



**General Plan
Advisory Committee**
April 11, 2011 | 6:00 – 9:00 pm
Community Center

MEETING #7 SUMMARY

I. Introduction

The Encinitas General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) held its seventh meeting on April 11, 2011. Daniel Iacofano of MIG, Inc. facilitated the session. City staff managing the General Plan update project and members of the consulting team were also present.

The meeting began with introductions of participants and an overview of the evening. The minutes from the previous meeting were approved with one minor comment from Beth Hergesheimer on the extent to which school playing fields are used for recreational purposes.

Daniel presented an overview of the project schedule to date and confirmation that the project is on track for completion by the end of 2011. Following this, Daniel presented a debrief of the March 28 public workshop, sharing that the meeting was very well attended, that the community gave great feedback, and that there were only a few issues where the team felt additional input was needed.

II. Summary Notes from Discussion

The following is a summary of the notes from the GPAC discussion. The discussion is organized according to topic area discussed with the verbalized GPAC comments summarized for brevity.

Recreation

Policy issue discussed: *“Address unmet demand for sports and ball fields and other facilities for active recreation.”*

GPAC feedback:

- The word “unmet” may need more context for people to fully understand the intent of the policy and should be reframed to clarify a need to track and respond to future needs or to consider a hypothetical condition
- There is likely concern that the policy will not be followed or supported by the City

- Aging and the needs of the aging may not be reflected in this policy, leading to reduced support or confusion
- Regarding the new proposed language, may need to add specifics about the types of impacts that should be addressed or replace the proposed language with new language about developing standards
 - These standards would include language about meeting community character
 - This language may need language about meeting needs of the market
 - This language may also need to be supported by a policy supporting the continued joint use of recreational facilities with schools

Policy issue discussed: *“Remove the existing Ecological Resource/Open Space/Park (ER/OS/PK) designation and create two new, separate land use designations: Park (PK) and Ecological Resource/Open Space (ER/OS).”*

GPAC feedback:

- Might be easier to designate “parks” now, rather than later
- Three designations to designate resource areas, open space (with light recreational uses such as trails), and parks would make and be easier to understand
- Similarly, “light park” might work
- Designate each park area with a sensitivity level of I – III

Public Safety

Policy issues discussed: *“Monitor and regularly assess sea level rise and associated vulnerability of infrastructure and public and private property, and identify strategies for responding to vulnerabilities (such as raising the ground floor level near inundation areas)” and “Establish a program to determine the effects of different sea level rise scenarios and develop adaptation strategies.”*

GPAC feedback:

- Might be concern about spending City resources on a distant, vague hazard – do not see an immediate need
- Might be concern about property value loss
- Like the new, suggested policies – very clear

Policy issue discussed: *“Take a proactive approach to ensure that existing buildings meet appropriate seismic thresholds”.*

GPAC feedback:

- Suggestion to exclude historic buildings (such as the Olivenhein community building) due to the effects on historic character of retrofitting activities
- Concern that third suggested policy is too vague, or unnecessary, and could be clearer
- Question about whether monitoring existing structures for structural safety should be applied to public buildings only, unreinforced masonry, or all buildings
- The original, broad text might be better

Policy issue discussed: *“Regularly monitor and assess vulnerabilities related to climate change.”*

GPAC feedback:

- Regarding hazards to monitor: add language about land movement
- Suggest making abatement district for public structures only
- Suggest broadening abatement district to cover existing hazards, not just new ones
- Broaden temporary shelters to include all extreme weather events, not just extreme heat events

Resource Management

Policy issue discussed: *“Use the Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan and the subarea plan for the City as a guiding documents when updating biological policies in the General Plan.”*

GPAC feedback:

- Suggestion to add a policy that refers to the migratory bird treaty to reinforce enforcement of federal law.

Policy issue discussed: *Agriculture preservation.*

GPAC feedback:

- General support for policies

Circulation

Policy issue discussed: *Mult-modal Level of Service policies.*

GPAC feedback:

- Really like Place-based Circulation Classification System
- Suggest using alternate terminology for “highway”
- Suggest adding “equestrians” to modes for Olivenhein
- Concern that not everyone in the community will want reduced LOS

- Need to remember that safety is important
- Also, many design solutions will improve traffic flow, alternative mode LOS, and safety
- Add a policy about having adequate pedestrian facilities for all school zones within City and/or for safe routes to schools
- Need to consider that allowing congestion to increase may increase air pollution
- Need to add policy language to clarify benefits of reduced LOS and that those benefits are the reason for the reduced LOS (reword policies to reflect benefit-outcome)
- Note that ITS has reduced congestion/delays in San Marcos by 45%
- Concern that widening peak hour will eventually lead to 24 hour congestion

Land Use & Community Design

Policy issue discussed: *Community character and image surveys.*

GPAC feedback:

- Policy about zero front setbacks/minimal front setbacks should be clarified that intent is for commercial only, not residential, and focus areas only, not city-wide
- Want General Plan to provide some incentives so City gets additional benefits/amenities, such as plazas
- Like lots of foliage to soften buildings and concrete and want General Plan to have policies addressing such
- Would like to include pocket parks in change areas
- Suggest developing a landscape view ordinance for various communities, such as Cardiff, so neighbors can compromise on impacted views

III. EIR Project Alternatives

City staff gave an overview of the EIR alternatives process that will be initiated.

IV. Next Steps

The information and discussion at GPAC Meeting #7 will inform the completion of the draft General Plan Update. The next public workshop will be July 19th. Also, there will be a City Council session on the General Plan update in May.

IV. Public Comments

At the end of the meeting, one member of the public in attendance commented that any view ordinance suggested for the City is unlikely to work and that the City could look to Del Mar as to what not to do. Additionally, he commented that he does not like the suggested LOS reductions as the intersections are already close to failing and that there is no way any of these intersections could possibly accommodate additional density.

Mike Strong, from the City, commented that the City now has an online forum/blog and would like GPAC members to provide some content, comments, or feedback.