

**CARMEL VALLEY COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

7 p.m., 11 September 2014

Canyon Crest Academy Performing Arts Theater
5951 Village Center Loop Rd., San Diego, CA 92130

CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE

Board Member	Representing	Present	Excused	Absent
1. Rick Newman	Neighborhood 1	X		
2. Nancy Novak	Neighborhood 3	X		
3. Hollie Kahn	Neighborhood 4/4A	X		
4. Debbie Lokanc	Neighborhood 5	X		
5. Christopher Moore	Neighborhood 6	X		
6. Steven Ross	Neighborhood 7	X		
7. Frisco White, Chair	Neighborhood 8	X		
8. Anne Harvey	Neighborhood 8A & 8B	X		
9. Steve Davison	Neighborhood 9	X		
10. Laura Copic	Neighborhood 10	X		
11. Manjeet Ranu, Vice-Chair	Pacific Highlands Ranch, District 11	X		
12. Jonathan Tedesco	Pacific Highlands Ranch, District 12	X		
13. VACANT	Business Representative			
14. Victor Manoushakian	Business Representative	X		
15. Allen Kashani, Secretary	Developer Representative		X (Recused)	
16. Christian Clews	Investor Representative			X
17. Brian Brady	Investor Representative		X (Recused)	

COUNCIL DISTRICT 1 PRESENTATION

Councilmember Sherri Lightner presented board member Manjeet Ranu with a City commendation recognizing his service on the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board. This was Manjeet's final meeting as a member of the board.

ACTION AGENDA

1. One Paseo: Discussion/Action on the FEIR for the proposed One Paseo

- Applicant: Kilroy Realty

Chair Frisco White reviewed how tonight's meeting will be structured. Public testimony has been closed. The board has provided a series of questions to the city, and the first portion of the meeting will be dedicated to city staff answering those questions. After this, the board will discuss proposed motions and take action.

Chair White introduced Cathy Winterrowd, Principal Planner from the City of San Diego, who would lead the city's response to questions. Cathy introduced the additional city staff in attendance: Nancy Bragado (long-range planning), Bernie Turgeon (Carmel Valley community planner), Ann French Gonsalves (traffic), Farah Mahzari (development services), and Renee Mezo (development services project manager).

Chair White explained that the questions for staff have been divided in to eight categories:

1. City of Villages, General Plan, and Community Plan
2. Community Character
3. Transportation, Traffic, and Parking
4. Retail Market Analysis
5. Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Schools
6. Candidate Findings Discussion Section
7. Statement of Overriding Considerations
8. Project Alternatives

He acknowledged that some questions were rhetorical and could not be answered directly. Below are the questions that the city addressed along with summaries of their responses.

City of Villages, General Plan, and Community Plan

Q: Since transit is particularly crucial in the development of villages, how does this once critical lacking component allow One Paseo to be processed as a village?

A: (Nancy Bragado) Transit is an essential component of the City of Villages strategy. We considered the lack of existing transit, but also looked at existing and planned transit. There are plans for *Rapid* bus rapid transit to serve the area in the future, and the proposed shuttle system could serve as proxy for transit in interim. The General Plan also calls for transit-supportive densities in villages, which One Paseo has, and this makes transit more likely to be implemented.

Q: It appears that there have been some liberties taken with the intentions and goals of the City of Villages strategy in order to support the goals of the project and we would like to hear from someone who had a hand in forming the City of Villages strategy whether its intent was, indeed, to propose this kind of urban density into an existing community in violation of the community plan, and why a reduced, less intensive, mixed-use alternative wouldn't sufficiently meet the goals of the City of Villages strategy. Does the statement in the FEIR evaluating the Reduced Mixed-Use alternative in particular require further explanation and support?

A: (Bragado) There is no "one size fits all" for the City of Villages, and a village can have varying scales and mixes of uses. The General Plan anticipates that there will be amendments to Community Plans, and we look to your recommendation to help us with this decision.

Q: Is it appropriate to create a mixed-use village in the center of a mature master-planned neighborhood with already established areas for residential, commercial, retail, etc.? How does the proposed project that results in significant unmitigated impacts meet that goal?

A: (Cathy Winterrowd) The General Plan anticipated that there could be conflicts in implementing the City of Villages strategy and existing communities. A change in community character is anticipated in suburban communities when urban infill is proposed. The FEIR says there are significant impacts to community character. This is because it is a different development pattern with different bulk and scale than the existing community.

Chair White asked staff how many villages exist in San Diego and if they connect to transit. Nancy Bragado answered there are some existing communities that function as villages, some that are being developed (UTC, Quarry Falls), and others that are identified for future development (Encanto).

Board member Nancy Novak asked what the intent of the City of Villages was and what was done to preserve and protect community plans. Bernie Turgeon responded that the General Plan assumed that there would be amendments to Community Plans to allow for villages to be developed.

Board member Laura Copic stated that the village designation for One Paseo is the most dense of the village designations in the General Plan, and asked why this designation was selected for this site. Mr. Turgeon responded that staff initially considered a regional commercial designation, but the Planning Commission suggested staff look at a village designation.

Board member Anne Harvey stated that Carmel Valley was commissioned by the city to be a village, it just happens to not be stacked on top of each other. There may not be a category for horizontal community villages, but that is what we are today.

Transportation, Traffic, and Parking

Q: Was the signal technology accounted for in the FEIR or is this a new, unproven, unvetted proposal? At what point would this solution be implemented and is this projected to be effective for the 14 years between the project build out and 2030 or only after that time (assuming the 56 direct connectors are built by that time)? In short, did the City vet this technology? What happens to traffic between the proposed project build-out and the time that Caltrans completes its projects?

A: (Ann French Gonzalves) The technology was not considered as a factor in the FEIR.

Board member Laura Copic asked if there is a case study to show how these work. Ms. Gonzalves answered that there was not a case study, which is one reason why it was not factored into the traffic study in the FEIR.

Board member Copic asked if the signal technology will help alleviate any of the identified traffic impacts. Ms. Gonzalves indicated that the applicant is proposing the technology to do just that, but because it isn't tested in San Diego, the impacts have to be considered unmitigated.

Q: Why has the City chosen to reduce parking requirements for One Paseo when parking has already proven to be a problem at Del Mar Highlands Town Center? Has City staff evaluated how these "shared parking" scenarios work in reality with any case studies of similar projects that have used this rationale?

A: (Gonzalves) The One Paseo shared parking analysis was done using the most up-to-date information available from the Urban Land Institute. The difference between this project and the Del Mar Highlands Town Center is that there are no office uses at Del Mar Highlands so it doesn't provide the same opportunities for shared parking.

Board member Hollie Kahn expressed her concern that residents will have to compete with other uses for shared parking. Ms. Gonzalves indicated that residential parking is not shared.

Q: Now with this baseline, please indicate the increase in traffic generated by the proposed One Paseo Reduced Main Street plan? And the percentage of increase above the office project?

A: (Gonzalves) The original office proposal would generate 6,500 ADT and the Reduced Main Street alternative would generate 23,880 ADT. This is an increase of 267 percent.

Q: Please explain whether or not the comprehensive Transportation Demand Management program would cause any beneficial reduction in the severity of traffic impacts at the 8 roadway segments where significant, unmitigated traffic impacts have been identified. Please explain whether or not with this system (and considering direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project) would reduce traffic impacts (at these 8 roadway segments) to a level that is less than significant. Please also explain whether or not the proposed comprehensive Transportation Demand Management System would help reduce emergency response times for City of San Diego Fire Station 24 providing emergency service to the Torrey Pines Community (e.g. Del Mar). Given that reduction in response time can be a matter of life and death, is there any reduction in emergency response time along Del Mar Heights Road that would be acceptable because Carmel Valley needs the One Paseo project?

A: (Gonzalves) The TDM plan does not contain a requirement for monitoring or a goal for traffic reduction. With the applicant's proposal to install new signal technology, this should be beneficial to emergency response times.

Q: Please explain how the traffic study evaluated traffic impacts associated with the proposed project during the time period between when the proposed project is anticipated to be built and when the I-5/SR-56 connector project is built and operational (approximately 14 year period). Please describe the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that would occur during this gap time period as compared to once the I-5/SR-56 project is completely built. What additional impacts would occur if Caltrans does not complete the I-5/SR-56 project according to the time frame assumed by the traffic study (e.g., what if the project gets built by Caltrans later than expected)?

A: (Gonzalves) No additional analysis was conducted that adjusted the timing of the connectors.

Board Member Ann Harvey asked about the timeline for transit connections in the community and the construction of connectors. Ms. Gonzalves answered that transit connections are proposed for 2030 and she is not sure about the timing of the connectors. She indicated that she would research and have this answer in time for public hearings.

Board member Copic asked when the new signal technology would be implemented. Ms. Gonsalves indicated that the applicant proposed to implement this system at the beginning of the project.

- Q: Please explain how the traffic study and FEIR evaluated cumulative traffic impacts. Does the cumulative impact analysis take into account the Del Mar Highlands Town Center current plan to expand (e.g., parking structure and 80,000 additional square feet of retail space)? Does the cumulative impact analysis take into consideration the full build-out of the Village at Pacific Highlands Ranch?
- A: (Gonsalves) Yes, the cumulative impact analysis assumed a 150,000 square foot expansion at Del Mar Highlands and the full buildout of the Pacific Highlands Ranch project.

Retail and Market Analysis

- Q: (Step 1) If there are types of retail that won't exist in the PMA, such as heavy commercial goods and big box retail (as described on page 4 of the Kosmont Retail Market Analysis dated 9/2012), what is left out of the \$542,000,000 leakage?
- (Step 2) How does what's left of the \$542,000,000 from step 1 translate into square footage needed within the PMA to eliminate leakage?
- (Step 3) Of the square footage needed to eliminate that leakage, how much is entitled and under way in the PMA, including but not limited to the expansion of Del Mar Highlands and the new Village at Pacific Highlands Ranch?
- (Step 4) After subtracting the entitled and underway square footage in step 3, how much remains?
- A: (Renee Mezo) Two economic studies were done for the project, the Kosmont Retail Market Analysis, which provided an urban decay analysis, and the London Study which assessed the economic impacts of the Reduced Main Street alternative.

Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Schools

- Q: How much do these studies cost? Are there cost estimates for building two elevated playing fields?
- A: (Winterrowd) The elevated playing fields are off the table, and there is no longer a proposal to build a parking structure at the community center with elevated fields. Park & Rec does not support parking structures in city parks.
- Q: If One Paseo is approved, which schools will the children who live in One Paseo attend and will the schools be able to accommodate them? What is the projection of the number of children who will live in One Paseo?
- A: (Winterrowd) The school districts make the decision about which schools the children will attend. The school districts for One Paseo are the Solana Beach Elementary School District and the San Dieguito Union High School District. It is estimated that there will be 122 students in grades K-6, and 120 students in grades 7-12.

Board member Copic asked if there was any analysis done about whether these schools could accommodate the additional kids? Ms. Winterrowd said there was not, but this analysis is addressed at the time that building permits are pulled.

Candidate Findings Discussion

Ms. Winterrowd stated that many of the questions in this section are things that the planning board needs to deliberate on and are difficult for the city to answer. She explained that the candidate findings are considered draft until adopted by City Council. They will have to consider whether the findings justify the impacts that the project may cause. Staff developed the draft findings based on evidence provided and the benefits of the project.

Chair White stated that he is having a hard time understanding staff's strong recommendation to support the project with so much unmitigated impact. Nancy Bragado answered that staff looked at the plan as a whole and assessed whether it is furthering the General Plan goals or not. Staff made the assessment that this project does further the goals of the General Plan.

Board member Christopher Moore stated that the findings strongly favor the proposed project and overstate its benefits while minimizing impacts. He does not feel that staff gave a fair assessment to the Reduced Mixed-Use alternative.

Q: Explain and graphically show how this project could be phased not based on market conditions, but on the timing and construction of the circulation improvements for the streets and the freeways that are outside of city jurisdiction.

A: (Winterrowd) The project is tied to circulation improvements that are feasible. The mitigation has to come with the impact, but we can't tie it to projects outside of the city's jurisdiction, such as freeway improvements. There is no phasing put forth that would tie the project to these improvements.

Statements of Overriding Considerations

Board member Copic stated that the Reduced Mixed-Use alternative lessens some impacts, but was dismissed as infeasible. She felt that this shows that impacts to community character carry less weight than economic considerations.

Board member Manjeet Ranu asked if there is any discussion about the General Plan/City of Villages strategy in the Statements of Overriding Considerations? Ms. Winterrowd answered that these are discussed in the Statements of Overriding Considerations and also in the findings, and they discuss housing types, the ability of the project to support transit, walkability/bikeability, etc.

Chair White shared that he felt the Statements of Overriding Considerations focused more on benefit to the city of San Diego and not to the Carmel Valley community.

Q: For Finding 1, what is the boost to the local economy if the jobs are spread out over the duration of the project rather than as a lump sum?

A: (Winterrowd) The boost to the economy would be both construction-related and long term.

Q: For Finding 3, what is the economic benefit above what was originally planned for the site? In other words, what is the benefit to the existing retail and housing community if 510,000 SF of offices were built? What is the net benefit to the community of One Paseo above that office threshold?

A: (Winterrowd) I don't know the answer to this. (Chair White asked them to research this and share with the Planning Commission and City Council).

Q: How does the project protect open space that is already protected or limited in development?

A: (Winterrowd) MSCP open space is already protected. If you develop a more dense project, there is less pressure to encroach on designated open space in the future.

Project Alternatives

Q: Is it not possible that the Reduced Mixed Use Alternative, if constructed correctly, would serve the needs of the community, the developer, and the City and create sufficient positive economics for all 3 while resulting in an adequate reduction of the 2 significant unmitigated impacts (traffic and community character)?

A: (Winterrowd) The impacts are reduced in Reduced Mixed Use Alternative but the applicant does not find this alternative to be feasible. City staff reviewed this analysis and accepted that it is not feasible. We looked at a range of alternatives in the EIR, far more than were required.

Board member Copic stated that in the dismissal of Reduced Mixed Use Alternative, it said it wouldn't provide critical mass of people to get retailers that would attract beyond the Carmel Valley community. But the applicant has said this is supposed to be a community village oriented to Carmel Valley. There seems to be a disconnect between what the city is evaluating (lifestyle center) vs. what the applicant is saying, that the project is oriented to Carmel Valley.

Q: It seems that these units were never planned for in Carmel Valley to begin with. Explain how it would improve the Carmel Valley Community Plan when we already have a mix of housing immediately adjacent to the core of the community? How will the unplanned increase in population from 608 housing units impact our schools, parks, recreation center, police, fire department, and other community amenities, and why are they needed by the community if we are approaching our planned residential goals?

A: (Winterrowd) The applicant is paying fees to address its impacts to community facilities.

Board member Rick Newman asked if, when the city looked at the feasibility of other alternatives, was land cost factored in? Ms. Winterrowd said that this was not factored in.

He asked if the Reduced Mixed Use Alternative was proposed by the applicant or by the city? Ms. Winterrowd indicated that the city asked for a reduced mixed-use project, but the applicant developed the specific alternative. He asked if the goals and objectives used to review the alternatives were developed by the city or the applicant, and Ms. Winterrowd responded that the goals and objectives are developed by the applicant and reviewed by the city, and the city thought they were appropriate.

Motions

White presented draft motions for the board to consider and conditions of approval. The first draft motion presented a number of conditions that would apply to any project that was approved. The conditions applied to the following categories:

1. Boulevard
2. Community benefits
3. TDM
4. Parking
5. Phasing
6. Implementation
7. Design

The second draft motion indicated the planning board's opposition to the Reduced Main Street alternative (the proposed project) and support for the Reduced Mixed-Use alternative, with minor modifications. After discussion, two motions were passed.

Upon a motion by Board Chair White and a second by Board member Newman, the following motion passed on a vote of 11-2:

The Carmel Valley Community Planning Board rejects the One Paseo Reduced Main Street Alternative as proposed. The size and scale of this project are not appropriate for the Carmel Valley community. The One Paseo Reduced Main Street Alternative has environmental impacts that are described as "significant and unavoidable and that there is no feasible mitigation". The significant impacts are described as 1) Transportation/Circulation/Parking, and 2) Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character. These impacts are significant to the quality of Carmel Valley and shall not be compromised by overriding considerations.

However, the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board supports in concept the Reduced Mixed Use Alternative as described in the FEIR. This alternative provides the same benefits to the community, but with reduced impacts that would be acceptable. This Alternative was not seriously considered by applicant because of its lacking the main component for the critical mass of retail necessary for a "lifestyle center." We will support an increase of the retail portion of the Reduced Mixed Use Alternative to 198,500 square feet.

Therefore, the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board supports and asks that the Planning Commission and City Council also approve the Reduced Mixed Use Alternative with the following characteristics:

1. The Reduced Mixed Use Project should be designed with the same design values as the Reduced Main Street Alternative.
2. The total project will encompass up to 876,300 square feet (198,500 square feet of retail, 267,800 square feet of commercial office and 304 dwelling units (410,000 square feet)).
3. Building heights shall not exceed six stories.
4. The project will handle its own parking demand and not allow spill over parking impacts in the surrounding neighborhoods.
5. The traffic can be mitigated without depending upon a major freeway improvement that may or may not happen in 14 -15 years

Upon a motion by Board Vice-Chair Ranu and a second by Board member Copic, the following motion passed on a vote of 13-0:

The Carmel Valley Community Planning Board requests that the City Council ensure that the following seven (7) conditions are included with any final project approval:

1. ***Boulevard***
 - Implement Option B as shown to provide a single concrete path to delineate the bike lane instead of green paint or asphalt.
 - All the landscape and streetscape improvements along Del Mar Heights Road shall be provided as shown.

2. ***Community Benefits***
 - The applicant shall provide an independent project manager reporting to Council District 1 and this Board. The project manager will be responsible for pursuing the implementation of the One Paseo Community Benefits and to support the outcome of the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board Livability Subcommittee within the sphere of influence of the One Paseo community benefits projects, including signal coordination, traffic calming, traffic mitigation, parks, pedestrian/bicycle trails, and the TDM program. This project manager will also work cooperatively with the City, applicant and Caltrans to bring about improvements that are required to mitigate traffic impacts.
 - These community benefits are vitally important to lessen the effects of the project on the community with its substantial change in character. As such, they must be a part of the project entitlement and the applicant shall expressly request that the project be conditioned with these and commit to the community that these benefits will be delivered.

3. ***Transportation Demand Management***
 - Provide five-minute shuttle headways along the High Bluff/El Camino Real employment and visitor-serving uses corridor during the 11-2 lunch period.
 - Identify and serve regional pick-up points for employees (e.g., Google buses) with frequent peak period headways and guaranteed rides home.
 - The applicant/developer/owner, in partnership with the City, MTS, NCTD, and SANDAG, shall expand the TDM program to include the entire High Bluff/El Camino Real corridor with remote, regional employee pick up points with frequent peak period headways and guaranteed rides home.
 - The applicant/developer/owner agrees not to protest inclusion in a potential future High Bluff/El Camino Real corridor transit district.
 - The applicant/developer/owner agrees not to oppose future traffic mitigation at Via de la Valle and El Camino Real, including a roundabout if that is approved and accepted.
 - For all mitigation measures that require Caltrans action, and until all such mitigation measures have been fully implemented, the applicant/developer/owner shall work in partnership with the City and with Caltrans to bring about delivery of such mitigation measures so as to alleviate traffic impacts in the most expeditious manner possible. Until such mitigation measures have been fully implemented, the applicant/developer/owner and City of San Diego (Community Planning Group representative) shall provide regular updates to the Carmel Valley Community Planning Group regarding progress being made.

4. ***Parking***
 - The applicant/developer/owner shall monitor peak events/seasonal events with respect to parking and deploy additional TDM program measures and parking measures/incentives to ensure adequate parking supply during periods of exceptional demand.

5. ***Phasing***
 - Base phasing not on market conditions, but on implementation of traffic mitigation, community benefits, and other public facilities (e.g., Proposition C of November 2010).

6. ***Implementation***
 - Substantial conformance review shall not apply to increases in the number of stories, significant increases in mass, or significant reduction in parking or articulation. Such changes require a Process 4.

7. ***Design***
 - The single story retail area adjacent to El Camino Real should be enhanced or reconfigured to achieve pedestrian orientation rather than vehicular.
 - All walls facing the public right-of-way and/or view need to have visual interest (e.g., living walls, art panels, visual articulation).
 - The residential building along Del Mar Heights Road should be better architecturally enhanced.
 - The Board shall be updated and provided an opportunity to review changes to the project as it goes through final design.

Next Steps

Chair White announced that the One Paseo project would be heard by the Planning Commission on October 2, 2014. It is anticipated to be before the City Council sometime before the end of this year.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES — 28 August 2014

Due to the late hour, the approval of the minutes from the August 28, 2014 meeting was tabled until the meeting on September 25, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:18 p.m.