CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
NORTH CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT
455 MARKET STREET, SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
PHONE: (415) 904-5260
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

Th11a

Prepared May 22, 2026 for June 11, 2026 Hearing

To: Commissioners and Interested Persons

From: Stephanie Rexing, North Central Coast District Manager
Oceane Ringuette, North Central Coast District Supervisor
Melissa Ashley, North Central Coast District Coastal Planner

Subject: City of Pacifica LCP Amendment Number 2-PAC-25-0013-1 (Outdoor Commercial Regulations)

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The City of Pacifica proposes to amend its Local Coastal Program (LCP) Implementation Plan (IP) to establish regulations covering outdoor commercial use and related non-permanent structures (such as outdoor dining areas) within public rights-of-way and/or within private outdoor commercial areas. The current program dates back to 2020 when, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the City issued 14 temporary emergency use permits in the coastal zone for such outdoor commercial areas. The City considers that program to be a success, and is now proposing an LCP process to provide a procedure for businesses to establish and operate such outdoor commercial areas in the coastal zone. The amendment would expand on existing more generic LCP rules to instead specifically provide a permitting pathway (subject to operational requirements and limits) in City commercial zones,[1] where these outdoor commercial use areas are often referred to as “parklets.”

Parklets would require both an outdoor activity permit and a coastal development permit (CDP), both of which would be issued in one-year increments (with options for renewal at the end of that time), subject to certain criteria. In particular, permits for parklets in the parking lane of public streets would only be allowed one designated area per block, where these areas cannot occupy more than four perpendicular/angled spaces or two parallel spaces. On private commercial property, parklets cannot occupy more than two off-street parking spaces or no more than 10% of onsite parking, whichever is greater. Additionally, multiple businesses could sign on to one permit and therefore share one parklet area.

Although initially a COVID-19 response, the City recognized that allowing for some parklets helped to activate the street environment and to provide opportunities to

[1] Including allowing such areas to be used for retail, retail restaurant, fast-food restaurant, restaurant, bars, personal services, art galleries, instructional studios for dance or arts/crafts, offices, churches, and health/fitness clubs.

enliven the public commons, and now sees the proposed amendment as a means to formalize and establish procedures to do the same thing moving forward. At the same time, the City understands that the public right-of-way currently provides for important public utility, especially for high-demand parking near the beach, and has thus decided to limit the program accordingly. As such, a maximum of 56 parking spaces (or 6%) in the public right-of-way and a maximum of 115 parking spaces (or just under 11%) within private lots could be impacted in the coastal zone under this proposed ordinance.[2] However, 44 of the public right-of-way spots and 76 of the private lot parking spots that could be impacted (i.e., nearly all potentially affected public right-of-way spaces and nearly 70% of all potentially affected spaces overall) are located fairly far away from primary public access areas and the beach, and these are not anticipated to significantly impact public access. In addition, at its maximum the proposal would still leave 821 public parking spots available in public right-of-way (96% of all right-of-way parking spaces), would still leave all 527 public beach parking lot spaces (all of them, as parklets would not be allowed there), and 954 parking spaces in privately owned lots in the coastal zone (or almost 90% of all such spaces).[3]

When analyzing the trade-offs between outdoor commercial parklets and public parking for coastal access, the key challenge is finding a balance that serves both the community and its visitors while remaining Coastal Act and LCP compliant. Ultimately, the intent of this program is to help Pacifica revitalize its commercial areas and, in turn, enhance the City's draw as a visitor destination. In this case, the City thoughtfully limited impacts to public access by limiting them to commercial areas, only allowing one per block, limiting the parking spaces each parklet can take up in private lots, directing the vast majority of parklets away from prime public visitor parking areas, and leaving public beach parking lots unaffected. In addition, each permit issued would be limited to a one-year term, which provides an opportunity to make sure the program is functioning as expected, including in terms of potential public recreational access and visitor impacts. All of which provides both a regulatory backstop as well as a means of facilitating appropriate (and LCP required) adaptation and changes over time.[4] Moreover, these parklet areas have operated in substantially the same manner for approximately five years without any apparent significant adverse impacts on public coastal access or parking availability. Following the formalization of this program, the City would therefore

[2] Where such impacts on the public could be both direct, where a parklet in the public right-of-way displaces public parking, and indirect, where parklets in commercial parking lots would reduce available parking for commercial patrons, and force them into nearby public parking spaces.

[3] It is also important to note that these numbers are the minimum numbers of spaces that would be retained, and it seems likely that these numbers may be even higher with program implementation given that, even during the COVID-19 pandemic, which can serve as a reasonable proxy for potential participation under this proposal, the number of outdoor dining installations did not exceed 14 in the coastal zone.

[4] And CDPs at the Pedro Point Shopping Center, which is a shared public access and commercial parking lot, and a primary beach access parking location, would be required to go through the Commission, as the Commission retains direct CDP authority in that area, where the Coastal Act is the standard of review (and the LCP non-binding guidance), and thus where potential public access impacts can be evaluated on a case-by-case basis through that process.

still retain what appears to be a sufficient amount of parking to meet the needs of both visitors and local residents while allowing these uses to continue.

In conclusion, staff recommends that the Commission find that the proposed IP amendment conforms with and is adequate to carry out the LCP's Land Use Plan (which is the standard of review for the proposed IP changes), and that the Commission certify it as submitted. The motion and resolution to do so can be found on **page 5** below.

Staff Note: LCP Amendment Action Deadline
This proposed LCP amendment was filed as complete on March 23, 2026. The proposed amendment affects the LCP's IP only, and therefore the 60-working-day deadline for the Commission to take action on it is June 17, 2026. Thus, unless the Commission extends the action deadline (it may be extended by up to one year), the Commission has until June 17, 2026, to take a final action on this LCP amendment.

Therefore, if the Commission fails to take a final action in this case at this Commission meeting (e.g., if the Commission instead chooses to postpone/continue LCP amendment consideration), then staff recommends that, as part of such non-final action, the Commission extend the deadline for final Commission action on the proposed amendment by one year. To do so, staff recommends a YES vote on the motion below. Passage of the motion will result in a new deadline for final Commission action on the proposed LCP amendment. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

> ***Alternate Time Extension Motion:*** *I move that the Commission extend the time limit to act on City of Pacifica Local Coastal Program Amendment Number LCP-2-PAC-25-0013-1 to June 17, 2027, and I recommend a yes vote.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. MOTION AND RESOLUTION **5**
2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS **5**
   A. Background **5**
   B. Proposed LCP Amendment **6**
   C. Consistency Determination **7**
   D. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) **11**
3. APPENDICES **12**

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1: Proposed LCP IP Amendment
Exhibit 2: LCP Policies
Exhibit 3: Impacted Parking Areas

1. MOTION AND RESOLUTION

Staff recommends that the Commission, after public hearing, certify the proposed LCP IP amendment as submitted by the City of Pacifica. Thus, Staff recommends a **NO** vote on the motion below. Failure of this motion will result in certification of the IP amendment as submitted and the adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

> ***Motion:*** *I move that the Commission reject Implementation Plan Amendment Number LCP-2-PAC-25-0013-1 as submitted by the City of Pacifica, and I recommend a* ***no*** *vote.*
>
> ***Resolution to Certify:*** *The Commission hereby certifies Implementation Amendment Number LCP-2-PAC-25-0013-1 as submitted by the City of Pacifica, and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the amended Implementation Plan conforms with, and is adequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified City of Pacifica Land Use Plan. Certification of the amendment will meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the amendment on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts on the environment that will result from certification of the amendment.*

2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

A. Background

The City of Pacifica is located about 10 miles south of San Francisco along the San Mateo County 'coastside', where the coastal zone boundary tracks along Highway 1. The City's coastal zone encompasses residential neighborhoods, visitor-serving and commercial areas, significant open space and habitat areas, and important and popular beaches and other public access attractions. In particular, the City is a very popular recreational destination for visitors from all over the Bay Area, as well as inland areas in the region, due in part to its beaches, open spaces, and well-known surf breaks, but also due to its proximity to both the San Francisco area and to the Peninsula, San Mateo, the Santa Clara (or Silicon) Valley, and the East Bay.

In June of 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the City of Pacifica used an emergency order[5] to identify certain temporary operational standards for outdoor parklets on private property and within the public-right-of-way, and to create a temporary licensure[6] for such uses. Before this emergency order was established, the City required commercial uses in any commercial district to operate within enclosed structures, unless the business obtained a Use Permit from the City Zoning Administrator or Planning Commission. The creation of the temporary permitting

[5] City of Pacifica Director of Emergency Services approved Emergency Order No. 2020-02.

[6] A temporary "Outdoor Activities License".

program enabled businesses to expand their commercial activities outdoors, as was required during the height of COVID. Fourteen of the twenty-five temporary Outdoor Activities Licenses issued by the City were in the coastal zone. Of these fourteen permits within the coastal zone, four authorized outdoor dining within the public-right-of-way and ten authorized outdoor dining on private property, for a total of 14 coastal zone parklets.

In late 2021, the City held two study sessions with the public and local businesses to assess their views on the continuation of the program. Following these sessions, the City Council approved new outdoor commercial regulations as part of the Local Coastal Program (LCP) Implementation Plan (IP),[7] and those regulations are the subject of this proposed LCP amendment.

B. Proposed LCP Amendment

The proposed amendment provides new regulations for such parklets subject to an outdoor activity permit and a CDP,[8] both of which would be issued in one-year increments (with options for renewal at the end of that time), subject to certain criteria, for the following uses: retail, retail restaurant, fast-food restaurant, restaurant, bars, personal services, art galleries, instructional studios for dance or arts/crafts, offices, churches, and health/fitness clubs. Under the proposed amendment, parklets would be allowed in commercial zoning districts when they fall into one of the following categories: the parking lane of a public right-of-way; the sidewalk of a public right-of-way; off-street parking areas on private property; or existing solid-surface or paved areas on private property that do not provide off-street parking spaces. Applications for parklets in the parking lane of the public right-of-way would be limited to one designated parklet per block, and a single application for such parklets could be submitted on behalf of multiple businesses. Designated parklets within the parking lane of the public right-of-way would not be allowed to occupy more than four perpendicular/angled parking spaces or two parallel parking spaces, and must provide a 25-foot setback from the nearest crosswalk, ensuring that any parklets allow for a free flow for pedestrians and wheelchair use of the sidewalk (e.g., at least 4-feet of clear path along the sidewalk).

Citywide, there are 877 public parking spaces located within the public right-of-way in the coastal zone. Of these, under this ordinance, up to 56 could be used for parklets,

---

[7] Enacting Article 52 to Chapter 4 (Zoning) of Title 9 (Planning and Zoning) of the LCP.

[8] While not explicitly called out in the proposed ordinance, the IP identifies what development needs a CDP and what can be exempted from CDP requirements. Because the parklets and related development would not qualify for any CDP exemptions under the LCP, a CDP would be required in addition to the outdoor activity permit. On this point, the City has confirmed that all parklets in the coastal zone would be subject to CDP requirements, and that the City may use their administrative CDP process to streamline the approval process. Given the outdoor activity permit is a one-year term, each parklet CDP would also be limited to a one-year term, and each time an outdoor activity permit is renewed (i.e., to extend the expiration date by one-year), the corresponding CDP must also be amended to similarly extend the expiration date. As required by the Coastal Act and the LCP, the City would also be required to notify the Coastal Commission for each such CDP amendment action, where some such actions would be appealable to the Commission. The City has also indicated they may pursue an 'Umbrella' CDP model that would allow businesses to collectively sign on and streamline the permitting process in the future.

representing approximately 6% of all such parking spaces. In other words, even if the program were implemented to its fullest extent and all allowable spaces were utilized, no more than 6% of public parking spaces within the coastal zone right-of-way would be occupied by parklets. Similarly, there are 1,069 commercial parking spaces located on private property in the coastal zone that are eligible for businesses to utilize for their parking. Of these 1,069 spaces available, up to 115 spaces could be used for parklets, or just under 11% of such commercial parking. The City also requires that, when located on private property, designated parklets cannot occupy more than 2 off-street parking spaces or no more than 10% of total onsite parking spaces, whichever is greater.

Applicants for outdoor activity permits/CDPs in the public right-of-way parking lane are required to conduct neighborhood outreach to notify all businesses on the block of their application.[9] Upon completion, a final copy of the outreach materials must be submitted to the City. As proposed, both the required CDP and outdoor activity permit are valid for one year from issuance, and permittees may renew their permits (and must apply for such renewal application no more than 90 days before the permits expire). Permit expiration is stayed and permittees may continue operating in the designated parklet area until the City approves or denies the renewal. If no renewal application is submitted before the permits expire, the permits automatically expire on that date without further notice.

Please see **Exhibit 1** for the full text of the proposed IP amendment.

C. Consistency Determination

Standard of Review

The proposed amendment affects only the IP component of the City's LCP and the standard of review for IP amendments is that they must be consistent with and adequate to carry out the LCP Land Use Plan (LUP).

Applicable Land Use Plan Provisions

The LUP contains a series of provisions designed to protect and provide maximum public recreational access, and to protect visitor-serving facilities, such as public parking areas. See **Exhibit 2** for a list of applicable LUP provisions.

Consistency Analysis

The proposed amendment would provide an explicit permitting pathway for parklets in portions of the public right-of-way and within private lots for commercial uses. The City believes that the amendment would strengthen the local economy by supporting business development, in turn, helping businesses increase profits and draw more visitors to Pacifica. Retail, retail restaurant, fast-food restaurant, restaurant, bars, personal services, art galleries, instructional studios for dance or arts/crafts, offices,

[9] Per the proposal, such outreach may be completed by sending certified mail to all businesses on the block and providing the City with the mailing receipts, submitting a petition signed by at least two-thirds of the business owners or their designees, or hosting one or more open houses (virtual or in-person) attended by at least two-thirds of the business owners or their designees and providing the City with an attendance list. In addition, outreach must state that multiple businesses may join the application, but only one parklet is allowed per block.

churches, and health/fitness clubs could all be allowed parklet areas, in addition to their already existing indoor space. These parklets have grown in popularity and utility in recent years throughout coastal California in response to the COVID-19 pandemic to support the need to continue to eat and recreate outside, and it is no different in Pacifica. While the primary intent of the amendment is to establish a limited number of parklets that would continue to activate the street environment and expand visitor opportunities, the use of such space for commercial activities is not without its potential impacts. In particular, such use could lead to loss of public parking in coastal areas in close association to the beach and other visitor-serving amenities,[10] such as in particularly in popular visitor-serving areas such as Rockaway Beach and the Pedro Point Shopping Center/Pacifica State Beach. Such parking areas are in high demand, especially for those coming from more inland areas and not fortunate enough to live close to such amenities. In other words, while sidewalk dining and parklets can serve as popular opportunities to enliven the public commons by providing a different visitor-serving opportunity, such use of public space for private commercial use must be balanced against potential public impacts, here primarily in terms of public access.

The LUP requires protection and maximization of public recreational access opportunities (see **Exhibit 2**, *LUP Policies LD-I-8: Development Priority for Visitor-Serving and Recreational Uses* and *PR-G-1: Coastal Access and Recreational Opportunities*). In this case, the City aims to facilitate outdoor commercial use areas and increased access to commercial facilities (including parklet areas and related infrastructure) by creating opportunities for businesses to develop and expand their customer base by attracting more visitors to the coast, subject to annual permit review to ensure compliance with established limits and standards that protect against potential impacts, particularly those related to public coastal access. The Commission also recognizes that parklets generally provide a viable approach to revitalize existing commercial areas, and can help create more vibrant, walkable neighborhoods near the coast, and here specifically, for the community of Pacifica. However, such uses must be balanced with the need for adequate public parking in association with the coast and other visitor-serving amenities.

The City of Pacifica includes a total of 2,473 parking spaces in the coastal zone within the zoned commercial areas, private commercial lots, and within public access parking lots that could be impacted by the ordinance. Of those spaces, 877 are located in the public right-of-way,[11] 1,069 spaces are located on private commercial property,[12] and 527 are located in public beach parking lots.[13] Of the 877 spaces located in the public right-of-way, a maximum of 56 parking spaces (or 6%) could be used for parklets under the proposal, and for the 1,069 spaces in private parking lots, a maximum of 115

[10] Where such losses could be both direct, where a parklet in the public right-of-way displaces public parking, and indirect, where parklets in commercial parking lots would reduce available parking for commercial patrons, and force them into nearby public parking spaces.

[11] Primarily in the City's West Edgemar, West Sharp Park, and Rockaway Beach areas.

[12] Primarily in the City's West Edgemar, West Sharp Park, Sharp Park Golf Course, West Fairway Park, Rockaway Beach, Pacifica State Beach, and Pedro Point areas.

[13] Primarily in the City's West Sharp Park, Rockaway Beach, and Pacifica State Beach areas.

parking spaces (or just under 11%) could be used for parklets under the proposal. Parklets would not be allowed in the public beach parking lots. See chart below (and see **Exhibit 3** for a more complete description of the locations of the available and affected parking):

Coastal Zone Area	Number of Parking Spaces	Maximum Allowed Parklet Use
Public right-of-way	877 spaces	56 spaces (6%)
Public parking lots	527 spaces	0 spaces (0%)
Public sub-total	1,404 spaces	56 spaces (4%)
Private commercial parking lots	1,069 spaces	115 spaces (11%)
Total parking spaces	2,473 spaces	171 spaces (7%)

As can be seen, the amount of parking spaces that could be used for parklets is fairly small in relation both to overall parking spaces (7%), and importantly related to public parking spaces (4%) in the City's coastal zone. As distinguished from some other parklet cases with which the Commission has been involved, these are relatively small incursions, and mostly in areas away from prime visitor locations.

Of the parking areas impacted, Rockaway Beach and Pedro Point Shopping Center are typically the most heavily trafficked and impacted by visitors and locals alike for beach and surf access, as well as commercial business users. At Rockaway Beach, 12 public right-of-way parking spaces and 12 private parking spaces could potentially be occupied. However, 318 public parking spaces at Rockaway Beach, or 96% of such spaces, would remain available, as would 110 private parking spaces, or about 90% of such spaces. Even with the degree of visitor interest and parking needs at Rockaway Beach, and even if the maximum number of spaces were used for parklets, it would not be expected to significantly adversely impact the ability of the public to access the beach and other visitor attractions at Rockaway Beach. And at the same time, such parklets themselves would provide new opportunities for public enjoyment and public commons activation.

As to the Pedro Point Shopping Center, this area provides a popular commercial parking lot that is also informally used for accessing Pacifica State Beach. Such intersecting uses make for a notoriously busy lot. The proposal could result in a maximum of 25 out of 258 total parking spaces in this lot (or almost 10%) to be used for parklets. While not an insubstantial number/percentage, it appears that judicious placement of such parklets, and the potential for some offsetting public amenities, should be able to avoid significant adverse public access impacts to the nearby beaches.[14]

While 56 parking spaces (or 6%) in the public right-of-way and 115 parking spaces (or just under 11%) within private lots would be the maximum number of parking spaces

[14] In addition, the Pedro Point Shopping Center is located within the Coastal Commission's retained coastal permitting jurisdiction, and therefore any CDPs for parklets would be subject to CDP applications to the Commission, where the Coastal Act is the standard of review (and the LCP non-binding guidance), and thus where potential public access impacts can be evaluated on a case-by-case basis through that process.

that could be impacted, 44 of the public right-of-way spots[15] and 76 of the private lot parking spots[16] are well away from primary coastal access areas, and these areas are not traditionally used by the public to access the coast, and are not anticipated to impact the public's access to these areas.[17] Plus, an additional 527 dedicated beach access parking spots remain unaffected. Therefore, the potential impacts of this parklet proposal on public access is essentially concentrated in Rockaway Beach and the Pedro Point Shopping Center. However, as discussed in Rockaway Beach, only a small portion of parking could be implicated in the maximum scenario, and dedicated public access parking areas which provide sufficient parking will remain unaffected. For the Pedro Point Shopping Center, as discussed, the impacts at the maximum scenario could negatively impact access, but given the lot is in the Commission's retained jurisdiction, any CDPs would be analyzed by the Commission on a case-by-case basis to assure impacts are avoided, lessened, or mitigated when necessary.

Additionally, under the proposed ordinance, the City would limit both the maximum number of parking spaces that may be impacted by parklets as well as the number of permits per block to avoid concentrating impacts in any one area, and to ensure impacts are both lessened and distributed throughout the City. Even so, these restrictions represent maximum allowable thresholds, and it is unlikely they will be reached given that, to date, the City has only issued 25 temporary Outdoor Activity Licenses since the program's inception, with just 14 in coastal zone locations. Of those 14 Outdoor Activity Licenses issued in the coastal zone, 10 permits authorized outdoor dining on private property and only 4 permits authorized outdoor dining within the public right-of-way (of the 4 permits originally issued on the public right-of-way, only one permit is still active and impacts 2 public street parking spots). Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that those maximum thresholds would be reached given that, even during the COVID-19 pandemic, which can serve as a reasonable proxy for potential participation under this proposal, the number of outdoor dining installations did not exceed those levels. Notably, these figures represent a period when outdoor dining was at its peak, serving as a substitute for indoor commercial activities during the pandemic. Today, however, parklets typically function more as an extension of indoor commercial operations, rather than a total replacement for it.

Accordingly, the Commission finds that the City's proposal to allow for well-distributed parklets within a limit the number of parking spaces should not significantly impact public access, consistent with LUP provisions that require that public recreational access opportunities be maximized, and that visitor-serving facilities, especially free public parking, be encouraged and protected as important coastal resources. At the

[15] Along Bill Drake Way, West Manor Drive, Palmetto Avenue, Francisco Boulevard in the West Edgemar, and West Sharp Park neighborhoods.

[16] Along Palmetto Avenue, Manor Shopping Plaza, Palmetto Avenue, Francisco Boulevard, 1700 Block of Palmetto Business Shops, 1905 Palmetto Avenue, 1966 Francisco Boulevard, 1919 Palmetto Avenue, 2019 Palmetto Avenue, 2014 Palmetto Avenue, 2070 Francisco Boulevard, 100 Santa Rosa Avenue, 2600 Francisco Boulevard, and 776 Bradford Way.

[17] These parking spaces account for nearly all potentially affected public right-of-way spaces and nearly 70% of all potentially affected spaces overall, and thus their potential use for parklets should not affect public visitor access in any meaningful way.

same time, while the Commission is generally supportive of the City's efforts to energize these City streets in these ways, and sees the benefits that would accrue to both the community and visitors to it, the Commission also recognizes that the use of such public spaces for commercial endeavors has the potential to reduce general public access. Fortunately, the City's proposal helps to account for this by not only providing for an initial assessment as part of any initial parklet permitting episode, but also for yearly renewals, which also provide an opportunity to make sure the program is functioning as expected, including in terms of potential public recreational access and visitor impacts. All of which provides both a regulatory backstop as well as a means of facilitating appropriate (and LCP required) adaptation and changes over time.

In sum, the Commission finds that the proposed IP amendment as submitted conforms with and is adequate to carry out the LUP.

D. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

CEQA Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) prohibits a proposed LCP or LCP amendment from being approved if there are feasible alternatives and/or feasible mitigation measures available that would substantially lessen any significant adverse effect that the LCP or LCP amendment may have on the environment. Although local governments are not required to satisfy CEQA in terms of local preparation and adoption of LCPs and LCP amendments, many local governments use the CEQA process to develop information about proposed LCPs and LCP amendments, including to help facilitate Coastal Act review. In this case, the City exempted the proposed amendment from environmental review (citing CEQA Sections 15061(b)(3) (no significant environmental impact), 15301 (existing facilities), 15303 (new construction or conversion of small structures), and 15304 (minor alterations to land)).

The Coastal Commission is not exempt from satisfying CEQA requirements with respect to LCPs and LCP amendments, but the Commission's LCP/LCP amendment review, approval, and certification process has been certified by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency as being the functional equivalent of the environmental review required by CEQA (CCR Section 15251(f)). Accordingly, in fulfilling that review, this report has discussed the relevant coastal resource issues with the proposal, has addressed all comments received, and has concluded that approval of the proposed LCP amendment is not expected to result in significant environmental effects, including as those terms are understood in CEQA.

Accordingly, it is unnecessary for the Commission to suggest modifications (including through alternatives and/or mitigation measures) as there are no significant adverse environmental effects that approval of the proposed amendment would necessitate. Thus, the proposed amendment will not result in any significant adverse environmental effects for which feasible mitigation measures have not been employed, consistent with CEQA Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A).

3. APPENDICES

A. Substantive File Documents[18]

- LCP Amendment File for LCP-2-PAC-25-0013-1

B. Staff Contact with Agencies and Groups

- City of Pacifica Planning Department

[18] Available for review in the Commission's North Central Coast District office in San Francisco.