of features that may exceed

the height. He thought it was reasonable to conclude that the structure proposed is one of the types of structures envisioned and allowed to exceed the height in this code section.

Chair Campbell asked that they continue with the meeting, try to be civil and get this done.

Commissioner Nibbelin wanted to focus on the General Plan and zoning related things. He mentioned a comment that came up multiple times was regarding the difference between hotel and motel. He stated that there was a write up in the staff report that dealt with this and he asked if they could articulate in lay people terms what that issue is and what staff's position is on it.

Sr. Planner Murdock responded that they noticed a discrepancy in the staff report in that the zoning provisions describe a motel as a conditional use but the zoning does not define what a motel is, but does define what a hotel is. He thought they were both commonly understood to be visitor type accommodations for transient purposes of short term occupancies, typically 30 days or less. He stated that, in trying to reconcile that odd omission of a definition of a motel while including it as a conditional use, staff saw no distinction in the two types of uses in that they both serve that same core function of providing short term lodging for visitors. He stated that combining it with the General Plan which is controlling and should determine what is in the zoning, the General Plan for commercial land use designation indicates visitor serving commercial uses as being appropriate uses. He stated that, with piecing the hotel and motel use together with the city's transient occupancy tax definition of what transient occupancies include, which are hotels, motels and other short term lodgings, staff determined that piecing them together there was no useful distinction between a hotel and motel.

Commissioner Nibbelin referred to comments relating to the date of the traffic analysis, and asked staff's thoughts on that.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it was a reasonable comment to wonder about the relevance of data that may have been compiled 3 or 4 years ago. He stated that, he would defer to the engineering staff on any observations they have on traffic levels in the area compared to 2015. He stated that he didn't hear anything in public comments that provided any evidence of what the actual traffic levels are, just speculation that they have increased. He stated that, if you are caught in traffic, you think it is terrible but if not, you don't think twice about it. He stated that, for purposes of the analysis, the traffic study was only to support the environmental determination. He stated that the evidence in the record was substantial evidence to support the categorical exemption.

Commissioner Nibbelin wanted to hold off on the response until he asked another question regarding the comments about the desirability of possibly affordable housing, and regarding the General Plan, zoning and implications of something like that and desirability for mixes of various uses in different places, he asked if staff had any thoughts on those comments.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that first he would make one more point on the traffic observation. He agreed that the concern was well taken regarding the age of information in the traffic study, then stated that the trip generation rates have not been identified to have changed and this land use will continue to generate the types of uses that were projected in 2015. He stated that their impact on the traffic environment in the area may change depending on baseline levels, but he didn't think there was any indication that it will generate traffic at any different level than was

already analyzed. He then referred to appropriate land uses for the area and mentioned that the General Plan controls the type of zoning which may implement those uses. He stated that the motel use is a permissible use in the visitor serving description in the commercial land use designation. He stated that the commercial land use designation also allows housing in a mixed use configuration but does require that it be in the same building as commercial use above ground floor. He stated that a mixed use project with housing above the ground floor could have been proposed at this site but it was the property owner's prerogative to propose whatever he or she wants to propose on the site in conformance with the applicable regulations, which in this case allow a motel use to be proposed. He stated that it was the property owner's discretion and they have reviewed that application for conformance with all the city's regulations. He stated that a motel use is a conditional use which notes there could be some undesirable or concerning aspects of the use which requires more careful consideration in a particular location which is the process they are undertaking at this time to hear from the community, Planning Commissioners and get factual information from staff and consultants about the appropriateness of this use in this location.

Commissioner Nibbelin referred to the hours for the balconies which were indicated as 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and caused him some concern. He also was concerned about construction related impacts and mitigation of concerns, hours of construction, etc. He wasn't clear as to whether the conditions of approval were as robust as they might be around some of those concerns and whether the Commission has some discretion to say more about that in the context of the conditions.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the hours of operation identified in the staff report and conditions of approval pertain to the outdoor deck in the front of the building which is a common area use. He stated that the included hours of operation reflected the hours the Commission imposed on other outdoor areas in the recent past with neighbors who were concerned about the impacts of the outdoor noise. He stated that there was no code requirement and was subject to the Commission's discretion to change or eliminate those hours should it find a good reason to do that. He stated that the conditions of approval do not include particular hours for the balconies off the individual rooms as they thought it would be difficult for the city to enforce as a condition of approval, but he thought they could explore something if there was a concern about those balconies. He stated that, regarding construction impacts, staff believes the limited construction hours that already exist in the Municipal Code are likely to be adequate, 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and shorter hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday. They would keep construction out of the hours of great concern for noise impact. He stated that beyond that, with impacts of traffic, typically there was a traffic control plan for any temporary road closures or lane closures, and any impacts to through lanes that could affect an intersection. He stated that Public Works reviews those carefully and require an encroachment permit which can set hours of operation, and would leave it to them to determine what the best hours should be for a particular project in a particular location.

Commissioner Bigstycck referred to construction and noise on page 358 of the packet with a list of best practices for construction noise and he wondered about it because it didn't look like they were included in the resolution as a condition and he asked if he was mistaken or if they could be incorporated.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he was not mistaken as they were best practices for a reason and were not mitigations in the environmental usage of the word. He stated that the project's factual

analysis did not find any significant environmental impacts related to noise either from operation or construction of the project. He stated that, if there was a basis such as for public health, safety and welfare due to the annoyance of the use, perhaps that could be explored to require adherence to those best practices.

Commissioner Bigstyk wondered if there was a zoning district in which the term hotel is specifically used.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated not to his knowledge.

Commissioner Bigstyk concluded that the closest they get to the specific term “hotel” is motel which falls under C-1.

Sr. Planner Murdock responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he had a couple of followup questions for applicant.

Chair Campbell stated that they can bring the applicant up.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if they received any feedback from the convalescent home.

Mr. Mora stated that he has spoken to the nuns and they said they could not attend the meeting and did not seem too involved in the process. He stated that some of them were busy elsewhere and could not come.

Commissioner Bigstyk referred to his statement of employing about 16 staff members, and he wondered what the maximum or minimum number of staff working on the premises.

Mr. Devdhara stated that the maximum would depend on the occupancy but if 100% occupied they would have a front desk manager and housekeeping staff for the size of 31 rooms could be between 5 and 8.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked staff about how long the plan for the on ramp on Milagra has been in process.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they could have the city’s engineering representative answer that question.

PW Sr. Civil Engineer Donguines stated that the Manor overcrossing project has been on the books since the 1990s and it was the early 2000s that the Milagra on ramp project was included with the Manor overcrossing project.

Commissioner Bigstyk concluded it was started in the 1990s and more rigorously developed since early 2000s.

PW Sr. Civil Engineer Donguines agreed, adding that as recently as last year, the city got a Measure A grant to start the pre-design of the project.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought it seemed reasonable to suggest that, if the city had money in early 2000s, this would have gotten started sooner.

PW Sr. Civil Engineer Donguines agreed as it was dependent on funding.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if there was any allowed parking on the west side of Oceana as he thought there was parking on the east side of Oceana closest to the property.

Sr. Planner Murdock did not think there was but he thought PW Sr. Civil Engineer Donguines can speak to the situation and the reason for that if there is no parking.

PW Sr. Civil Engineer Donguines stated that there was no parking on the west side of Oceana.

Chair Campbell asked the audience to limit their side comments and stop interjecting into the proceedings or they will have to take another recess and ask them to leave.

Commissioner Bigstyk referred to the schools, stating that as a parent he would be concerned about a flower buzzing too close to his child, and asked why he should not be concerned about schools this close to a motel from the standpoint of security for the children.

Police Chief Steidle stated that staff took a look at one of the letters sent, and there were concerns from their residents regarding that. He stated that we don't have any hotels currently near schools now, and they take a look at the type of crimes that are occurring because of hotels, specifically in our community. He stated that they looked at six hotels and did an analysis of the crimes that occurred over the last few years, which are the occasional auto burglary, and it was an extremely low rate, 7 burglaries in six hotels combined in the last three years. He stated that they worry about assault and battery. One citizen commented about sex trafficking in proximity to schools. They noted that most of the crimes at hotels that have to do with sexual assaults are not strangers but people who end up in the hotel room together, usually one being intoxicated and something happens that was not welcome and someone becomes victimized. He stated that they have no reports of any type of stranger sexual assaults or any involving children. He stated that, regarding sex trafficking near schools, you have to understand how that occurs. He stated that the Pacifica Police Department is involved in the County program to curtail sex trafficking which has been pushed by state senators. He stated that it is not a situation where a stranger grabs a child and takes him into a hotel room, specifically stating it has nothing to do with a hotel. Sex trafficking affects underprivileged people or people in a bad situation, part of gangs or people on the street who are not upstanding citizens and will get caught up with the wrong group and land up with someone who wants to use them for sex trafficking and they are taken out of the area and end up in possible a shady apartment complex or low end motel someplace. He stated that they are not seeing residents being victims of trafficking but someone from a surrounding county being brought in to our county. He stated that the Pacifica Police Department does not have concerns about children becoming victims of crimes, but rather traffic and pedestrian safety which has already been addressed in the report.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if they receive complaints about noise from other hotels in Pacifica.

Police Chief Steidle stated that it is very rare and is usually just room to room, such as playing the television too loud and if the management cannot handle it, they call the police to have them take care of the problem.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that while he grew up in Pacifica, he spent a lot of time in San Bruno on the weekends and the airport required hotels to subsidize windows to mitigate airport noise. He asked if it was in the Commission's purview to have them update windows to mitigate noise in the surrounding area.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought it was within their purview if they can point to evidence that this project would create significant noise. He stated that the records indicate that is not the case and in the absence of that information, he thought there would not be any basis to require that. He stated that the situation he mentioned was directly related to high noise generated by aircraft which are impactful to health and their analysis required the window replacement to mitigate that noise on the ground.

Commissioner Bigstycyk referred to a comment about anyone having experience of living behind a hotel and he had in San Bruno as he was directly across the street from a motel and thought, for the most part, noise was not an issue. He referred to noise in the back of Park Pacifica when a neighbor throws a party, and noise is only in a hotel parking lot. However, he thought, if the neighbors had a problem, maybe the motel could provide an upgrade on the windows. He referred to the neighbor behind the motel expressing concerns about privacy, and he thought the second story appeared to be mitigated by the fencing and wall, but for the third story, he was not sure if the awning would provide coverage to prevent them from looking into that neighbor's backyard. He mentioned the parking, stating that 85% is accounted for and then mentioned some of his concerns regarding various different scenarios, and stated that if there was consensus, he would go along with it, but if appealed, he would have a concern that they didn't address the concerns fully.

Vice Chair Clifford stated he would like to ask the architect about his height question. He asked if there was a way to reduce each floor a small amount to alleviate going over the 35 foot limit.

Mr. Mora stated that he can discuss it with the owner. He stated that the plan was to provide a space that was more comfortable with 8 feet being comfortable as well as 8 feet 6. He stated that the 2nd floor was raised to allow the fire truck to come around, following a meeting with the fire chief.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that he had wondered about why it needed to be 14 feet and his response made it clear to him.

Chair Campbell stated that he agreed with Sr. Planner Murdock that lowering the height will make it more cramped for a hotel. He stated that his issue with the location was it wasn't a good place to stay, as you were next to a fire station, across from the freeway but he thought it was a perfect place for a class A commercial building. He didn't want to say it couldn't work, but he was struggling with how you shoe horn it in. He thought it was a tough call as transient occupancy tax (TOT) was an important money generator for the city. He also thought there was an occupancy rate understanding for more hotels. He was wondering if this was the right facility and the right place.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated he felt compelled to respond to his comments. He stated that he is in the area a lot as his gym is within walking distance. He mentioned good Vietnamese and Mexican restaurants have opened close by recently, as well as Mazzetti's Bakery and a sushi place in the vicinity that would benefit with an increased base, so he was thinking it actually may be a good location for something like this and he thought it was a project they should consider supporting.

Chair Campbell acknowledged that it would probably fill and would do well next to some good eateries.

Vice Chair Clifford agreed with Commissioner Nibbelin that it is a good project, will enhance the neighborhood. He wasn't too concerned about noise or the traffic impacts. He thought, as the hotel is built and the Manor overpass is completed, they will probably see less traffic impact on the neighborhood. After getting an explanation on the heights, he saw no reason to change them, and he felt it was a good looking building and he can't see any reason not to vote for it.

Commissioner Berman thought the property can be enhanced from what it is now. She stated that she would like to see more community involvement. She didn't think the area was too high a desirable place, with the nearby Chevron but there is potential with the upcoming traffic improvements and the pedestrian connection nearby. She mentioned a few thoughts she had that they might want to think about, adding that she had a hybrid opinion now.

Commissioner Nibbelin thought a continuance to address some of the issues raised by Commissioner Berman such as the date of the traffic analysis, parking concerns by Commissioner Bigstyk which he didn't personally have a problem with but additional information might be warranted, as well as a neighbor's concerns about additional screening as well as more information regarding safety concerns. He felt that doing their due diligence might be good should it be discussed at a higher level.

Chair Campbell agreed, and also thought something that hasn't been mentioned was lighting in the back for parking which has been a significant consideration in other hotel projects they have seen.

Commissioner Kraske stated he was agreeable to a motion to continue.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked staff for their thoughts on the direction the Commission is going and, if nothing vociferous, he would be inclined to continue the item.

Planning Director Wehrmeister felt they had the direction they need and stated that given that they didn't know how long the consultants will take to update the TIA, they would re-notice this and continue it to a date unspecified.

Commissioner Nibbelin stated that would be his motion.

Vice Chair Clifford seconded that motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Clifford, Berman, Kraske, Nibbelin, Bigstyk, Rubinstein and Chair Campbell

Planning Commission Minutes

April 1, 2019

Page 23 of 27

Noes: None

CONSIDERATION:

5. N/A Annual Report to City Council for Calendar Year 2018.

Planning Director Wehrmeister presented the staff report.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked if a motion was needed approving the annual report.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated just if they agreed with it.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano wanted to clarify that they will be going to public comments on this item.

Commissioner Nibbelin thought the report was in good form and they should move forward subject to public comment.

Vice Chair Clifford agreed that the report was just fine.

Chair Campbell agreed.

There were no public comments.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they have direction.

6. Annual Reorganization of the Planning Commission.

Asst. City Attorney Bazzano stated that, since it was an item on the agenda, she recommended having public comment.

Planning Director Wehrmeister presented the staff report.

Commissioner Bigstycyk commented that he assumed the normal procedure was for the Vice Chair to be nominated as Chair and, after having seen Vice Chair Clifford for many years, he would be happy to make that motion.

Chair Campbell stated that he would second it.

Commissioner Nibbelin asked if that was his motion.

Chair Campbell stated that they have to go to public comment first.

There were no public comments.

Commissioner Bigstycyk moved that the Planning Commission appoint Vice Chair Clifford as Chair; Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0-1**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Berman, Nibbelin, Kraske, Bigstycyk, Rubinstein and Chair Campbell.
Noes:	None
Abstain:	Vice Chair Clifford

Chair Campbell stated that Vice Chair is appointed in the order of seniority which he thought would be Commissioner Nibbelin.

Commissioner Bigstycyk moved that the Planning Commission appoint Commissioner Nibbelin as Vice Chair.

Vice Chair Clifford stated that Commissioner Nibbelin served as Vice Chair not too long ago and he would like to open it up to a more recent member and his recommendation would be Commissioner Rubinstein.

Commissioner Nibbelin appreciated that motion, but if Commissioner Bigstycyk was inclined to withdraw the motion he would second Vice Chair Clifford's nomination for Commissioner Rubinstein.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that, with respect to Commissioner Nibbelin, he would withdraw the nomination at his request.

Vice Chair Clifford nominated Commissioner Rubinstein as Vice Chair; Commissioner Nibbelin seconded the motion.

The motion carried **6-0-1**.

Planning Commission Minutes

April 1, 2019

Page 26 of 27

Ayes: Commissioners Clifford, Berman, Nibbelin, Kraske,
Bigstyeck and Chair Campbell.
Noes: None
Abstain: Commissioner Rubinstein

COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Chair Campbell stated that, having missed the last meeting, he thanked Commissioner Gordon and he hoped they have him come to be given acknowledgement for having served for 11 or 12 years.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that they have a second permit technician to fill Tina Gibbs' position. She stated that her name is Amery Sandoval and while she doesn't attend the meetings, she will be the new face in the office.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Nibbelin moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:34 p.m.; Vice Chair Clifford seconded the motion.

The motion carried **7-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Clifford, Berman, Kraske, Nibbelin,
Bigstycck, Rubinstein and Chair Campbell
Noes: None

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

Planning Director Wehrmeister