

**CARMEL VALLEY COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
7 p.m., 24 May 2012**

Carmel Valley Library, Community Room
3919 Townsgate Drive, 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. Steven Ross	Neighborhood 4/4A	X		
4. Debbie Lokanc	Neighborhood 5	X		
5. Christopher Moore	Neighborhood 6	X		
6. VACANT	Neighborhood 7			
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. VACANT	Pacific Highlands Ranch, District 12			
13. Jill McCarty	Business Representative	X		
14. Victor Manoushakian	Business Representative	X		
15. Allen Kashani, Secretary	Developer Representative	X		
16. Christian Clews	Investor Representative	X		
17. Rodney Hunt	Investor Representative	X		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES—26 APRIL 2012

After noting corrections, Christian Clews motioned to approve the minutes as corrected, seconded by Rick Newman and unanimously approved with Victor Manoushakian abstaining (14-0-1).

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. PHR Trails:** Direct Chair to submit comment letter on Pacific Highland Ranch Community Plan Amendment to include trails along existing utility access roads.
- Applicant - Manjeet Ranu, CVCPB Vice Chair

Manjeet Ranu motioned to accept the consent item, seconded by Victor Manoushakian and unanimously approved (15-0).

PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

Christian Clews made a comment about an extraordinary amount of political signs appearing in public right-of-way and suggested that the signs be removed.

Councilmember Sherri Lightner spoke about One Paseo and explained that concerned residents are free to contact CD1.

Bryan Pease explained that he is opposed to the One Paseo project and he is running for CD1. Chair White reminded Bryan that we are not here to discuss the One Paseo project and that we are only discussing the EIR/Precise Plan Amendment.

Ray Ellis introduced himself and explained that he is running for CD1. Regarding One Paseo Ray explained that he has concerns about traffic and mitigation.

Jessica Lopez representing 1800 janitors throughout the County asked the community to urge developers to provide good jobs.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Continued.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

It was noted that numerous emails regarding One Paseo have been received.

COMMUNITY PLANNER REPORT

Continued.

COUNCIL DISTRICT ONE REPORT

Continued.

MAYOR'S REPORT

No report/no representative present.

COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REPORT, DISTRICT 3

Continued.

STATE ASSEMBLY REPORT, DISTRICT 75

No report/no representative present.

INFORMATION AGENDA

No items.

ACTION AGENDA

1. Avocado Brow Ditch Repair: Consider the replacement of approximately 178 LF of concrete brow ditch with 24 inch HDPE storm drain within an existing 15 ft. easement located on a Homeowner's Association lot in the Via De La Valle Community between Avocado Place and Caminito Cantaras.

- Applicant - Will Meredith, Project Engineer, City of San Diego Public Works

Chris Moore recused. Will Meredith presented a proposal to replace approximately 178 LF of concrete brow ditch with 24 inch HDPE storm drain. The applicant explained that the pipe installation will be revegetated with temporary irrigation. After discussion, Christian Clews motioned to approve the project, seconded by Nancy Novak and unanimously approved (14-0-1).

After the item Dave Roberts, mayor for Solana Beach introduced himself and explained that he will be running for a County Board of Supervisor seat.

2. One Paseo DEIR and PPA Response: Consider the draft response letter for the DEIR and Precise Plan Amendment and direct the Chair to submit letters with changes or corrections.

- Applicant - CVCPB

Chair White opened the item and explained that he was disappointed with some of the emails received criticizing the board; and Chair White reminded everyone that we are not here to talk about the project and whether it is good or bad but we are here to discuss the EIR and precise plan amendment. EIR/PPA Amendment supporters were given ten minutes to talk and opponents ten minutes as well.

Applicant Robert Little explained that the City produced the DEIR through an independent consultant. The project will come before the board later. Robert explained that two letters were recently provided to the City with corrections.

A resident asked Chair White how long the board would accept input and Chair White noted that comments are due May 29 so the board can accept input through the weekend.

Andrew Reece, a landscape architect explained that he is excited about smart growth and that he has looked at the vision, land use plan, design guidelines and implementation sections of the DEIR, and he feels the DEIR understands the mixed-use concept well.

Steve Burton, president of ACE parking and a resident for 18-years, explained that he support the parking described in the DEIR.

Bob Fuchs explained that section four discusses need for the community group to be involved in meaningful discussion and that review of a 4500 page document by May 29 is challenging.

One Paseo (Cont.)

Ken Farinsky explained that he supports mixed use but the DEIR describes things inconsistently in regards to story heights. Ken feels that impacts on schools and parks should also be studied. Ken explained that Carmel Valley is short on park space and the DEIR does not acknowledge this. Ken feels the DEIR is flawed and needs work.

Fred Barron explained that he is interested in mixed use but the EIR doesn't address whether a scaled down mixed use project could adequately address impacts. Fred also explained that the mixed-use needs to work for teens and pre-teens.

A resident named Steve explained his opposition is based on density (500,000 SF allowed vs 1.8MM SF). He also feels 10 or 11 stories of hotel does not fit in Carmel Valley; and that 27,000 cars/day will cause gridlock in Carmel Valley.

A resident named Tracy explained that she supports a more scaled down version of the proposed project.

Robert Wolf explained that he is concerned about traffic and that the project needs to be scaled to something that blends in.

[At this point the chair closed public testimony on the DEIR/PPA]

Anne Harvey commented that the board is considering adding an EIR alternative.

Manjeet Ranu presented a power point presentation summarizing issues identified by board members and Manjeet asked the board members to chime in as topics are brought up.

After overview of the topics for discussion, Manjeet started with discussion on the DEIR with the first topic being Environmental Setting. Anne Harvey explained that the immediate surroundings are 2-story office and shopping however the DEIR discusses the surrounding as 10-story buildings near I-5. Anne commented that the DEIR must be improved to reflect the immediate surroundings.

Christopher Moore noted that the traffic study doesn't appear to account for the Del Mar Highlands permitted expansion and he has issues with the baseline.

The next topic of discussion was the project description. Manjeet explained that the Project objectives need more alignment with community character, planned land uses and vision. Jan Fuchs explained that the City's General Plan has a vision for a City of Villages. However, Jan Fuchs added that not every community needs to have a mixed use village especially one that is detrimental to the community.

Chair White explained that he had a hard time understanding footages at blocks.

Debbie Lokanc made comments regarding bulk and scale.

Steven Ross quoted the General Plan noting that 'each village shall be unique'.

Chris Moore commented that the project should be walkable and bikable but the project appears to be more about destination with driving. Chris would like to see more discussion about walking and biking linkages.

The next topic for discussion was regarding Land Use. Manjeet explained that the retail market study needs to account for negative impacts to existing and planned retail including particular concerns about the PHR Village Center; the study does not account for all approved, planned projects; physical impacts from such a large retail project endangers existing and planned land uses. Manjeet explained that he has concerns for drawing from our current land use plans and we cannot afford to have our community dominated by one plan. Manjeet also noted that the Community Village and zoning needs to be customized; the DEIR phasing makes assumptions without commitments in the plan; the DEIR relies on a non-specific Precise Plan; the DEIR has excess and non-specific flexibility to make changes with unknown impacts. Manjeet commented that the DEIR is relying on a Precise Plan that needs more work.

Anne Harvey commented that the DEIR should address what the land use change means to other communities.

Jan Fuchs added that further surroundings seem to be held above immediate surroundings and hotel use is at El Camino Real and SR56.

Chair White made a comment about setbacks.

Allen Kashani explained that the PHR Village Center has not had a chance to come to fruition yet and the residents desire a boutique grocery; and that the PHR Village Center proposes a cinema as an 'anchor'. Allen is concerned about opportunities being taken away from the PHR Village Center. Chair White added that existing land use was intended so that PHR residents shouldn't have to drive to Carmel Valley for their needs.

Manjeet explained that we need more disclosure and analysis.

Chair White explained that the DEIR should study impacts to schools.

Chris Moore explained that the size and scale are not compatible with the immediate vicinity.

Jill McCarty asked the applicant if there are comparable projects in Southern California. Robert Little responded noting Playa Vista in Marina Del Rey; The Americana at Brand in Glendale; and Paseo Colorado in Pasadena. Chair White asked if any of these locations are in a suburban environment. Robert explained that the answer is a bit subjective but a project called Santana Row in San Jose has a lot of similarities to the proposed project. Steven Ross asked for examples in San Diego. Robert explained that mixed use is in infancy in San Diego but he mentioned Sevita and Pacific Station in Encinitas.

The next topic introduced was Transportation. Manjeet noted that the DEIR has unmitigated traffic impacts and an inadequate transportation demand management program; there is internal inconsistency within DEIR between traffic study analysis and retail market analysis trade area; there are negative impacts on Del Mar Heights Road through traffic. Manjeet added that the DEIR needs to evaluate alternative designs for Del Mar Heights Road and El Camino Real as a potential solution

to negative impacts and that the DEIR did not fully account for adopted plans and entitlements.

Chris Moore added that given such a high volume there is no conceivable way to mitigate projected traffic conditions. Also, Chris has a concern with block lengths given the two traffic signals proposed; lengths within blocks are rather short and he has concerns with queuing; cumulative projects should be included including the Del Mar Highlands permitted expansion.

Christian Clews asked about prior use ADT vs proposed use ADT. Jan Fuchs commented that the no project alternative has 6497 ADT vs 27,000 ADT proposed.

Steve Ross read an excerpt from the General Plan City of Villages section noting that traffic impacts should be minimized.

Chair White asked the applicant about the 150,000 SF permitted Del Mar Highlands expansion and Andy Schlaefflei responded explaining that the expansion was incorporated in the long-term study with info from Sandag.

Anne Harvey commented that users outside the project will be less connected and the DEIR does not consider this.

Rodney Hunt requested that the DEIR include a wider area of study as impacts will cause drivers to take side streets.

The next topic discussed was Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character. Manjeet noted that bulk and scale are radically different from anything in Carmel Valley; bulk and scale walls itself off from the community and is its own island, limiting view corridors into the site; negatively impacts community character and this is unmitigated; has drastic transitions. Manjeet also explained that the DEIR focuses on the use of transitions and not sufficiently on the physical form; and the DEIR does not consider the negative impact that the widening of roads will have where a Mira Mesa Boulevard character will result.

Jan Fuchs explained that the DEIR nominally discusses the character of the community and that the DEIR says the general plan trumps the community plan.

Anne Harvey explained that trees in medians are important and in some cases more important than widening.

The next topic introduced was Public Services and Facilities/Recreation/Safety. Manjeet explained that payment of FBA fees is a deferral of mitigation and this is a problem especially for parks as there is no park site identified. Manjeet explained that the park requirement should be met on site via parks, plazas and equivalencies. It was also added that the EIR did not consider future conditions adequately on degradation of public safety response times.

Manjeet then discussed the Alternatives section of the DEIR and noted that the EIR does not include a Reduced Density/Intensity alternative, which could achieve the project objectives without the same negative impacts. Chair White added that an alternative should consider getting a mixed use project appropriate for Carmel Valley.

Manjeet then introduced issues with the precise plan amendment and noted that it would have been more appropriate to have developed and approved this Precise Plan Amendment prior to presenting a project to the community; the PPA will sustain that it will “complement the existing fabric and help achieve desired community character”; Commercial village designation must be customized for Carmel Valley; fundamental principles must be defined in more detail; the Community did not develop the overall concept plan with the applicant.

Regarding land use, Manjeet explained that Land Use Element of the PPA clearly indicates the present design of the proposed One Paseo project rather than a diagrammatic relationship of potential uses. Manjeet noted that the CC-5-5 zone is much too broad in terms of uses for this project/site and is not compatible with Carmel Valley; and Multi-Family Residential dwellings will be compatible with the surrounding context of residential design and not be allowed to approach the height of the office buildings. Chair White added that the CC-5-5 zone permits ‘big box’ and a specific proposal should be tailored rather than being so broad.

Regarding Mobility, Manjeet noted land use and block designs appear to indicate that this will be a destination point arriving by vehicles rather than walking; if a rideshare program is going to be policy and objective for the PPA, then it must have a qualifies objective for the reality rather than a policy statement; the PPA should indicate the ratio or number of parking spaces and curb cuts along public streets; the PPA should also indicate the approach of widening roads. Chair White also suggested thinking outside the box with ideas like fronting Del Mark Heights Road to avoid a Mira Mesa Boulevard look.

Regarding Design Guidelines, Manjeet noted they must be more specific, indicate true design standards and be compatible with surrounding uses; plazas and open spaces need dimensions; guidelines must give some dimensional parameters to the building in height and bulk; service hours should be clarified. It was noted that we want to see more ‘teeth’ in the PPA.

Regarding the Landscape guidelines, Manjeet noted that the internal plaza should have a direct view from the public streets, introduced on the opposite side to visually have the landscape as a boulevard. Manjeet also noted that there should be measurable standards and there may be concerns with California Sycamores. Chair White suggested discussion with Donahue Shriber to develop a canopy theme for El Camino Real.

Following the presentation and discussion, Chair White added that he is hopeful that this discussion will open dialogue to pursue a more acceptable project, and on a positive note there appears to be consensus towards a mixed use project at the heart of Carmel Valley.

Laura Copic motioned to direct the chair to send the EIR/PPA draft letter, seconded by Jill McCarty and unanimously approved (15-0)

Anne Harvey then motioned to direct the chair to complete the DEIR letter before May 29 taking comments into consideration, seconded by Debbir LoKanc and unanimously approved (15-0).

Laura thanked the board members and Jad Hudson that worked on the letter.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEEING REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Subcommittee	Representative	Report	Next Meeting
Regional Issues & Design Review	Harvey, Jan Fuchs	None	None noted
FBA	White	None	None noted
MAD	Rick Newman	None	None noted
MAD N 10	Copic	None	None noted
MAD PHR	Ranu	None	None noted
Bylaws/Elections/Policies/Procedures	Clews	None	None noted
Community Concourse	White	None	None noted
Trails	Harvey (Copic, alternate to LPCP CAC)	None	None noted
CVREP	Clews	None	None noted
San Dieguito River Park	Harvey	None	None noted
Prop 'C' phasing/SR-56 Steering Committee	Ranu	None	None noted
CPC	Moore	None	None noted
Signage	John Dean	None	None noted
Redistricting	Rick Newman	None	None noted

CHAIR'S REPORT

None.

OLD/ONGOING BUSINESS

None.

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, 28 May 2012, 7 p.m., Carmel Valley Library

ADJOURNMENT

The board adjourned at 10:20PM.

ACTION ITEMS

None.