

CARMEL VALLEY COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD
Meeting Minutes
7 pm, Thursday, June 22, 2023

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE

Board Member	Representing	Present	Absent	Absence (Board Year)
Jeffery Heden	CV Voting District 1	X		
Barry Schultz, Vice Chair	CV Voting District 2		X	2
VACANT	CV Voting District 3			
Debbie Lokanc	CV Voting District 4	X		0
Frisco White, Chair	CV Voting District 5	X		0
Breda Nicolas	CV Voting District 6	X		0
VACANT	CV/PHR Business			
Allen Kashani, Secretary	CV/PHR Developer	X		0
VACANT	CV/PHR Property Owner			
VACANT	CV/PHR Property Owner			
Michelle Strauss	PHR D1	X		0
Adam Fox	PHR D2		X	1
Vic Wintriss	Fairbanks Country Club/Via de la Valle/North City Subarea 2	X		0

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Jeffrey Heden motioned to approve the minutes as corrected, seconded by Vic Wintriss and the minutes were approved (7-0).

C. CONSENT AGENDA

None.

D. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION - Speakers are limited to topics not listed. Presentations are limited to 2 minutes or less.

None.

E. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Officer Briggs provided a report. Arrests have been made regarding burglaries and namely three arrests have been made since the report at the last Board meeting. The next surveillance meeting is Thursday, June 29 at 4:30PM.

F. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

G. COMMUNITY PLANNER REPORT - Lesley Henegar, City of San Diego (CV / PHR / Fairbanks CC / Via de la Valle)

No report.

H. COUNCIL DISTRICT 1 REPORT – Emily Lynch, Office of Councilmember LaCava

Emily Lynch provided a report. Councilmember Joe LaCava is co-hosing a town hall meeting Wed June 28 5-7PM. Registration for the town hall meeting can be made by contacting Emily.

I. MAYOR’S REPORT - Emily Platanesi, Office of Mayor Gloria

Emily Platanesi provided a report. The fiscal year 2024 budget of \$5B has passed. A comprehensive shelter strategy to address homelessness and capacity citywide was considered in the budget. It was also noted that an unsafe camping ordinance was passed June 14 preventing camping in certain public areas.

J. COUNTY SUPERVISOR’S REPORT – Office of Supervisor Lawson-Remer

No report.

K. STATE ASSEMBLY REPORT – Mark Manning, Office of Assembly Member Brian Maienschein

Mark Manning provided a report. AB781 regarding emergency evacuation of pets was mentioned. A Senior Scam Stopper event is being held at the Ed Brown Senior Center on July 19 2-4PM (in-person and virtual). Contact Mark for more info.

L1. STATE SENATE REPORT – Cole Reed, Office of State Senator Toni Atkins

No report.

L2. STATE SENATE REPORT – Aurora Livingston, Office of State Senator Catherine Blakespear

No report.

M. US CONGRESS – Priscilla Huang, Office of US Congressman Scott Peters

No report.

N. INFORMATION AGENDA:

1. PHR Branch Library: Project status update at major points of construction as needed.
 - Applicants - Zina Rummani, City of San Diego

No report.

O. Action Agenda

1. Carmel Grove and Carmel Knolls Comfort Stations: Update and consideration of proposed comfort stations (restrooms) at Carmel Grove and Carmel Knolls Parks.

Emily Platanesi and Andy Fields presented. Emily noted that the City was using State grant funds for proposed park improvements and they will not be moving forward with the comfort station at Carmel Mission due to fit constraints, and instead those funds are being re-purposed to security and lighting at Carmel Knolls instead. However, the City is proceeding with comfort stations at Carmel Grove and Carmel Knolls. A new concession stand will be coming to Sage Canyon as well.

Andy Fields also shared history and noted that the City worked with the community between 2014-2016 on the Financing Plan which included the comfort stations and again in 2018. The comfort stations (which Andy clarified are basically bathrooms) were included as part of the scope of work in the Public Facilities Financing Plan and they have been following the plan as a guidebook, and the City wanted to be sure they spent to community expectations.

Chair White identified that the Board has new members that may not have been part of the original action by the Board. Debbie Lokanc identified that residents were against the comfort stations and that residents should know when bathrooms are being installed. However, Debbie noted that awareness has since been publicized. In contrast, Jeffrey Heden identified that 103 of 104 people that he surveyed were in favor of the comfort stations.

Michelle Strauss asked about maintenance for new facilities, and Andy responded that maintenance budget will be added.

Scott Flurry from the Stone Canyon community next to Carmel Knolls indicated that he was not aware of the comfort stations until two days ago in a newspaper article. Scott is asking for some more notice. Debbie Lokanc mentioned that she was not able to talk to the Stone Canyon community because that community is gated.

Chair White re-iterated that the train had already left the station when the Board approved the PFFP.

Steve Schumaker voiced support for the bathrooms but was concerned about excessive costs at \$2.2M. A City staff member identified that the \$2.2M amount includes other items such as ADA upgrades, design and other soft costs.

Another Stone Canyon resident expressed opposition with concerns for loitering and homeless activity. Additional residents from Stone Canyon expressed opposition to bathrooms.

A resident named Mary Ann from a subdivision next to Carmel Knolls requested funds to improve parking at Carmel Knolls.

Jeffrey Heden suggested that the City touch bases with the Police Department to see if they have any issues with comfort stations that exist in parks.

No action was taken on the items which were previously included in the Public Facilities Financing Plan reviewed by the Board between 2014-2018.

2. El Camino Real Assisted Living Facility (PTS 675732): Consider proposed A Conditional Use Permit, for development of a 104,363 SF assisted living facility on a 3.97 acres site, with 104 assisted living beds, 20 memory care beds and related facilities. A Site Development Permit for development on a premise with environmentally sensitive lands. A Neighborhood Use Permit for 2 ground signs at the El Camino Real driveway (1 for the church and 1 for the assisted living since it does not have street frontage).

•Applicants - Kathi Riser, Atlantis Group

A project data sheet with zoning information was handed out to the Board, along with conceptual drawings and other documents. Jake Rohe with the Development company PMB opened the presentation. Jake identified that an open house meeting was held the prior week and they have made as many concessions and modifications as they can. Jake explained that 80% of population expected to use the facility would come from within a 3-4 mile radius of the property; 80-year old population will double between now and 2040; and 17% of people between 75-84 are estimated to have Alzheimer's Disease. The proposed project would be for grandparents and parents, and they believe the proposed project is an essential part of the community.

Marcela Escobar then opened with a slide presentation and identified that about 20 people attended the open house meeting, along with Chair White who was noted as a silent observer who attended since he provided keys to the facility. Marcela identified that documents handed out to the Board include a Question and Answer document and Marcela began identifying the project location and showing some visual perspectives of the project.

Marcela indicated that the project complies with all development standards and no deviations are proposed. The church is 13.36 acres with assisted living at 3.97 acres, and

clustering was utilized to achieve the proposed project in compliance with density requirements.

Regarding traffic, Marcela identified that they have an adopted traffic study that follows requirements and the rules/regulations for traffic studies. Marcela added that there are no direct impacts to biological resources. It was also noted that the owners agree to work with the neighbors on construction noise.

The architect Marlo Cortez provided an overview of the architecture. Marlo noted that the applicant is complying with setback requirements. Adjacent to the Stallions Crossing properties to the South, the third floor is proposed to be set back 30-feet, with no access or balconies on that side. Glass windows would have some opacity as well in order to address privacy concerns. Chair White clarified that while the applicant is adjusting massing, density is not being impacted.

Regarding trees Marcela indicated that they have upsized all trees to specimen trees (it was noted that specimen trees are larger in maturity and typically come in wood boxes). The applicant is proposing to plant 215 trees total. Marcela reiterated from the last Board meeting that they would be happy to work with the community in the field with location of the trees.

It was noted that colors are toned down to have more dark organic natural colors despite the brightness of the presentation. Cross sections were provided to depict that excavation is being done as much as approximately 12-feet to reduce visual impact.

MHPA lands will be placed into a permanent preservation easement for wildlife, and that a Neighborhood Use Permit will be required for signage. It was also mentioned that California Coastal Commission permits are still needed. Regarding parking, 57 parking spaces are being provided vs 42 spaces required.

Marcela noted that a substantial portion of the meeting room at capacity was in support of the project, and called for supporters to raise their hands. Chair White asked if the residents lived in Carmel Valley and it was clear from verbal response that there was a significant presence of Carmel Valley Residents in support.

The applicant's traffic engineer Huang presented. It was noted that traffic conditions have not yet resumed pre-covid levels, so the applicant has factored the 2012 studies grown by 13%. For example, volumes today have not grown to 2019 levels. Huang identified that they studied horizon years and cumulative impacts. Marcela indicated that it is their feeling that the study overestimates traffic.

Regarding ingress/egress from and to El Camino Real, Huang mentioned that there is an existing 140-foot right turn (deceleration) lane on El Camino Real plus taper; and a 900-foot acceleration lane with a 660-foot taper northbound back onto El Camino Real. The existing access to the site would continue to be right-in and right-out. A traffic signal was considered but was not allowed due to warrants not being met, and also due to sight

distance requirements and curvature of the road. It was mentioned that trip generation during peak hours is approximately 9 trips in and 9 trips out during peak hour traffic.

It was noted that the River Park Joint Powers Authority (JPA) provided a letter expressing concerns about wildlife, biology and habitat. Marcela and Anna McPherson identified that they respectfully disagree with the letter. The project has a biological resources technical report looking at spring surveys with analysis and assessment, concluding that the project has no direct impacts. Mitigation for construction impacts are addressed in the report. Regarding the JPA concerns about wildlife corridor, Anna explained that the analysis identified that the wildlife corridor is outside of the footprint. Anna added that Appendix D includes analysis of flora and fauna, with no impact to resources since the project is proposed on the disturbed portion of the site. A conservation easement is proposed on the preservation area of the project. Visual effects are analyzed in the document that is available online. Anna mentioned that public review ends Monday June 26, at which the document will no longer be available online.

Chair White asked about public view from trail looking at property. Anna noted that the existing visual conditions shows a lot of development. Chair White also asked about a reduced alternative. Anna responded that CEQA requires that a reasonable range is analyzed to reduce or eliminate an impact. Because there is no visual impact, there is not a project to be reduced. An alternative to reduce construction impact was considered but rejected due to financial impact.

Breda Nicoles asked if bike lanes are being coordinated with the El Camino Real project bike lanes and Marcela responded with affirmation that the bike lanes are coordinated with the City Capital Engineering Projects Department.

Jeffrey Heden asked about relationship of levels to the Stallions Crossings homes and the applicant responded that the second and third stories are aligned with the ground floor of the Stallions Crossing homes, with 11-feet for each story floor-to-floor.

Debbie Lokanc asked about visual impact from street view. Anna noted that there is a visual effects chapter in the EIR.

Matthew Cunningham representing San Dieguito Community Alliance provided an organized presentation in opposition and provided a few handouts including a legal letter from CBM addressed to the Board. Issues identified include:

- Traffic and bike safety, including stopping distance
- Concerns of there not being a current traffic study
- No Vehicle Miles Traffic (VMT) study
- Emergency & Evacuation

Chair White asked Matthew for a brief summary of the CBM letter handed out to the Board and Matthew responded that the letter reiterates their concerns. Matthew also responded indicating land use and proposition A AR-1 Zone is their concern. Chair White

asked if the attorney was aware that the project is a discretionary action and Matthew responded affirmative. Matthew further read several of their concerns including compatibility with surrounding development, inadequate project description, traffic, implementation policies, framework plan, MSCP, noise impacts and fire related impacts. In summary Matthew identified that they assert the Supplemental EIR (SEIR) as being inadequate without sufficient mitigation. Vic Wintriss from the Board identified that the Board is not an attorney group and asked how is the Board supposed to decide on what the legal issues are? Marcela identified that the legal letters are standard practice and that the City will be responding to legal comments submitted as part of the public review process.

Chair White mentioned that at the open house meeting there was discussion about traffic, views, massing, and some trade-offs. Chair White asked based on the meeting what is the community asking for? Matthew identified that they are looking for reduction from three to two stories and for reduced massing; and they are also asking for a traffic study. It was noted during discussion that private views are not protected, whereas public views are protected.

Father Pakrad, pastor for the Armenian Church expressed support including care for neighborhood elderly.

A resident from Rose Cliffs Place expressed support expressing need for services for seniors, and the need to keep our community seniors nearby. Additional residents provided personal examples of need for continuing care for elderly, including issues with having to commute for care. A resident noted that she has not observed traffic issues at continuing care facilities.

Saul Allen, a resident since 2002 from Venetian Del Mar and a bicyclist expressed opposition including traffic and light pollution.

Joe Kellegian, who had served on the Solana Beach City Council and Mayor voiced support indicating that the property is following codes and there is a need for the proposed facility.

Victor Manoushakian, formerly on the Board spoke and called the project a gem and expressed support.

Nina John from Stallions Crossing along the project asked that the board seriously consider the concerns expressed by the opposition.

A resident identified that the applicant will propose a conditional use permit and the resident expressed concern that the land is supposed to be open space.

Sunny Delore from Stallions Crossing, while not opposed to senior living on the project, identified that she is concerned that for example the applicant has not addressed details about how the glass reflects. Chair White identified that while the opposition is not

opposed to the project he is not certain whether or not another meeting is going to make a difference.

Another Stallions Crossing resident commented that the project is not far enough back and not short enough.

John Wilson from Stallions Crossing, expressed concerns about safety and trucks, and that the project may be legal but is not right.

Harry Krikorian with the Church identified that they use the entry/exit regularly and they haven't experienced any problems, and he feels that lighting is not a problem at the Church.

A Stallions resident asked during Easter mass where is parking going to be provided. The applicant responded.

A Stallions Crossing resident expressed concerns where there is only one entry/exit, and to make the project more passionate and collaborative. It was noted by the applicant that there would be an operational plan for evacuation for the project.

Chair White explained that he is sensing that based on comments Stallions Crossing is not necessarily against the project but against some aspects, and Chair White asked if there is any ability to have another meeting and work the issues out, including massing more centrally to the project. The owner explained that licensing requirements would require type 3 construction for massing changes vs type 1 proposed, and that type 3 construction is not economically feasible. It was also noted that Stallions Crossing was initially opposed to locating the parking area on the south side. It was indicated by Chair White that a design charette would probably result in the same project proposed today, and the "line in the sand" is what is proposed.

After discussion Vic Wintriss motioned to approve the project, with a second by Allen Kashani expressing intention to add conditions to the motion. At this point the Board began discussing issues for consideration including massing, traffic, noise, light pollution. It was mentioned that noise and light pollution would be covered in the SEIR.

During discussion of the motion, the Board expressed concerns for traffic safety at the ingress/egress intersection and identified desire to condition the approval based on request that the applicant pursue the following in order of priority: 1) a traffic signal at the entry intersection as a first option; 2) if a traffic signal will not be allowed by the City provide traffic calming at the intersection to address entry/exit traffic safety issues; 3) if priority 1 & 2 cannot be done then lengthen the deceleration lane. Additionally, the Board discussed need to add that the applicant shall further explore alternative options for emergency vehicle access separate from project ingress/egress. Jeffrey Heden added that he would like to see some proof that solutions are approved, and it was suggested that the applicant shall return to the Board to identify solutions that they were able to achieve

with the City. Breda Nicolas added her intention to abstain given she has not had time to review the legal letter presented by opposition.

Chair White originally expressing desire to vote against, added that he would like to see some more building massing compatible to the neighborhood to transition from residential to commercial. Chair White indicated that he was considering changing his vote with the addition of a condition to have further study to reduce building massing at the south side.

Vic Wintriss accepted the request by the Board to approve the project conditioned on request that the applicant and City pursue the following in order of priority: 1) a traffic signal at the entry intersection as a first option; 2) if a traffic signal will not be allowed by the City provide traffic calming at the intersection to address entry/exit traffic safety issues; 3) if priority 1 & 2 cannot be done then lengthen the deceleration lane; the applicant shall further explore alternative options for emergency vehicle access separate from project ingress/egress; the applicant shall further study to reduce building massing at the south side; and the applicant shall return to the Board with conclusions of all the above. The motion passed (5-1-1).

3. Traffic Light in N10: Accept the submission of additional information as requested by the board in March to consider request of the neighborhood to install a traffic light at the intersection of Carmel Country Road and Derrydown Lane.

•Applicants - Mark Goldberg

After discussion, the Board approved the installation of the traffic light at the intersection of Carmel Country Road and Derrydown Lane. The motion was approved 5-0-0. It was noted that the Board did not consider the relocation or removal of existing signals.

P. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

Q. CHAIR'S REPORT

None.

R. OLD / ONGOING BUSINESS

None.

S. ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at approximately midnight.

T. NEXT MEETING:

Thursday, July 27, 2023, 7 pm Location Carmel Valley Library

Note: MAD meetings are on the first Tuesday of the month in February, April, June, September, November, and December at the Carmel Valley Recreation Center 4:30PM.