

**MINUTES**

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

April 20, 2020

7:00 p.m.

Acting Chair Nibbelin called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Acting Chair Nibbelin explained the conditions under which the meeting will be conducted based on the Governor’s orders and County Health Officer orders related to the COVID-19 public health emergency.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: Commissioners Berman, Bigstycck, Campbell, Kraske, and Acting Chair Nibbelin  
Absent: Commissioners Rubinstein

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

**STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director Wehrmeister  
Sr. Planner Murdock  
Asst. City Attorney Sharma  
Contract Planner Usher

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

Sr. Planner Murdock did a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **5-0**.

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None

**DESIGNATION OF LIAISON TO CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF April 27, 2020:**

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated no liaison was needed for the April 27 City Council meeting.

Acting Chair Nibbelin explained how citizens can provide public comment via email in the teleconferencing format.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

None

**CONSENT ITEMS:**

None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**1. CAP-13-19  
PE-789-20**

**File No. 2019 -020 – Cannabis Activity Permit CAP-13-19 and Parking Exception PE-789-20**, filed by West Manor LLC for establishment of a Cannabis Manufacturing Operation located at 901 Palmetto Avenue, Unit B. (APN 009-244-010).  
Recommended CEQA Action: N/A.

Sr. Planner Murdock presented the staff report.

Acting Chair Nibbelin referred to the “raised hand” function to comment on items, but he didn’t see anything to indicate a raised hand.

Planning Director Wehrmeister explained that, if he clicks on “participant” there should be a number 10 next to a couple of people and he can see the raised hand.

Commissioner Bigstycyk moved that the Planning Commission continue the item to a future meeting; Commissioner Berman seconded the motion.

Sr. Planner Murdock did a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **5-0**.

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

- 2. CDP-405-19**                      **File No. 2019-015 – Coastal Development Permit CDP-405-19,** filed by Karen Thomsen, to construct a 360 square foot (sf) one-story addition to an existing 815-sf single-family residence with 288 sf one-car garage located on a 5,000 sf lot at 316 San Pedro Avenue. (APN 023-018-220). Recommended CEQA Action: Class 1 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15301.

Contract Planner Usher presented staff report.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he has a presentation with slides to help the Commission or the public to visualize the project.

Acting Chair Nibbelin asked if that would be done now or when it is time for the applicant to present his statement.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated he would defer to Contract Planner Usher if there was something she wanted to talk through on the slides.

Contract Planner Usher stated that she didn't think a slide presentation would be necessary.

Commissioner Bigstyk assumed it was a private street and the staff report says the only street between the proposed development and the ocean is San Pedro Avenue. He asked if Shelter Cove factors in or because it is private it doesn't factor in.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought he was referring to findings related to application of the public recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. He stated that for the purpose of that policy the language was limited to public roads which is why they focused on San Pedro Avenue.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that while his next question doesn't really factor in, he thought it should be asked. He asked if the project agrees with the updated LCP.

Sr. Planner Murdock didn't think anyone has done the analysis of that for the purpose of specific policies in the draft LCLUP. He stated that Council has approved the document but enforcement is not in effect yet because the Coastal Commission has not certified it, so they confined their analysis to the current 1980 LCP for this permit.

Acting Chair Nibbelin asked if the applicant was available to make a presentation.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they have the property owner, Karen Thomsen and the architect, Steven Clarke, who assisted with the application.

Ms. Thomsen stated that she has never done this before and doesn't have a presentation prepared but she was happy to answer any questions, and she appreciated all the help from Contract Planner Usher.

Acting Chair Nibbelin asked if Mr. Clarke had anything to add.

Mr. Clarke stated that he had nothing significant to add and felt it was a straightforward project. They tried to stay within the pallet of the existing house and make it look as seamless as possible.

Acting Chair Nibbelin asked if they had any comments other than those received prior to the hearing.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they do not.

Acting Chair Nibbelin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought it was nice to see any development in Pedro Point that wasn't contentious. He was curious about the roof and asked if Commissioner Berman had any feedback on the roof but otherwise he didn't see any reason not to vote for this project.

Commissioner Berman stated that she was a civil engineer, not an architect, and she didn't typically deal with structure design and roof design. She did find it interesting when she reviewed the material and she liked that it was a lighter material and reduces heat island effect which she thought it was great. She stated that it looked interesting and she was in favor of innovative new materials with development. She thought this was a great opportunity to see how it works out. She asked if she could ask a question of the applicant.

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated she could.

Commissioner Berman asked the reason for using a new material for the roof.

Ms. Thomsen stated that the roof they chose was currently on the house and they wanted it to match the existing one. She stated that, when she purchased the house, the previous owner had already changed the roof to this material and they were matching that roof.

Commissioner Bigstycyk moved that the Planning Commission FINDS the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, APPROVES Coastal Development Permit CDP-405-19 by adopting the attached resolution, including condition of approval in Exhibit A; and INCORPORATES all maps and testimony into the record by reference; Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

Sr. Planner Murdock did a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **5-0**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Bigstycyk, Campbell, Kraske  
and Acting Chair Nibbelin

Noes: None

**3. UP-96-18**

**File No. 2018-008 – Use Permit UP-96-18**, filed by Modus LLC on behalf of Verizon Wireless, for construction of a wireless communication facility on an existing utility pole in the public right-of-way of Terra Nova Boulevard, approximately 870 feet north of Everglades Drive, in the vicinity of 1450 Terra Nova Boulevard (APN 022-310-300). Recommended CEQA Action: Class 3 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15303.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that before the presentation he wanted to welcome JoAnna, Bill and Jake to the meeting, and asked if anyone else was there from their team, as there was someone in the waiting room and he wanted to be sure they have everyone.

JoAnna Wang, agent for Verizon Wireless, stated that was everyone from their end.

Contract Planner Usher then presented staff report.

Commissioner Bigstyk referred to all the feedback, then asked confirmation that Verizon stated that there was nothing 5G about this project.

Ms. Usher stated that it was correct.

Commissioner Bigstyk thought, even if it were 5G, we could not vote based on that site as anything that has to do with radiofrequency is not something on which they can base their vote.

Ms. Usher stated that he was correct.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked if there was any element that had to do with 5G, as they were talking about one antenna and if something bigger than that were to be implemented that would not be a make it or break it if such a thing ever comes down the pipe. He asked if that was a fair assessment.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated he wasn't sure he understands the question, and he asked him to formulate it in a different way.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated, if there is ever going to be a conversation about 5G, that was probably not a conversation that is going to have a lot to do with one little antenna. If it were to be a conversation, it would be a citywide thing, not one antenna being what everything is based around.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that, if he was understanding his question, the employment of 5G technology is not a citywide conversation so much as a nationwide conversation for purposes of the United States through the Federal government having primary jurisdiction over the deployment of wireless technology such as 5G, and the Federal government has already taken significant steps to further the deployment of 5G technology. He understood that it was largely a matter of carriers catching up to deploy that technology at the time that they think it is appropriate for their particular networks, capital investment strategies and ability to have technology ready at the right time. He stated that there was very little the city has regarding input into individual site deployment of 5G. He stated that where the city, residents and elected officials have input is at the federal level, through legislatures and public comment opportunities on federal regulations

governing wireless technology. He stated that, in recent years, there have been very notable rule making processes at the FCC where hundreds, if not thousands, of local jurisdictions have commented and at least one of them has ended up in litigation which is working its way through the courts but this decision making for 5G deployment is handled at the Federal level and as he understands it, local input into that is preempted other than a limited aesthetic review that we have on a site by site basis, such as the use permit that they are working on at this time.

Commissioner Bigstyk asked, if this antenna were ever to be modified, for such a technology, whether it would have to come before them again.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it depends on the physical form factor of the modification. Among those rule making processes that he alluded to moments ago, one was meaningful a few years ago and defined what was a substantial modification to an existing facility. He stated that it means once a local agency such as Pacifica grants discretionary permit for a facility, many types of additional modifications can be made without requiring further discretionary review. He stated that nearly every application he has seen come to the city for a facility that has already been approved has fallen well below the thresholds for modifications and it would require very significant height increases or horizontal projection increases in order to allow the city to impose the discretionary review process on those modifications. He stated, if this facility is permitted such as every other permitted wireless facility in Pacifica, most future modifications would be handled through the building permit process. He stated that city staff does request and review RF emissions information similar to the Commission reviewing the information at this meeting to ensure that the building permit level modifications comply with the RF emissions standards. He stated that, for most situations, you will not see those modifications come to the Commission.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that they received a lot of public feedback on the 5G question as well as a petition involving a school and he wanted to make sure the public is fully addressed as possible before they pass this. He asked if it would be possible to put a condition of approval that, if there was to be a modification to the hardware to allow for it to be 5G, it would have to come before the Commission.

Sr. Planner Murdock didn't believe there was a way to impose a condition of that type, but suggested that his planning colleagues or city attorney might be able to comment further.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that they would not be able to have that come back to the Planning Commission in the future on that ground alone.

Commissioner Bigstyk commented to the public that they were not discussing 5G. He had other questions not connected with 5G.

Acting Chair Nibbelin suggested taking a comment from another commissioner and then come back to him.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that it was fine, adding that he has more questions.

Sr. Planner Murdock wanted to clarify one point in the staff report by Contract Planner Usher. He stated that the planning staff notified Jefferson Union High School District on March 25, not May 25, and they did provide ample notice of the public hearing to the school district and gave them the opportunity to share that with their community as they saw fit.

Commissioner Bigstycyk asked if they know how many homes this would affect or is the target of the range of the antenna just the high school, i.e., who are the customers who will be served by this.

Contract Planner Usher stated that she would defer to the applicant on that question.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that it was not a problem, as he was sure was the case in a lot of his questions. He stated that about a year ago they were going to hear applications on other antennas in addition to this one, one in this neighborhood and the other on the other side of town. He was curious about the process as originally it was this one and he asked where the other two were in the process, and he wondered what the reason was that the other two weren't brought back with this one. He also referred to mention of a tolling agreement between the city and Verizon and he wondered what that means and if it had something to do with the others.

Contract Planner Usher stated that she would comment and thought the applicant may also elaborate further. She thought there were three applications by this applicant. One was on Monterey and is no longer an application and was withdrawn. The other one was proposed on Redwood and they may see it coming back in the near future, but it wasn't complete at this time and the applicant was revising the project plans, but it is in the works and may be back to the Commission in the near future for deliberation.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that he had questions about the alternatives but thought those were better to ask Verizon. He asked city staff if we have a city engineer at this meeting, and has the city engineer recently looked at the pole they are discussing at this time.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that, if he means a city engineer for the purpose of a public right-of-way, the Public Works Department and the city engineering team have reviewed the application for its relationship to the public right-of-way. He understood that the physical form of the pole is primarily regulated by the Joint Pole Association that owns the pole and issues related to its structure are a matter for that JPA (the name of this entity, but not the same as the public JPA). It is a consortium of utility providers and others that locate infrastructure on utility poles. He stated that it is not a city-owned utility pole in the sense that the city would have records on maintenance and take steps to maintain or replace it.

Commissioner Bigstycyk concluded that the JPA would be the one that has that information, and asked if they have a representative of that JPA now and do they know the last time they looked at the physical well-being of that pole.

Sr. Planner Murdock didn't think there was a representative from the JPA participating in this hearing. He stated that they routed this to their building official in the Planning Department who generally makes evaluations of concerns about structural modifications, etc., and was not aware that he raised significant or any concerns about this type of modification or structural concerns about its design. He stated that, regarding utility pole modifications, these are very small facilities that do not carry with it significant possibilities of changing the dynamics of the pole. He stated that the JPA does review these requests carefully and applies California PUC and other standards in their review, adding that the applicant may be able to elaborate on that structural review process.



Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he was very interested when the last time the physical well-being of that pole was reviewed and hoped to get an actual date before the end of the meeting as he has had some serious concerns about it in the past.

Acting Chair Nibbelin opened to the applicant.

JoAnna Wang, stated that she was the government affairs manager with Modus and the authorized representative of Verizon Wireless. She stated that her firm specializes in site development of wireless facilities on behalf of major carriers. She stated joining her was Jacob Olander, project manager with Modus and can speak to any PG&E engineering and design standards as well as Bill Hammett, a representative and licensed engineer of Hammett & Edison Consulting, an independent third party engineering firm that completed the radiofrequency compliance and safety report as well as the interference study and is available to answer any questions regarding health and safety. She was going to cover the consumer usage trends carriers are seeing in small cells into the wireless ecosystem to address those demands and then will address the project specifically. She stated that heavy consumer reliance on wireless technologies, remote services and expectation of connected mobility is driving the need for continued network improvements. She stated that wireless communication services are not a luxury but a necessity as the average North American household has 13 connected devices and the demand on the network necessitates new infrastructure to provide reliable services. She stated that, in 2017, the average user consumed about 7 GB of data per month, and based on current projections, by 2023 those consumption rates will increase to about 48 GB of data per month per user. She stated that, in 2018, the CDC reported that 55% of American households are now without traditional landlines and that number is only increase as residents continue to opt out of landline services. She mentioned an important public safety component which is the National Highway Traffic Administration' statistics note that 76% of 911 calls originate from a cell phone. She mentioned that the wireless ecosystem needed to meet this demand requires a combination of solutions, comprised of macro facilities and small cells help supplement these existing macros but not replace them. She stated that they operate at lower powers and higher frequencies and need to be located in targeted locations closer to the end users to optimize network performance. She pointed out the objective of the project site was to provide enhanced communication services, both data and voice to students, pedestrians, emergency services, etc., to service the school and the neighboring community. She pointed out that the service area was a challenging area to serve and the field obstruction can make it difficult for the signal to penetrate and reach the end users. She mentioned the time frame from the time Verizon identified the area as in need of improved service and they have worked on due diligence, mentioning the process and visual changes planned following ordinances and studies conducted, to come up with the least intrusive plans. She mentioned the alternatives considered, before making their decisions. She also mentioned that they were in compliance with FCC standards. She mentioned that, after considering eight locations and three design iterations, they felt they have demonstrated that the project presented to the Commission today was the least intrusive means to provide the necessary service and they were requesting that they adopt staff's recommendation to approve as conditioned and move forward with the permits.

Acting Chair Nibbelin asked if they have had any public comment not already received via email.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they do and he will read them.

Sunil Bhat, Pacifica, stated “one last document to be submitted to the meeting with comments from Pacifica residents who signed petition submitted earlier today attached in PDF form. The petition can be viewed at [www.change.org/pacifica5G](http://www.change.org/pacifica5G).” The attachment includes the printout from change.org which notes that “Pacifica does not need questionably safe 5G cellular in its valleys. The risk to our residents is too high for minimal benefit. We need more reliable and safer internet and voice cellular coverage which does not come from 5G.” Sr. Planner Murdock stated that the attachment lists comments made by individual signatories to the petition and most seem to question the necessity of 5G and don’t trust it, etc.

Lisa Pierra Tresca and Michael Quiroga, Pacifica, stated “please let it be noted and entered into the record that we oppose the installation of 5G equipment on or near the campus of Terra Nova High School in Pacifica. We are parents of a freshman and oppose this proposal for the sake of her and all other students as well as the environment. There exists worldwide concern and research by doctors and scientists on the health hazards and ill effects of 5G. Many scholarly articles and research exists. Please refer to a few articles here though many more exist.” Sr. Planner Murdock stated that she provides two links to other articles and then continued comment: “Furthermore, the parents of Terra Nova were only notified on Friday, April 17, of this proposal via email by the principal. That is certainly not enough time for community members to consider it. Since it is shelter in place now we respectfully request this agenda item be tabled for a future meeting where community members have more input. Some community members are not familiar with online meetings, etc., and they are essentially being denied the opportunity to express their concerns. Thank you for your consideration.”

Unidentified Sender sent three screen shots, one of them a letter from the applicant. The other is apparently a phone screen shot with some technical information about Erickson 5G equipment and the third screen shot is another list of technical equipment from Erickson 5G equipment. Sr. Planner Murdock stated that there was no further text or commentary in the body of the comment.

Sunil Bhat, Pacifica, stated “The antennae manufacturer website for Erickson 4455 shows it is a 5G equipped antenna capable of mid-band, 4T4R, and 760 mm waves which are 5G frequencies” and comment includes a link to Erickson.com urban wireless street solutions.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated those were all of the public comments he had on the site.

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated that it was normally their practice to allow the applicant to respond to any public comments. He stated to Ms. Wang that, if anyone on her team wanted to respond to comments, they were welcome to do so.

Ms. Wang stated that she knows a lot of the comments are related to public health and safety and she would like to cede her time Mr. Bill Hammett who is the subject matter expert. She mentioned that Commissioner Bigstyk had asked questions regarding the structural integrity of the pole and before she cedes to Mr. Hammett she would address that question. She stated that, as part of the due diligence period, they meet with PG&E, walk the site with them, get their preliminary approval of the project, adding that they do their own structural calculations prior to any approval. She stated that it was phased and they will take another review of the application after Verizon Wireless receives approval and they make sure they review the application and proposed project at the latest time in the entire due diligence period to have the latest design and equipment and can then make sure that they do their own structural analysis and engineering independent of Verizon Wireless. She stated that they will test and treat the pole separately and,

if it requires a pole replacement because it is not in good condition, they will do so and if the design changes after PG&E reviews it, they would come back and request a modification from a full top extension to a pole replacement design and improve the structural integrity of the pole to withstand all the structural load.

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated that they will give Mr. Hammett two minutes to provide any additional information.

Mr. Hammett stated he is a registered professional engineer in California and manages a firm of 20 employees in Sonoma. He stated that a regular part of their practice is the calculation or measurement where appropriate of radiofrequency exposure conditions. Over 35 years they have evaluated over 20 thousand sites and they have a lot of experience. He mentioned a book he wrote on this topic, and that they are hired by carriers, cities, landlords, and their job is straightforward, i.e., what are the exposure levels and how do they compare to the standard. He concurred with staff's findings. He referred to his report which was shown during the slide show, which showed exposure levels at 2.4% of the allowable limit at ground level and 0.33% in the nearest building, or 300 times below the standard. Mr. Hammett stated he reviewed public comments in addition to the ones submitted before the meeting. He thought everyone had a misunderstanding about the proposal as it is not 5G millimeter width facility and are not being proposed at this site. He stated that, because of the ten-fold difference in frequency, it would require new antennas, new transmitters and a completely new facility to accommodate the 5G millimeter wave frequencies and it was not part of this proposal. He stated that a lot of comments unrelated to the health were just the 5G that they focused on, and it was not part of this proposal. He questioned if it would ever be part of this location.

Acting Chair Nibbelin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Campbell understood that the FCC has not yet rolled out the regulations for 5G in the United States, but they had a lot of comments indicating that a lot of people seemed to believe this was a 5G application. He asked if there was anything in the application that would lead them to believe that.

Acting Chair Nibbelin thought staff might be able to give their thoughts on that.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that he did not recall reviewing any information that alluded to this being a 5G facility. He thought there was a widespread understanding of wireless communication facilities as being primarily large macro facilities with multiple 4-foot or 6-foot panel antennas and large equipment cabinets and anything smaller than that must be a 5G type of facility. He thought, if that was the case, one might reach the conclusion that because it was not a macro facility it must be a 5G facility. He stated that carriers have been rolling out the small cell facilities, sometimes used to be known and distributed as DAS systems. He stated that they were very small facilities and mounted on utility poles and light poles for years. He thought, recognizing that 5G was not yet fully deployed, those other facilities were not 5G facilities and yet they bear resemblance in terms of their physical form to smaller types of modern facilities.

Commissioner Campbell asked if these were similar to the ones rolled out throughout Vallemar about 5-6 years ago.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that these were similar in the sense that they were locating on existing utility poles. He stated that the meter configuration is similar in some respects but the antenna design in location is quite different. He stated that the Vallemar facilities basically used just over a 1-inch diameter antenna that was just over a foot tall and most of those facilities had two of them on a bracket mounted on the side of the utility poles. He stated that this proposed facility has a canister antenna of two feet in height and several inches wide and mounted at the top of the pole and are different in their physical form.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thanked the Verizon representative for being present and appreciated all the work that was done and for being as due diligent as possible. He mentioned that Terra Nova Boulevard was the only place they could conceivably place one of these facilities, as a person with whom he spoke mentioned Everglades, Picardo, etc., which are streets along the football field. He asked if it had to be along Terra Nova to be viable.

Ms. Wang stated that the closer to most of the traffic the better and it was technically preferred. She stated that they have shorter distances, going only 500-1000 feet depending on the near field obstructions and elevation changes, thus it is preferred to be located closer to the school. She stated that they also work off line of sight and the closer you get to Everglades and/or north along Mason Drive in the residential community as it gets way too far with too many things in the way to reach the school.

Commissioner Bigstycyk referred to alternative site #7, and he stated that it didn't look like there were many trees directly by the pole and it was counter intuitive, but he asked if they were talking about the trees northeast of the pole as being the issue as he didn't think there were trees immediately in that vicinity.

Ms. Wang stated that there are trees around 20-30 feet tall along Terra Nova but also some that are a little set back that are significantly higher, i.e., the 65-footers she referenced. She included a picture of the alternate setting, and if staff can pull it up the Commissioners can take a look at what it looks like from the site as the baseball field is elevated and they also have the 65-foot trees. She stated that, for a site to work there and reach beyond the trees and not have signal diverting and reach the school, keeping in mind that this facility is even further located away from the school than the proposed location and would not have the same network performance and less preferred and challenging given the amount of students in the area and the traffic congestion at the school.

Commissioner Bigstycyk asked the question again as to whether the school is the primary target of this antenna.

Ms. Wang responded affirmatively that, when you have facilities such as this, it provides capacity to the target but also helps alleviate traffic and congestion at other sites nearby. She didn't have the proprietary information, but whatever facility is currently serving the area will benefit as well by having this small cell facility here off loaded, concluding that there are broader impacts beyond just the high school.

Commissioner Bigstycyk asked again for clarity that the high school was the primary target and if it helps others along the way it was even better.

Ms. Wang responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Bigstycyk referred to the specific pole they were discussing, and that she didn't have the information of the last time someone specifically looked at its condition but she had suggested that, if found to be in a bad position, one answer could be to replace the pole.

Ms. Wang responded that she didn't have the actual dates of when people did their field analysis throughout the last four years, but if it is not structurally sound, PG&E will evaluate and request a pole replacement.

Commissioner Bigstycyk concluded that they were talking about PG&E's facility upon which they would put their facility and he was asking because it looked like what they were trying to avoid doing is a new structure but, if not within the realm of impossibility, there could be a new structure but trying to avoid that. If it was not a sound structure, and needed to be a new structure, that would be PG&E putting it up and it would be the same structure for their purposes.

Ms. Wang responded affirmatively. She stated that Verizon Wireless does their own internal structural calculations and they deemed that the site was structurally capable of holding a load which is why they designed it as such but PG&E is the ultimate arbiter and can, at a later date, decide that they feel that a structural upgrade is necessary. She stated that, if that is the case, post-building permit after they received PG&E engineering and they decide to change the design, they would have to come back through building and propose a modification to the approved use permit.

Commissioner Bigstycyk asked, if they decided a new structure might be beneficial, would it be possible to find a better place to put that new structure than the place they were discussing now.

Ms. Wang asked if he meant completely outside of this location.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought it would have to be in the same vicinity but maybe not directly but maybe across the street or up on the hill.

Ms. Wang didn't believe so mostly because that utility line services existing distribution powers and they would need to make sure that there was a support structure that would hold the existing lines because if moved, they would have to reroute all of the existing distribution lines.

Commissioner Berman referred to going deeper into Commissioner Bigstycyk's concerns, which she shares, and thanked Ms. Wang for explaining the process with PG&E's vetting of the facility knowing it is a PG&E pole. She stated for the sake of the public, she asked staff confirmation that, while they are confident that PG&E will review the pole close to installation date, she wanted to be sure the city and the building department are reviewing the structural analysis during the building permit phase. She was trying to get that they weren't purely relying on PG&E's review and the city during the permit phase will do its own review and could determine that the facility needs to be replaced if deemed unsafe.

Acting Chair Nibbelin asked contract Planner Usher if she could speak to that.

Contract Planner Usher agreed that it was the correct process. She stated that the interdepartmental team, Public Works and Building, will be involved in the engineering of the building plan check. She stated that they reviewed the planning application but will be involved

again if there is a building permit phase. She clarified that, if the project is approved, it would go to building permit. She stated that when it comes to that phase they will be involved in that review.

Acting Chair Nibbelin appreciated all the questions and public comments to address these concerns. He felt that the current circumstance was clear how essential this coverage is in light of the shelter in place orders and the attempts to educate the children at school and things they can do to relieve pressure on the system were warranted and he thought this was carefully vetted. He was in favor of the project, while understanding the concerns expressed, he felt they were addressed to his satisfaction.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that they were in deliberation and he appreciated Commissioner Nibbelin's point that this is essential and due diligence has been done the best at providing stability. He appreciated all the work and the reason why this was essential. He stated that when he looks at it, it looks like it's splintering at the base and the anchor holding it in place is rusty. He thought having this antenna would heighten it and it would make the pole out of scale and out of character with the neighborhood and he had safety concerns as well as design concerns. He referred to mention of a safety button about eight feet up and he thought it might not be high enough to preclude a wild teenager from getting to it and doing harm to the structure. He stated that it greatly disturbs him that during the time in which they are all struggling with concern about our health and safety, and even if this could help with health and safety, he felt this was a barrage of feedback they got from the public about their concerns with health and safety, and now they have the other reason, even unfounded, to be concerned with their health. He stated that it bothered him regarding the petition that more than 200 people signed, as even if their concerns were addressed during the meeting, that they can't be in the room to express a revised perspective and share it with them in real time makes it very difficult for him. He stated for that reason, he would like to continue it. He thought his concerns were kind of addressed but he would like someone to tell him that they looked at the pole and it was not going to come down as a result of the construction. He concluded that he would not be able to vote for it at this time, as it bothered him that so many people didn't have the opportunity to speak.

Commissioner Berman had one question. As she appreciated Commissioner Bigstycyk's concerns and comment regarding the structural integrity of the pole, she thought staff is there and maybe there was a possibility to add a condition of approval specific to the pole's integrity. She felt confident that the process they have with PG&E and with the building department and Public Works review of the building permit will verify that the structural integrity of the pole is acceptable or require something new, and she asked if there was an opportunity to enhance a condition of approval specific to this structural integrity of the pole.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought there was as the use permit findings required for approval of the facility relate to public health and safety. He stated that they have in the past imposed such a condition. He stated that he has been searching for that language without success but again he believes they imposed similar requirements on the Vallemar wireless right-of-way facilities that the city approved. He stated that he will continue searching as they continue to deliberate. He thought it was a requirement imposed for the applicant to submit information to the satisfaction of the building official that the method of attachment and additional loading on the pole was satisfactory to meet applicable standards and was an explicit opportunity for the city to review that information to ensure that if it was in the files of the JPA they were able to provide that and

satisfy the requirement and in the event it was not, provide some secondary information provided by the applicant to demonstrate full structural integrity.

Commissioner Berman stated that she would be in favor of that if they can find that language.

Commissioner Campbell thought it would be a good condition if Sr. Planner Murdock can find it. He stated that he didn't want to second guess the building and engineering on this as he felt it was out of their purview. He thought, if they could get a condition that makes everyone more comfortable about the quality and condition of the pole, that would be useful. He recalls going through this process with a fairly significant cell tower near Ocean Shore School a few years back and one thing they came to learn that health and safety concerns were not something that they could base a decision on if certain exposure thresholds were met which he thought was the 1996 Telecom Act. He assured the public watching that it wasn't that they weren't concerned about it but that their authority to base a decision on those types of health concerns are not something they can vote yes or no on at this time. He thought, if they can find that condition, he would support the project.

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated that, pending the location of language or general direction that they include a condition of approval along the lines of what Sr. Planner Murdock suggested and he thought a motion would be in order if anyone was included to make it.

Acting Chair Nibbelin moved that the Planning Commission FINDS the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, APPROVES Use Permit UP-96-18 by adopting the attached Resolution, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A, including condition of approval that goes to the Planning Director and framed by Sr. Planner Murdock the opportunity to review the structural integrity issues to the satisfaction of city officials, and incorporates all maps and testimony into the record by reference. He asked Sr. Planner Murdock if the condition of approval he suggested involved the Planning Director or Building Official.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought staff would like to propose, if the Commission would entertain a five-minute recess to allow him to find the final adopted resolution and borrows the exact language from the prior hearings they applied to another carrier. He thought it was important that they treat the carriers as near equivalent to one another as they can.

Acting Chair Nibbelin suggested that they reconvene at 8:35, asking if that was enough time.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it was.

Acting Chair Nibbelin called a break until 8:35 p.m. then reconvened the meeting. He then stated that they took the break to find the conditions of approval language referring to concerns about structural integrity of the pole in question. He asked if he found the language.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that apparently there was not a condition of approval included on another project. He recalled the discussion of the pole safety at the City Council meeting as the items were appealed and called up as applied to the various sites. He stated that the circumstances he was recalling turned out to be a commitment by staff at the meeting as opposed to a condition of approval. He stated that staff did put together language for the Commission's consideration. They proposed to include a condition that says "prior to issuance of a building

permit the applicant shall submit information demonstrating adequate structural integrity of the pole with the subject facility installed to the satisfaction of the building official.”

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated that he had a motion on the table and he would incorporate by reference that proposed language.

Commissioner Campbell stated he was going to second that but his approval was contingent that this is not a 5G mechanism and isn't a Trojan horse for a 5G facility to come in after their approval. He stated that, from what he has read and heard at this meeting, he didn't think it appeared to be the case and was a straight 4G tower mechanism. He wanted it on record that based on everything he heard from the applicant, this is a 4G, not a 5G tower and he hopes there is nothing that they haven't seen or heard about that would make it otherwise. With that being said, he seconded the motion.

Sr. Planner Murdock did a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **4-1**.

Ayes: Commissioners Berman, Campbell, Kraske  
and Acting Chair Nibbelin.

Noes: Commissioner Bigstycck



**4. CDP-413-19**

**File No. 2019-030 – Coastal Development Permit CDP-413-19,** filed by San Pedro Valley LLC, to demolish an existing single-family residence, detached garage and barn, and to construct a new 1,753 sf, two-story single-family residence, a 236 sf detached one-car-garage and a 216 sf carport on a 3,516 sf lot located at 277 Kent Road (APN 023-013-030). Recommended CEQA Action: Class 3 Categorical Exemption, CEQA Guidelines Section 15303.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he needed to recuse himself on this matter after speaking with the city attorney, he received a gift from one of the project proponents in February that would preclude him from voting on this project at this time. He was recusing himself at the advice of City counsel. He stated that he would mute and turn off his video until the end of this deliberation.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that he was not recusing himself but he briefly had a conversation with some of the residents of Pedro Point and for the sake of transparency they briefly talked about the property. He stated that it was not influencing his judgment or deliberation in any way but he wanted to be sure it was on record.

Contract Planner Usher presented staff report.

Commissioner Bigstycyk asked staff to comment and elaborate on why they were looking at the property piecemeal which he thought would be useful as it was his understanding that one part was residential and the other commercial.

Contract Planner Usher stated that the commissioner was referring to another development application on file with the city adjacent to the project site which is being processed. She stated that they are separate applications on separate timelines and approval tracks and will be completed at different times and require a different analysis. She stated that, in some context, they provided the proposal that was submitted at the time the staff report was being prepared for some context for the commissioners but they were separate applications, reviewed separately, on different timelines for review and completeness.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought that dovetails with the Coastal Commission letter they received. He asked her to give them a basic assessment of what the erosion risk is with this property especially on the north end facing the ocean.

Contract Planner Usher stated that the geotechnical report quoted a rate for 50 years of a 5 to 17 foot rate and at 100 years a 10 to 35 foot rate.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated it was important to note that the applicant has his geotechnical engineer here to address the technical aspects of the projected bluff erosion over the assumed 100-year life of this project. He understands from the applicant that the geotechnical engineer who analyzed this issue did evaluate among other factors historical aerial photography to allow a precise calculation of what actual erosion was in this very localized area. He stated that other sources of projected or estimated bluff erosion such as the USGS erosion rate quoted by the Coastal Commission in its updated comment earlier in the day. He stated that it was reliant upon more generalized erosion information that typically is done at widely spaced intervals up and down the coast. He mentioned that the USGS was approaching this issue on a regional basis in

most cases over broad areas to understand how erosion in Southern Pacifica compares to another region in Northern California broadly speaking. All these policies referenced by some of the commenters as well as the Coastal Commission lead to the need for a site specific geotechnical hazard analysis which is what the applicant and his geotechnical engineer have prepared and they can speak more to the details. He stated that staff has received the information that all the related policies and maps and generalized modeling lead to, which is where there is a potential for an elevated risk, do the site specific analysis and determine actual on the ground conditions for a particular project site.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that one of the features that stuck out from the Coastal Commission recommendations was the idea of maximizing the setback which would presumably be in the rear of the home. He stated that, if a 20-foot setback as currently proposed meets our requirements, that was fine, but he was curious based on that kind of vague language from the Coastal Commission on the one point of maximizing the setback. He asked if it would be possible to have a greater setback than 20 feet and possible to move things forward a little bit to maximize the setback or is what they are looking at going to be as good as it was going to get.

Sr. Planner Murdock thought the applicant should speak to what some their considerations would be with modifying the project. He thought at a very high level on looking at the site plan, there was probably some room for moving the structure closer to Kent from a physical standpoint. He stated that anything beyond a few feet would probably require a rather sizeable reduction in floor area of the structure which would have an impact on the floor plan, usability and its marketability.

Commissioner Bigstyk was curious after the other recommendation the Coastal Commission made but he wasn't sure this was the time or place to start discussing those recommended conditions and he will yield now and bring the conversation back later.

Acting Chair Nibbelin opened the public comments and invited Messrs. O'Connell and Brinkman to let them know how they are going to proceed.

Mike O'Connell, applicant, stated he was one of the applicants, along with Mike Panesi, who is on the line, along with Brian Brinkman, architect, Dan Dyckman, geotechnical engineer and Chris Rogers, biological consultant. He stated he would present a brief overview of the site considerations they made while designing this, then he will turn it to Dan Dyckman to talk about bluff retreat and erosion. He stated it was a substandard lot and was a little bit different from most substandard lots because of its depth, which allowed them to not have the typical 25-foot wide development with a carport and a single car garage that blocks the front of the house but were able to separate them and allow them to see more of the house from the street which was a superior aesthetic design from a typical substandard lot. He stated that the existing house encroaches about 6 inches into the neighboring property and they will clean that up. He stated that they have a generous setback to the front and rear and were increasing setbacks between the existing single-family home. In comparing the two site plans, their historical consultant helped them evaluate this and other properties in the area by trying to mimic the design of the existing site, explaining their reasoning. He stated that the garage was a nonconforming setback but pushed it back to have it compliant. The tried to position the house similar to the existing house while meeting setbacks for current codes. He pointed out other site plan considerations, such as optimizing the view from the family room and master bedroom looking toward the ocean. He mentioned that they didn't want to block a neighbor's kitchen window on the northeast side of their house as it gets a lot of morning light. They are working on the existing topography and

were not making adjustments, such as elevating the floor to maximize the view, but mimicking the elevation of the lower floor of the existing house and minimizing the amount that the detached garage and carport blocks the view of the house. He pointed out the view looking west where they are set back from the rear of the neighbor's rear window to ensure they get the light in the kitchen window and helps with privacy issues since the back of the houses are staggered. He stated that all the comment letters were concerned about the bluff retreat and he thought there was a little confusion about the commenters as they reference the draft Local Coastal Land Use Plan and in that plan portions of Pedro Point are identified as a site potentially vulnerable to landslides as that was a vulnerability map and they need to do a site specific investigation which they did. He referred to mention of the USGS analysis and the disclaimer says that they were not intended for a comprehensive detailed site specific analysis of bluff retreat. They were required to prepare a detailed site specific analysis of bluff retreat. He stated that Dan Dyckman did that by analyzing detailed historical aerial photography and developed a precise estimate of how much bluff retreat happens on an annual basis possibly going back to early 1900s and his estimates are between .1 and .35 feet per year translating up to 35 feet total during the design life of the structure. He stated that the setback from the top of the bluff varies between 111 feet and 123 feet and they were at a comfortable distance and fit within the more conservative estimates they have seen which also were not based on a site specific analysis. He pointed out the line on the slide which was the setback from the top of the bluff to the property line and beyond the property line they have another 21 feet which is how they came up with 111 feet and 123 feet setback to the actual structure.

Dan Dyckman, geotechnical engineer, stated that they started with a conventional analysis where they take a look at historical aerial photographs which are preferred because they are scaled and they can do triangulation off of different points to compare the geometries. They looked at photos back to 1955 and took it to 2000 which was a 45-year-period of air photos, looking at different points along the back of the property and proximity to the bluff and they came up with the .1 to .35 feet per year. He mentioned that people say erosion has been happening faster in recent years and so they went on to Google earth and took measurements but he didn't like the accuracy of them. He stated that they used those to see if they had any real change, and came up with a significant increase in the rate over 2002 – 2018, which included some heavy storm years. They came up with a rate that ranged from .58 - .62 feet per year, and he translated that to a 100-year setback and they were barely encroaching into the northern corner of the property. You get back into the property approximately 8-10 feet on the rear property line. He stated that, even with 100 years, assuming that the last 18 years are the new normal, they have plenty of room between the bluff at that time and the projected bluff and where the house is.

Acting Chair Nibbelin asked Sr. Planner Murdock, regarding public comment, if they had any additional ones besides those emailed before the meeting.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they do not have any additional comments for this item.

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated that they would then close the public hearing.

Acting Chair Nibbelin asked if any commissioners had any comments, and when no one responded, he asked if anyone would like to make a motion. He then asked Commissioner Bigstyk if he was having any issues with his audio. He stated that he didn't see any commissioner indicating a desire to make a motion and he stated that he would make a motion.

Commissioner Nibbelin moved that the Planning Commission FINDS the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVES Coastal Development Permit CDP-413-19 by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A; and INCORPORATES all maps and testimony into the record by reference.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he was significant difficulty with his audio. He asked if it was too late.

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated that he made a motion but he was willing to withdraw his motion for the moment if he had questions or comment.

Commissioner Bigstyk referred to his original question about the maximum setback, and he asked if that has been addressed and wondered if it was possible to maximize the setback any more than it already has been.

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated that it would be a question for Mr. O'Connell and his crew as whether they believe they could move the structure any further back on the lot.

Mr. O'Connell stated that there was space between the house and the detached garage and a few feet would be easy to do, but anything more than that throws off the architecture. He stated that he has had discussions with their team about the setback and what was at the rear of the house, and it would be possible to shrink that a little bit without making the space not functional as it was a small house as planned.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that his questions are involving the Coastal Commission's recommendations. He asked staff if there was city infrastructure along Shelter Cove Road that might need armoring by the city in the future. He was asking because he was trying to determine if the concern by the Coastal Commission is even relevant for this project and if the city already supersedes this project and it was not relevant.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated he was not aware of any public infrastructure between this project site and the ocean and he didn't know if any other staff members were aware of anything.

Planning Director Wehrmeister stated that was her understanding, and was not aware of any infrastructure in that area. She also believes that may be a private road and unaccepted right-of-way. She would confirm with Sr. Planner Murdock, but it didn't mean that the city may not have an easement but it leads to that there is likely no public infrastructure.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated he was not aware of any public interest in that area in terms of publicly held easements or other rights of way in that location. He stated that it is a private street and it used to provide access to the Shelter Cove development at the west end of Pedro Point. He stated the road washed out several decades ago and was not rebuilt.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that the heart of his question is about the letter they got regarding how much they should be scrutinizing these recommended conditions from the Coastal Commission. He asked if staff would recommend putting these conditions into the conditions of approval.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that they thought very carefully about the Coastal Commission's revised comments, with staff discussing them internally, and he didn't think any staff members believed that they ought to include them or they would have brought it up as part of the staff presentation. He stated that they touch on issues that are well explained and, if there is a policy basis for it in the city's draft LCP which has worked through the process in the city and they will be working through the Coastal Commission process. He stated that some of the policies, once part of the city's certified LCP, will allow the city to impose conditions of approval of this sort, but they haven't found evidence yet to support imposing them on an ad hoc basis for this project alone. He stated that the only exception to that would be the first part of the number 1 comment which read "no future shoreline or bluff protection for this residence and removal of the structure if and when it is threatened." He stated that the current LCP does have language in Policy No. 26 that does indicate that new structures being developed now shall not require shoreline protection to be built. He stated that there is a policy basis in the city's documents to impose that first part of it, but they feel like the remainder of it probably would not be appropriate at this time.

Commissioner Bigstycyk asked if he was referencing Coastal Act Policy No. 26.

Sr. Planner Murdock stated that it was identified as that in the 1980 LCP.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that he looked at the second part 'assures stability and structural integrity and neither creates or contributes significantly to erosion, geologic instability or destruction of the site or surrounding area' and he thought maybe the Coastal Commission recommendations addressing that specific concern.

Sr. Planner Murdock agrees that the Coastal Act policy relates to the effects that the shoreline armoring device has on the coastline as opposed to the project. He thought it was generally understood that, in most cases, shoreline protection devices do adversely impact the coastline in the way described in that Coastal Act policy. He stated that, if one were able to engineer a shoreline protection device that did not have those results, perhaps it could be constructed in compliance with the policy but in nearly every case, all that he is aware of, any new shoreline protection device would not be able to satisfy that policy and would be prohibited for new development.

Commissioner Bigstycyk thought it was strange to work that much with the updated LCP and have it passed by Council for all intents and purposes and not be able to use it which he thought was a weird limbo place in which to be. He stated, as he read that suggested condition of approval by the Coastal Commission, that it seemed to serve to try to indemnify and hold harmless the city should a worst case scenario happen with this property which was why he became interested in the third condition from that standpoint to make sure the city was well protected. He asked if staff thought that condition was not necessary at this time.

Sr. Planner Murdock believed that was the case, stating that this issue comes up from time to time and the city attorney can do a much better job than he can explaining what indemnities there are to the city under its permitting authority when it makes well-founded action based on evidence. He thought perhaps Asst. City Attorney Sharma could explain it further.

Asst. City Attorney Sharma stated that there are particular ways of bringing lawsuits against cities under the Government Claims Act. She explained that if they put this condition on this project and they haven't put similar conditions on other similarly situated projects, that would be

problematic. She would be concerned about having that language in this project and not having inserted it in other projects as it could increase legal risks with respect to the other developments. She did not recommend inserting that language for this project.

Commissioner Bigstycyk asked if there were any trees involved to try and stabilize the hillside to the north or is there interest in that.

Mr. O'Connell stated he did not understand the question. He asked if the question was whether they were planting trees as part of the project.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated that he asked to stabilize the hillside in the rear.

Mr. O'Connell stated that they don't feel that it is unstable and much of that slope is not on the property but within the former Shelter Cove right-of-way or Shoreside right-of-way.

Commissioner Bigstycyk stated he was in favor of the project but was trying to do due diligence. He felt the design was interesting. He was interested in maximizing the rear setback as much as possible as was recommended. He didn't know if it came from them as a suggestion and, if there was a condition of approval that could be made, he would be in favor of that but overall he was in favor of the project.

Mr. O'Connell stated that, as far as increasing the rear setback based on the analysis that Dan Dyckman has done to date, they didn't feel that was necessary. If staff or the Commission felt otherwise, they would be willing to entertain that 2-3 foot reduction between the house and the garage to give them another couple of feet but he thought they were trying to mitigate against at that scale, 2-3 feet doesn't make or break it.

Commissioner Bigstycyk agreed it didn't make or breaks it, but he was interested if the rest of Commission has interest in it, but he was as content as he thinks it can be, and he likes the project.

Commissioner Berman stated that, in regard to the setback, unless staff has a strong opinion to incorporate further setback or increases, in reviewing the project, she didn't feel the need as she understands the geotechnical investigation to date given the significant buffer that is already present on the design. She appreciated the architectural design to allow for more visual front of the house which is more appealing than just looking at the garage or carport. She thought it allowed for a better feel in the neighborhood, and she didn't feel that a couple of additional feet would make her personally feel any differently.

Commissioner Kraske stated that he felt it was a good project and he was in favor of it, and he would like to second his motion to approve the project.

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated that he would restate his motion that has just been seconded, specifically that the Planning Commission FINDS the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act; APPROVES Coastal Development Permit CDP-413-19 by adopting the attached resolution, including conditions of approval in Exhibit A; and INCORPORATES all maps and testimony into the record by reference.

Sr. Planner Murdock asked if Acting Chair Nibbelin would entertain modifying his motion to incorporate the additional condition of approval read during staff presentation by Contract Planner Usher, specifically the incorporation of geotechnical recommendations.

Acting Chair Nibbelin agreed, the incorporation of the geotechnical recommendations as stated by Contract Planner Usher in her staff report: "All recommendations detailed in the preliminary geotechnical investigation by GeoForensics, Inc. dated November 2019, shall be incorporated into the project plans and approved by the Building Official prior to issuance of a building permit." He assumed the second would stand for that.

Commissioner Kraske agreed.

Sr. Planner Murdock did a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **4-0**.

Ayes:	Commissioners Berman, Bigstych, Kraske and Acting Chair Nibbelin.
Noes:	None
Abstention:	Commissioner Campbell

**COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:**

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated that Commissioner Campbell rejoined the meeting.

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that he was having a conversation with a high ranking staff member and it was decided that it was an appropriate time to wear a mask and he should wear one, and he thought it was appropriate to remind everyone that San Mateo County has gone in the direction of mandatory mask wearing and he thought it would be put into full effect as of Wednesday morning at 8:00 a.m. and he reminded everyone that now was a good time to stay safe and do due diligence and have fun with it.

Acting Chair Nibbelin thanked him and his colleagues by keeping them supplied (through his work at the Linda Mar Safeway store).

Commissioner Bigstyk stated that they do what they can.

Commissioner Berman thanked staff and fellow Commissioners as well as the applicants for being so flexible with the shelter in place in setting up a very well organized video conference for their meeting. She was sure much of the public appreciates the effort and she appreciated it as well.

Acting Chair Nibbelin agreed it was a fantastic effort on staff's part.

**STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

Planning Director Wehrmeister thanked and expressed her gratitude as well as staff to Commissioner Campbell and Commissioner Kraske. She stated that at the last meeting the City Council appointed three new Planning Commissioners and they will be starting with their first meeting on May 4, and she stated that this will be the last meeting for Ryan Kraske and Richard Campbell. She stated that they have been great to work with and staff appreciated both of them.

Commissioner Campbell appreciated working with staff over the years, adding that the city was blessed to have a very professional and passionate staff, as well as working with all his fellow commissioners.

Commissioner Kraske stated that it was his pleasure serving on the Commission these last few years and working with them all.

Acting Chair Nibbelin stated that it has been fantastic having them as colleagues and the city has benefitted from their insight and diligence in helping vet all the projects over time.

Commissioner Bigstyk thanked Commissioners Kraske and Campbell and staff for making this all goes smooth as silk.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business for discussion, Commissioner Bigstyk moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 p.m.; Commissioner Berman seconded the motion.



Sr. Planner Murdock did a verbal roll call.

The motion carried **5-0**.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Medina  
Public Meeting Stenographer

APPROVED:

---

Planning Director Wehrmeister