



General Plan Advisory Committee
February 23, 2011 | 6:00 pm
Community and Senior Center

MEETING #6 SUMMARY

I. Introduction

The Encinitas General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) held its sixth meeting on February 23, 2010 at the Community and Senior Center.

The role of the GPAC is to advise City of Encinitas staff and consultants over the course of the General Plan Update process and provide on-going feedback to the groups they represent. Daniel Iacofano of MIG, Inc., Matt Raimi of Raimi & Associates and Dave Sorenson of Kimley-Horn & Associates facilitated the meeting with City staff in attendance (Patrick Murphy, Diane Langager and Mike Strong).

Patrick Murphy welcomed the GPAC and began the meeting by congratulating members reaching the half-way point in the CGPU process. Significant progress has been made and the project remains on schedule. Mr. Murphy also introduced new members of the GPAC. Peter Curry will be representing Leucadia 101 Mainstreet Association, Morgan Mallory will represent Cardiff 101 Mainstreet, and Janet McCullough will represent the real estate industry.

Mr. Iacofano reviewed the meeting agenda for the evening (February 23, 2011). The main goals of the meeting were to get GPAC feedback on issues and policy considerations that will be addressed in some of the General Plan elements.

II. Review of Land Use and Discussion

Daniel Iacofano provided a summary overview of what has occurred at GPAC, workshops, and Council meetings regarding the identified focus areas and potential land use changes.

Prior to their December 2010 meeting, City staff provided GPAC members a facilitation map for Santa Fe Avenue, Encinitas Blvd. and El Camino Real conveying “marked-up” potential land use changes within focus area boundaries. The idea was to get GPAC members thinking what these areas may look like in the year 2035 and if and where land use changes may be appropriate for further evaluation. GPAC members subsequently discussed the areas and incorporated workshop feedback into potential land use options in preparation of the January 26, 2011 City Council work session.

At their January 26, 2011 meeting, the City Council discussed and provided direction on the proposed land uses for the identified focus areas. The consultant team provided an overview of Council's discussion. The impact of Council's preliminary direction does not constitute approval, but will assist staff and the consultant team to develop the foundation for a draft preferred land use alternative for the City. As the CGPU proceeds, there will be additional opportunities to identify new issues and evaluate land use options. As the process continues, staff will work to ensure that issues are not overlooked and opportunities and constraints are fully analyzed. A final preferred land use alternative will emerge after the community's consideration of alternatives and trade-offs (mid to late 2011).

III. Policy Discussion

The consultant team facilitated a discussion on issues and policy considerations that will be addressed in some of the General Plan elements (e.g. recreation, resource management, public safety, and transportation and traffic. GPAC members provided the following comments in preparation of the March 28, 2011 Citywide Public Workshop.

Recreation:

- Children don't have places to play like they used to when the City incorporated. The City is much more built out.
- Development impact fees that are tied to a project should go to that neighborhood, or recreational improvements should be made onsite or close to new projects.
- Address water use in parks.
- The City should continue to explore different ways to get schools involved in providing recreational areas. If the opportunity was there, neighbors wouldn't have to travel to go to a park. Joint-use arrangements provide benefits to schools and public.
- Multi-use parks – design parks so they can have more than one use or adapt to changing needs.
- Address the long term maintenance of park lands. No diversion. If the park space is part of a development project, require the benefit (improvements) to be built first. If park lands are dedicated; create a long term plan for its operation and maintenance.
- Address community gardening.
- Address sand replenishment on our beaches.

Resource Management (open space and conservation):

- Review and update the City's efforts to address and achieve reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Evaluate targets vs. levels.
- Find ways to educate people and businesses about what energy-efficient and cost-saving programs are out there.
- Green building benefits could be misleading (sustainable return on investment: monthly costs vs. total cost of ownership). Don't forget about net present value, initial rate of return, and discounted payback period.
- Address rainwater capture systems as a way to reduce and reuse water.

- When discussing the Climate Action Plan or greenhouse reduction strategies, break down what MMTCO₂ is to the average person. For example, give people something to relate to so they can understand.
- Address reclaimed water. There should also be improvements to reclaimed water for agricultural use (reduce salinity).

Public Safety:

- There was some discussion from the GPAC on whether or not the General Plan should address sea level rise.
- Consider the different looks (aesthetic treatment) to bluff stability.

Transportation:

- Agree with level of service (LOS) tradeoffs discussion to maintain character and not widen roadways or blow out intersections.
- Streetscape improvements should address pedestrians.
- Buses may not work as mass transit as gas prices increase. Keep transit sustainable (and convenient) and consider electronic trolley system like Portland, OR.
- Shuttle system should include coast and Manchester Avenue, near Mira Costa College, churches and senior living.
- The freeway divides the City AND creates a barrier to east-west travel. There are few options to cross. Need to recreate freeway thinking; additionally, the interchanges are a problem.
- Railroad is also a barrier.
- The LOS standard is used consistently throughout the City. Should the standard be different in other communities or neighborhoods? All streets are not created equal.
- Traffic congestion leads to idling, wasted gas and increased emissions. There is also a lot of searching for parking spaces. Consider a parking structure off of the freeway at Encinitas Blvd. We do not have good mass transit, but all of the transit station parking lots are always full, which impacts passenger parking availability and reduces the convenience of potential riders.
- Consider priority parking for electric vehicles.
- When you charge for parking there is a disincentive to use transit or to park-and-ride.
- Prioritize buses and high-occupancy cars/vehicles.
- Facilitate iCarpool with education.
- On major roadways, not all cars are moving at the same speeds. Keep arterials clear.
- Transportation encourages jobs to locate here.
- LOS – characterize when it's appropriate or when it could be acceptable to change the LOS standard. (Peak period or hour failure vs. the rest of the day.)
- In terms of preserving the community character of our roadways, calming measures are generally opposed to emergency responders like the Fire Department. The General Plan needs to address emergency response

requirements to find a solution to not lower safety but still have good design goals.

- Address alleys as an opportunity. They are poorly maintained. Make it so the alleys are used.
- You can improve LOS with adaptive controls such as a dynamic model that feeds “live” information to the traffic system to help traffic signal coordination.
- One common thing that was heard throughout the update process was to keep the character of our neighborhoods. Traffic policies must support that.
- Think outside of the box. Encourage job growth here to reduce commuting.
- Serve east Encinitas with bus service.
- There is a disjointed transportation corridor. Transportation systems need the right mix. The City should network and partner with NCTD to improve accessibility with faster and safer service and shorter trips to destinations.

Other discussion points:

1. How are “the arts” going to be addressed in the General Plan?

Staff response: Art and culture goals, policies and objectives would be addressed in the Land Use and Community Character Element. Staff also noted that art policies could be addressed throughout the General Plan in a number of elements.

2. In general, is visitor-serving commercial more restrictive than commercial zoning?

Staff response: Commercial zoning allows visitor serving uses as well as other office and retail uses. However, preliminary land use discussion is focused on allowing visitor-serving commercial above general commercial. The proposal is not intended to take away from existing retail and office uses. Regarding the need for more lodging, the City’s market assessment shows support for boutique lodging. Furthermore, visitor-serving commercial facilities are assigned priority under the Coastal Act. Since the City has few visitors serving commercial designated properties west of Highway 101, the Coastal Commission will ensure that increasing lodging opportunities for coastal visitors and promoting access to the City’s beaches are both adequately addressed in the updated General Plan and Local Coastal Program submittal to Coastal Commission.