

http://www.pacificatribune.com/news/pacificans-rally-against-quarry-development/article_251bb472-12e4-11e6-aca4-47e81f6a6da6.html

FEATURED

Pacificans rally against quarry development

By Jane Northrop Staff Writer Updated May 5, 2016



marque glisson

Drone photograph of quarry.

As every Pacifica household received a piece of mail this week from the Quarry developer, “Preserve @ Pacifica,” reactions have been less than favorable.

Signs against the proposed development and the proposed voter initiative have sprung up all over town, while those who seek to gain enough signatures on a petition to put the initiative on the ballot

are travelling door to door through neighborhoods and setting up tables in front of supermarkets.

Several local residents called the Tribune last week to oppose both the methods the developer is using to bring his project to Pacifica and the project itself.

“This developer is coming off as a conservationist. It’s very deceiving. I was really shocked,” said Kerri Dukas.

Chaya Gordon is a Rockaway resident who feels the developer is trying to overturn the Pacifica ordinance requiring a vote of the people on residential units in the Quarry.

“In 1983, the voters passed a city ordinance that requires approval by the voters for any residential development. Therefore, any other development is not subject to the voters. This latest proposal is a developer who demonstrated they have a lot of money to produce materials. They want to very deviously bury in this ‘plan’ the inclusion of 206 residential units. The only thing they need a vote on is the residential units. The quarry is a totally inappropriate place for this development. The coastal zone is subject to flooding from sea level use.

“The moneymaker will be the residential units. Nothing else has to be built. Putting a four story building there? That would be ridiculous. Their material is intentionally misleading about this. The initiative is not the plan. They made no mention of the hotel bungalows. They have no legal obligation to do what they are proposing. They are doing nothing about traffic. Try to imagine hundreds more cars every day from the residents and the employees. That would push the bottleneck. It would create a permanent traffic nightmare.

“The initiative states it will ‘eliminate the public vote requirement for any future rezone.’ A developer submitted an initiative that was already voted on by the people of Pacifica. That is really objectionable,” she said.

Suzanne Jonas said she was upset by the mailer and the phone calls she has received from the developer.

“I think this is harassment. It’s very deceptive even calling it ‘preserving the quarry’ when all they want to do is develop it. It’s misrepresentation that they are promoting this. There would be no more votes on residential housing. I’m super concerned about the traffic impact. I think this will make life for people quite miserable. I’ve talked with a lot of people who are concerned about these things. This developer is completely bulldozing their way to a vote,” she said.

Jerry Trecocci, who, along with Mike Mooney, is trying to get enough signatures on a petition to put the Quarry initiative on the ballot, said he's doing this only to give people an opportunity to express their feelings about whether they want a vote of the public or to put the development in the hands of a few elected officials.

"That is so hearings can be put into place as to how to change a bridge or get the feelings from the public about how they would like to do the project. For example, the large hotel bungalows—that's negotiable. Everything on the ballot is pretty much negotiable. We want the public to understand that. People have concerns about traffic. My wife leaves home 10 minutes early to get to her job in San Francisco. The delay is about eight minutes. There are plenty of things in the initiative that would be a benefit, such as additional tax revenue to fund a library, build an adequate gymnasium and develop a music and art program, if the public is willing to make a sacrifice in commute time. I know traffic is a problem. It might be worth looking at this further. It doesn't say that this is going to take away their right for a vote and to express their pros and cons.

"If we pass this initiative, City Council can still overrule it. Also, many other agencies have to weigh in, and rightly so. If the public chooses they don't want to do this, then it will go away for the time being. We can help by giving City Council some direction by putting this on the ballot. Let the chips fall where they may. Personally, I would want it to pass. What may have been valid 30 years ago may not be valid now. I'm not trying to change anyone's mind," he said.

Jane Northrop can be reached at jnorthrop@pacifictribune.com