

*General Plan Advisory Committee
October 3, 2011 | 6:00 pm
Community and Senior Center*

MEETING #8 SUMMARY

I. Introduction

The Encinitas General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) held its eighth meeting on October 3, 2011 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. facilitated the meeting with City staff in attendance (Patrick Murphy, Diane Langager, Mike Strong and Gus Vina).

Mr. Iacofano reviewed the meeting agenda for the evening. The draft General Plan was released for public comment on September 1, 2011 and celebrated the release at a citywide open house (workshop) on September 19, 2011. The main goals of the October 3, 2011 GPAC meeting were to provide an overview of the draft General Plan and get GPAC feedback on key issues that are being heard about the draft policy document.

City staff is developing an expanded outreach effort in the next few months that will include many public events that will encourage public participation. The City Council is also asking various city commissions/committees to review the draft chapters and/or sections that relates to them and provide input.

II. Overview of Draft General Plan

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. Mr. Iacofano also provided an overview of the draft policy document, including a discussion of the following:

- Overriding policy imperatives;
- Element structure overview;
- Element goals; and
- What's new

III. Identify Key Issues and Questions

Staff briefly covered some of comments received from the September 19, 2011 workshop. Staff noted that comments received covered many topics - highlighting both major and minor themed issues.

GPAC members were asked to review comments and provide any additional comments or key issues being heard about the draft General Plan. The following represents a summary of the GPAC member comments.

1. Peter Kohl feels barking dogs need to be addressed in Noise Element.
2. John Eldon noted that when the policy document uses “encourage” verses “shall” it weakens the policy. When the words “shall” or “must” are used, they represent a statutory or other legal requirement. “Encourage” or “should” is less rigid and the word “should” indicates a recommendation. There may be instances where this should change in the draft policy document. Morgan Mallory concurs and thinks that staff should go through and use “shall”.
3. Gene Chapo spoke of his concerns with analysis of SANDAG and state mandated numbers for regional housing needs. How do we accommodate the high density residential in focus areas? There is a misunderstanding to why the draft General Plan is only looking to increase density in certain areas. Mr. Chapo asked if the city can achieve the numbers in another way, like in other areas. For example: increasing density from R-3 to R-5 in certain areas.
4. Gene Chapo also indicated that cars will still dominate the roadway in the year 2035 and spoke of his concern that the Circulation Element is not analyzing it in the same way. Seems to be fuzzy - circulation and intersection analysis is different in how roads will be actually used. Will the document be legally defensible?
5. Morgan Mallory identified the constriction point (only two lanes) at the Santa Fe Avenue/I-5 Freeway undercrossing as a concern. How does this pinch point affect the current thinking on increasing density in this area? Bart Smith stated that the Freeway underpass at Santa Fe Avenue needs to be widened.
6. Derrick Marow noted that walkability and access around school areas needs to be addressed. Mr. Marow stated that Safe Routes to School policy language is not strong enough and there should be more support for walking and biking accommodations. Peter Kohl said that there needs to be better education and awareness for safe biking.
7. John Gjata spoke on the role that the General Plan wording has on driving issues. How does the General Plan develop regulation? Geoff Wing feels the document

- needs to be flexible; it cannot be overly restrictive, i.e., use discernment with the use of “shall” verses “encourage”. Things that are important should say “shall”.
8. Virginia Felker has been hearing the need for higher (above 3 stories) for land uses on El Camino Real, which might be appropriate depending on context/location. It may not make economic sense for some property owners to redevelop at 2-3 stories.
 9. Patricia Klaus stated that emergency response times within the community of Olivenhain are important. Ms. Klaus noted that Public Safety Element, Policy 1.1 seems unnecessary and not sure that it is needed as a policy. Policy 1.6 calls for the city to update level of emergency service standards; however, what will we strive for as an average response time?
 10. Lee Vance indicated that not everyone has been using consistent terms, language, or nomenclature. The city should develop definition of terms – goal, policy, criteria, standards, etc.
 11. Julian Duval wants to make sure visitor serving amenities are covered in the plan.
 12. JoAnn Shannon is interested in getting facts about mixed use and if it is successful in Encinitas. For example, it would be good to have some information on Pacific Station and the Lofts at Moonlight Beach, i.e., are the units selling. This might effect the discussion of density in the General Plan, which may or may not support mixed use.
 13. John Gjata stated that the policy of the current administration should drive “shall” vs. “should” policy language.
 14. Gene Chapo indicated there is some R-30 and mixed use concerns. This might be due to not an understanding of what this type of project might look like. General Plan should mandate new design review guidelines and articulate standards for these types of projects (to control building design, bulk, and mass).
 15. Eric Larson noted that local growers have comments on the draft plan. Growers felt that they are singled out. Some policies read like an ordinance, such as, soil contamination. Also, the General Plan seems to value food production over floriculture. Food production is not profitable. Mr. Larson also indicated that farm workers are employed 12 months out of the year and live in the community as part of the existing housing stock; the need for farm working housing is limited to nonexistent.
 16. Morgan Mallory identified the need to address policies on soil contamination; but understands the concern of the policy being too regulatory (like an ordinance).

17. Geoff Wing asked how many comments of a particular type result in draft policy changes.
18. Donna DiBenedetto wants to ensure that performing, literary, and visual arts are appropriately covered in the update. Ms. DiBenedetto also spoke of the high concentration of artists living in the community and the need for a place to perform or display art (e.g. performing arts theater).

IV. Remaining Outreach and Next Steps

Staff discussed the role of GPAC members during the public review process. For those GPAC members serving on city commission or committees, the City Council is asking them to review draft chapters and/or sections that relate to them during their upcoming meetings. The following feedback was received relative to various Commissions/Committees review of the draft General Plan:

- Senior Commission – Land Use, Housing, Public Health, Circulation (transportation).
- Environmental Commission – Land Use, Resource Management, Circulation, Public Health.
- Youth Commission – Park and Recreation, Public Health, Circulation.
- Park and Recreation Commission – Park and Recreation, Resource Management, Public Health, Land Use.
- Arts Commission – Land Use, Park and Recreation.
- Cultural Tourism Committee– Land Use, Park and Recreation
- Traffic Commission – Circulation.

V. Public Comment:

Mike Andreen asked for clarification on the difference between regulatory versus policy language. Mr. Andreen also spoke of concerns about changing any general plan amendment related voting requirements.

Tony Kranz would like a redlining of the original general plan showing the changes. Mr. Kranz also spoke of his concerns for completely replacing an old, but good, document.

Julie Graboi indicated that she has some concerns over the methodology used in various surveys administered by the city. (She has a list of ten concerns, which will be provided to staff at a later time.) The processed being used has not brought out the true sentiment of the community. Ms. Graboi asked about the consultant's experience and noted that there are some concerns with administering a student survey without asking for parent permission.

Derrick Marow noted that the San Dieguito union High School District gave notification to the parents of the survey being conducted.

Donna Westbrook asked city staff to provide a cd of the existing General Plan at all future outreach events and advertise that the 1989 policy document that is being thrown away. Ms. Westbrook wants redlining of original General Plan.

Duff Pickering noted that lots of people in the New Encinitas area is just learning about this plan and the planning process. Need extra effort to get New Encinitas community involved. Providing enhanced visualization of mixed use design might help people to better understand it.