

Concerns and requests emailed to the Carlsbad City Council, Planning and Parks Commissions; and California Coastal Commission

Item #4 – Provided a survey of San Pacifico Community Association on community concerns and requests of the City regarding developers' proposed development of last remaining vacant portions of our Coastal Planned Community's [Ponto] Planning Area F by Shopoff, and Planning Areas G & H

Emailed on 12/5/2017, 2/19/2018, and 3/6/18 to: council@carlsbadca.gov; mike.pacheco@carlsbadca.gov; Don.Neu@carlsbadca.gov; manager@carlsbadca.gov; chris.hazeltine@carlsbadca.gov; gbuhr@coastal.ca.gov; Erin.Prahler@coastal.ca.gov;

Copy:

Jim Nardi jimn8916@gmail.com ; WILLIAM VAN CLEVE billvanclave@prodigy.net ; Avril van Zyl vanzyl.aakc@live.com ; Tony Ruffolo tonyruffolo616@gmail.com ; Chas Wick chaswick@reagan.com ; jeanscamp@yahoo.com ; sebbiessixpack@att.net ; Lance Schulte meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net ; Lee Leibenson lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com

Dear Carlsbad City Council, Planning Commission and Planning Staff; and California Coastal Commission Staff

The following is being submitted by the San Pacifico Community Association Ponto Beachfront Development Review Committee. The Committee is composed of about 20 citizens and is charged by the San Pacifico Community Association with identifying and communicating Community consensus on proposed development in our Ponto Community. We would appreciate receiving a reply; and if you have any questions regarding its contents please contact the following committee members at:

Jean Camp: jeanscamp@yahoo.com
Michael Sebahar: sebbiessixpack@att.net
Lance Schulte: meyers-schulte@sbcglobal.net
Gail Norman: gnorman_ca@yahoo.com
John Gamma: Johngama99@gmail.com

Copy:

Lee Leibenson: lleibenson@waltersmanagement.com
Jim Nardi: jtnardi1@msn.com

Subject: Shopoff Ponto West and Ponto East land use planning and development permit applications - 1st application submittal 5/1/15 - GPA-15-01, MP-175 (L), LCPA-15-03, HMP-15-04, MS-15-02 & MS-15-03, CT-15-02 & CT-15-03, PUD-15-07 & PUD-15-08, SDP-15-08, CDP-15-14 & CDP-15-15; and 2nd application submittal 4/20/17 - MP-16-01, LCAP-16-02 amend 2017-01, HMP-15-04 & HMP-16-02, MS-16-02, CT-16-03, PUD-16-01 & PUD-16-02, SDP-16-02, CDP-16-07 & CDP-16-08

The San Pacifico Community Association requests the community desires expressed in the following survey from our Community meeting on May 3rd be entered into the public record for the above planning applications, and any subsequent City and California Coastal Commission planning applications for the properties East and West of Ponto Road and North of Avenida Encinas [Shopoff option site]. The

San Pacifico Community Association is the majority property association in the Poinsettia Shores Planned Community [Poinsettia Shores Master Plan and Local Coastal Program] of which the properties East and West of Ponto Road and North of Avenida Encinas [Shopoff option site] are also apart. The Community consensus does not think the above proposed land use planning and development permit applications are compatible with the established lower density land use, lower development intensity, building height and mass, and character of our Coastal Planned Community and the Coastal Act, requirement that development be "visually compatible with the character of the surrounding area."

We wish the City would utilize a Community based planning approach vs. a developer driven and focused process to develop that last remaining vacant Coastal land in South Carlsbad.

The Community survey: On May 3rd, a San Pacifico Community meeting was held and approximately 200 citizens from San Pacifico attended. A Shopoff representative was invited and attended. The meeting provided summary information about the current planning processes and the two developers' proposals. Some paper surveys were available and about 60 were completed and returned that evening. Those unable to get a paper survey were able to complete an almost identical survey on-line at www.pontolocals.com. About 90 more surveys were completed on-line. The following tabulates both survey results.

Ponto East and Ponto West - Shopoff questions – May 3, 2017

1. **DWELLING DENSITY:** The area East of Ponto Road is now zoned R-23 (15 dwelling units per acre minimum to 23 dwelling units per acre maximum), not including State affordable housing density bonus:
 - Shopoff is proposing 137 dwellings on 6.5 net acres (= 21 dwelling units/acre)
 - Potentially with additional dwellings for an affordable housing density bonus

Should Shopoff's proposed density be reduced closer to the 15 dwelling an acre minimum as per the General Plan?

148/156 = yes = 95%

8/156 = no = 5%

2. **HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS:** currently proposed on the East side of Ponto Road are:
 - 40 feet high (3 story)
 - These buildings would be the tallest along the SW Carlsbad coast
 - Commercial buildings like hotels are limited to 35 feet tall
 - The building heights for the Poinsettia Shores Planned Community [which San Pacifico is majority of the development and the Shopoff and Kam Sang proposals are minor developments] limits building heights to 30-35 feet.
 - All San Pacifico residential buildings except Satalina [35 feet tall] are no taller than 30 feet and must have a minimum 3/12 roof pitch

- The Ponto Beachfront Village Vision Plan that provides additional development guidance for the Shopoff proposed development specifically calls this area the “townhomes” area and shows 2-story [under 30 feet] townhomes as the ‘vision’ for the site.

Should the Shopoff proposed 3-story and 40 feet building heights be reduced to 2-story and/or no taller than 30-35 feet maximum to be consistent with the vision and more compatible with the Poinsettia Shores and San Pacifico community?

157/162 = yes = 97%

5/162 = no = 3%

3. **BUILDING INTENSITY:** The Shopoff proposed stack flat residential buildings have underground parking to allow more land use intensity and building mass. The proposed buildings run in a fairly contiguous cluster west of the railroad right-of-way from Avenida Encinas north to Ponto Storage.
 - Shopoff’s proposed residential square footage [not including any balconies, private recreation or ancillary buildings] is 247,100 square feet total in 3 stories at 40 feet high.
 - For reference the Carlsbad Costco building is about 115,500 square feet in 1 story at 35 feet high. So Shopoff’s proposed residential building footprint is approximately 72% of the Carlsbad Costco, though it would be 5 feet higher than Costco.

Is Shopoff’s proposed building intensity compatible with San Pacifico and the Poinsettia Shores Community and appropriate?

149/159 = no = 94%

10/159 = yes = 6%

Should Shopoff place story poles on-site to show and photo document the proposed building mass?

146/155 = yes = 94%

9/155 = no = 6%

4. **THE BEACHFRONT VILLAGE COMMERCIAL SITE:** west of Ponto Drive proposes some design issues that may be of concern:
 - A driveway entrance/exit along Avenida Encinas will make pedestrian/bike travel to the beach less safe.
 - The site is proposed to filled with soil to lift the ground level at Coast Highway 9 feet higher and buildings put upon this higher ‘building pad’
 - The proposed building designs and material qualities may be of concern
 - A proposed grassy park-like ‘common area’ that can be used by customers and community may connect with the City’s land and planned trail under Coast Highway [Carlsbad Boulevard]

A. Should a driveway if needed be on Avenida Encinas or on Coast Highway?

68/108 = Coast Highway = 63%
56/98 = Ponto Road = 57%
22/108 = Avenida Encinas = 20%
4/59 = Both = 7%
3/59 = Neither = 5%

B. Should the site be filled 9 feet or to what height?

108/152 = no = 71%
14/152 = yes = 9%
30/152 = not sure = 20%

C. Are the proposed building design and qualities sufficient to be the commercial and community heart of the Ponto Beachfront Village? Suggestions?

31/43 = No = 72%
4/43 = yes = 9%
8/43 = did not respond = 19%

D. Is the proposed 'common area' desirable? If so, do you prefer seating, grass area, trail, or other?

102/150 = yes = 68%
29/150 = no = 19%
23/150 = don't know = 15%

36/91 = Grassy area = 39.6%
31/91 = Trail = 34.1%
17/91 = Other = 18.7%
16/91 = skipped = 17.6%
7/91 = Seating = 7.7%

5. **THE POINSETTIA SHORES MASTER PLAN** and Local Coastal Program require prior to any land use change on the Shopoff site [approximately 10 net acres] a documented evaluation of making the East of Ponto Drive site recreation facilities (i.e. "public park"), or lower cost beach visitor accommodations.
- Since 2012 the San Pacifico, Ponto and entire Southwest quadrant of Carlsbad have been in a Park standard deficient [not meeting the City's minimum 3 acres of Park per 1,000 population City Growth Management Program Standard].
 - In 2015 our Southwest quadrant needed 6.6 acres of new City Park to comply with Growth Management Standards.

Should the Shopoff East site [or portion of the site] be: (circle one or more, give examples)

1. Recreational,

2. Lower cost visitor accommodations,

3. Residential, or

4. Visitor serving commercial/recreation uses?

5. Other

140/155 = Park/recreational = 92%

27/155 = Visitor serving commercial & recreation = 17%

6/155 = Residential = 4%

2/155 = Lower cost visitor accommodations = 1%

6. **PARKING:** There is not a lot of excess or extra parking in the current Shopoff proposal and this will not be a "Gated" community. Concerns have been raised regarding vacation rental by owner (VRBO) and beach access parking in this new development.

- Parking in this area is already a problem on weekends and during the summer
- Additional residential units and VRBO will make this problem worse

A. Should Shopoff modify their development plans to accommodate more parking for potential VRBO parking in their development? Yes ___ or No ___.

125/160 = yes = 78%

23/160 = no = 15%

B. Have you experienced problems with VRBO and parking in your neighborhood and if so, explain.

79/139 = no = 57%

38/139 = yes = 27%

22/139 = did not respond = 16%

C. What parking solutions would you propose?

Following are the replies, it appears a good study to define the needed parking supply and design solution to assure sufficient parking is desired.

- Require city standards or adhere to city vision plan.
- A professional parking study should be conducted that evaluates the current and future PUBLIC parking demands, before it is a daily problem.
- A reasonably priced parking lot/structure.
- All new buildings must have sufficient parking planned onsite.
- Amble parking within Shopoff plans to cover daily business transactions, new homeowners, and beach parking which will inevitably be in that area.
- angled parking on street, underground parking
- Below ground parking garages

- Eliminate the proposed development.
- I propose that the city better address the vacation rental issue.
- I really do favor angled parking on Ponto as an alternative, regardless of the VRBO issue.
- I think underground would be ideal, however, what about water drainage and flooding being close to the water. Would homeless people make it a new home?
- I think VRBO and AirBnb needs to be addressed like it is in our community CC&Rs. They should not allow Vacation rentals for no less than 30 days minimum. Maybe even give them stricter rules. As for parking, the city needs to regulate the people who camp and live in their vehicles on Ponto drive. Hopefully Shop off can help mitigate this growing problem with some type of solution.
- I'd propose angled parking on the street with meters and a requirement that homeowners park in their designated areas. I suggest Shopoff make the resident space sizes wide enough to include all vehicles, large and small.
- I'm not a parking expert but please don't try to use loop holes in the planning of buildings to wiggle out of providing proper parking.
- Increase parking for the airBandB demand. The issues parking, noise, use of common areas, change in neighborhood character are all fairly obvious and having to be addressed. The City needs to do its job to make sure the impacts are addressed. If City standards are out-of-date or inadequate then change them to address the impacts.
- Keep development parking to traditional Carlsbad standards. No "park in lieu" fees. Two bedroom condo or hotel suites should have two off road parking spaces. In recent history, Carlsbad has been allowing development without adequate parking!
- less buildings will mean less parking needed
- Lower density, stricter rules with rentals.
- mandatory two parking spaces/garage with no street park 11pm-5a.m
- More off-street parking.
- More parking at the beach on 101. Diagonal parking to allow for more -- explore parking on east side of 101.
- More parking spots within plan. Traffic appears to be a major problem now. More people...twice the cars.
- No VRBO should be allowed.
- Not have this development
- not sure
- parking garages
- Parking passes to hang in car window? BTW - THANK YOU for all your hard work. I am very appreciative for what you are doing for our neighborhood!
- Parking structure to the north
- Provide a larger area for VRBO as well as occasional day visitors. Only limited parking is presently provided. Lately as we have become more know more cars are parked on weekends on the streets.
- public underground parking
- rated parking in strip between Carlsbad state park and Carlsbad boulevard; train station; roadside in front of water plant on Encinas; park/ride at I-5 and La Costa Dr. in Encinitas

- **Subterranean parking for all businesses and residents**
- **The job of a traffic engineer**
- **The more underground parking the better. Security at night to enforce only residential parking. Additional storage units for residents to store bicycles & surfboards.**
- **There simply should be REQUIRED the actual needed amount of parking according to the proposed density PLUS additional accommodation for public needs.**
- **underground**
- **Underground garage.**
- **Underground parking**
- **underground parking**
- **Underground parking or drop the number of units. It's not rocket science**
- **What happened to underground parking? Look at the above ground parking structure Hilton put in do we want a series of parking structures west of the railroad?**