

**Carmel Valley Community Planning Board Motion with Staff Responses**

Meeting of January 13, 2016

<b><u>Motion #1</u></b> <b>Motion to approve the project with the recommendations below, failed by a vote of 5-5-2.</b>	<b><u>Staff Responses</u></b>
<b>IMPLEMENTATION</b> 1. "That all project mitigation requirements and community benefits shall become Permit Conditions."	The mitigation for the project is included within the environmental resolution and is referenced in the permit. All of the traffic mitigations are included within the permit as conditions. The applicant has agreed to provide a condition regarding a shuttle and signal upgrades and optimization of ten signals including an emergency vehicle preemption system. Please see draft permit conditions numbers 45 and 56.
2. "That the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board may revisit the project if new information and city review documents, such as the Amendment to the FEIR, staff review analysis and Traffic Studies are received that warrant such."	Comment noted.
3. "That One Paseo shall monitor the construction phasing so as to not overstress the capacities of Del Mar Heights Road and take appropriate measures to reduce the impacts that were not anticipated by the FEIR."	All construction impacts have been analyzed in the previously certified EIR and Addendum to the EIR. The project is required to comply with all City-wide regulations regarding construction traffic. The public may contact Kilroy directly during construction to voice any concerns.

<p>4. "That One Paseo, if the need arises in the future, may use the Substantial Conformance Review (SCR) if appropriate and allowed. However, any SCR application must include notification of the community through the input and recommendation of the CVCPB."</p>	<p>The project will be required to comply with the SCR Municipal Code regulations, and will include a distribution to the affected community planning group as a courtesy notification.</p>
<p>5. "That One Paseo, if the need arises in the future to make material changes to the mix of development uses on the site shall proceed using the appropriate city Process that engages and considers the views and concerns of the community, but shall not exceed the 14,000 ADT cap (calculated using the Settlement Agreement formula)."</p>	<p>Any changes to the project would be required to comply with the Municipal Code. Changes may require the approval of a SCR or an amendment to the existing entitlements, which may trigger additional traffic analysis.</p>
<p><b>TRAFFIC</b></p> <p>6. "That One Paseo shall not generate more than 14,000 ADTs, as calculated using the Settlement Agreement Formula."</p>	<p>As proposed, the project does not generate more than 14,000 ADTs.</p>
<p>7. "That the City of San Diego and One Paseo shall construct the Dual Lane mitigation option Westbound on Del Mar Heights Road at Interstate 5 that requires one lane extending to the West curb cut and the second lane to the East curb cut of the AT&amp;T building."</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 5.2-2:</b> (a) Prior to issuance of the first building permit, the project applicant shall assure by permit and bond the widening of the segment of Del Mar Heights Road within City jurisdiction to extend the WB right-turn pocket at the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB on-ramps by 470 feet east of the existing limit line (at intersection) to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy, the widening and lengthening shall be completed and accepted by the City Engineer. (b) Prior to issuance of the first building permit for an office building, the project applicant shall assure by permit and bond the widening of the segment of Del Mar Heights Road to include a second WB to NB right turn lane at the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB on-ramp within Caltrans' jurisdiction to the satisfaction of Caltrans and the City Engineer. Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for an office building, the widening shall be completed and accepted by Caltrans and the City Engineer. Upon completion of this mitigation measure, one right-turn lane shall extend to the west side of the AT&amp;T building and one right-turn lane shall extend to the east side of the AT&amp;T building.</p>

<p>8. "That the City of San Diego and One Paseo shall eliminate the triple West bound turning lanes from High Bluff to Del Mar Heights Road."</p>	<p>Due to project impacts, the triple west-bound turning lanes are required mitigation for traffic impacts.</p>
<p>9. "That the City of San Diego and One Paseo shall eliminate the mid-block pedestrian crossing to the project on Del Mar Heights Road."</p>	<p>The City standard design for signalized intersections do not allow for the elimination of a mid-block pedestrian crossing on Del Mar Heights Road.</p>
<p>10. "That Kilroy Realty shall not oppose the Roundabout traffic solutions for Via de la Valle, Showpark, El Camino Real and San Dieguito Road."</p>	<p>This item is not related to any code requirements or findings and therefore staff has not included it as a condition of the permit. The applicant will be paying its fair share contribution towards the future Via de la Valle Widening project (PTS No. 12657) and the El Camino Real to Via de la Valle bridge widening project (CIP No. S00856). The applicant has stated they have no opinion on future projects.</p>
<p>11. "That One Paseo shall install an Adaptive Traffic Control system, including Emergency Service Pre-Emption on Del Mar Heights Road."</p>	<p>Condition: "Prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy, the Owner/Permittee shall install traffic signal upgrades and optimization on a total of 10 intersections along Del Mar Heights Road from the intersection of Mango Drive to the intersection of Lansdale Drive. The upgrades and optimization shall include a communications system, emergency vehicle preemption system, controllers, detection, CCTV monitoring system, and optimized traffic signal timing. The Owner/Permittee shall fully fund the installation of the program, as well as the operation of the program for two (2) years after installation, under the direction of the City's traffic operation division."</p>

<p><b>EMERGENCY SERVICES</b></p> <p>12. "That Kilroy Realty and the City of San Diego shall work with the community of Torrey Pines to ensure that public safety and emergency vehicles are not delayed beyond what is considered the acceptable response time. The establishment of a temporary Rapid Response Team shall be considered."</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>13. "That Kilroy Realty and the City of San Diego work with the City of Del Mar to provide a Fire Station on the West side of Interstate 5 to better serve the Torrey Pines community."</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><b>DENSITY AND SCALE</b></p> <p>14. "That the residential buildings shall not exceed the heights illustrated and designated on the drawings dated Amendment Second Submittal December 18, 2015. The residential buildings along the Del Mar Heights Road and High Bluff frontages also shall not exceed the heights illustrated and designated on the drawings and shall be designed 3-dimensionally with offsetting planes and terracing (stepping) effects as shown."</p>	<p>The height of the proposed project is governed by the underlying zone (CVPD-MC) which once amended state, "The maximum allowable height shall be in accordance with the CC-5-5 zone except that maximum allowable height for development where the primary use is commercial office shall be 120 feet." No buildings that exceed the allowed height are proposed.</p>
<p>15. "That One Paseo shall consider subterranean parking at the office buildings rather than the proposed multi-story parking structure. This will allow the footprint expansion of the residential buildings to lower the height and density of the residential components."</p>	<p>There is some subterranean parking provided under the office buildings. All parking for the residential units is provided via a parking podium under the structures. The rest of the parking is provided in two, multi-level, above ground parking structures and some surface parking. Shared parking opportunities would be provided among all the proposed on-site uses.</p>

<p><b>TRAFFIC</b></p> <p>16. "That One Paseo, the City of San Diego and other agencies as necessary shall engage in a serious dialog to create a Public-Private Partnership for Transit in the greater Carmel Valley area. In keeping with the City of Villages vision, this system should connect existing villages, such as the Pacific Highlands Ranch community and the Cities of Del Mar and Solana Beach to reduce the vehicular impact of additional development. The favored route would run East-West on Del Mar Heights Road, and then North on the Coast Highway to the Solana Beach Transit Station. This route includes the Pacific Highlands Ranch Village to the East, the Carmel Valley Town Center, and the cities of Del Mar and Solana Beach. As an option, it may include Jimmy Durante Boulevard, to provide access to the Fairgrounds. Other suggestions include a southbound connection to the Sorrento Valley Transit Station, and the possibility of creating multiple local loops that bring community residents into the Town Center."</p>	<p>Comment noted. A condition regarding the proposed shuttle has been included in the permit as follows: Prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy, the Owner/Permittee shall install traffic signal upgrades and optimization on a total of 10 intersections along Del Mar Heights Road from the intersection of Mango Drive to the intersection of Lansdale Drive. The upgrades and optimization shall include a communications system, emergency vehicle preemption system, controllers, detection, CCTV monitoring system, and optimized traffic signal timing. The Owner/Permittee shall fully fund the installation of the program, as well as the operation of the program for two (2) years after installation, under the direction of the City's traffic operation division.</p>
<p>17. "If a public transportation system is not forthcoming, then the proposed One Paseo shuttle system shall be multi-loop with various stops to serve the surrounding Carmel Valley neighborhoods."</p>	<p>Please see response number 16 above.</p>
<p>18. "The creation of a public-private transportation system should not fulfill One Paseo's mitigation requirement for the shuttle system, allowing them to stop contributing to the system. Only the creation of true public transit should meet this obligation."</p>	<p>Please see response number 16 above.</p>
<p><b>COMMUNITY BENEFITS</b></p> <p>19. "That One Paseo shall provide for more Workforce Affordable Housing by increasing its commitment for Workforce Affordable Housing to 20% or 122 units."</p>	<p>Per City Council direction on 2/23/15, the project is subject to the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and has been conditioned to provide 61 affordable units on-site to households earning at or below 65% of Area Median Income.</p>
<p>20. "That the City of San Diego and One Paseo shall engage in a</p>	<p>The previously certified EIR did not analyze the potential environmental</p>

discussion to provide a rooftop passive public park or garden above the retail parking structure along Del Mar Heights Road as an extraordinary community benefit. One Paseo will construct the facilities and the cost will be deleted from its FBA obligation. One Paseo shall grant an irrevocable Public Use Easement and will control and maintain the public-use facility but shall not deny reasonable hours of use.”

impacts associated with a rooftop park, whether private or municipal. If FBA fees are used for the park, it would be City parkland. If the rooftop park is designated as public parkland there would be issues associated with the hours of operation. Since public parks are required to be open to the public 24 hours a day, any modifications to those hours of operation would require a Municipal Code amendment, which has not been addressed from a project or CEQA perspective. Regardless of the ownership, a rooftop park at a minimum could have potential land use, visual effects/neighborhood character, noise, hydrology/water quality, public utilities, public services/facilities, recreation, and health/safety impacts. The applicant has stated they cannot implement this proposal based on the potential environmental impacts and regulatory obstacles associated with it.

**Motion #2**

**The five (5) board members in favor of the motion expressed that it captured the concerns and needs of many in our community; our neighbor Torrey Pines to the West; those who opposed the project before but supported it now, and; the litigant groups. Several board members who were against the motion to approve the project were nevertheless supportive of the board's conditions contained in the first motion. The second motion succeeded by 10-1, to include a letter discussing the project. That letter is included as an attachment and summarized below.**

Comment noted.

**BOARD MOTION**

**A. Implementation**

"We strongly support that mitigation requirements must be Project Conditions of Approval to guarantee that all mitigations, project requirements and benefits are enforceable. We further required that any future SCR or development changes be brought to the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board for review."

**B. Traffic**

"We in favor of the motion strongly supported the terms of the settlement agreement that allows for a maximum ADT of 14,000. We put forth conditions in the motion that met the major concerns and desires of the adjacent residential communities and litigants regarding traffic and turn lanes on Del Mar Heights Road, High Bluff and Interstate 5."

**C. Emergency Services**

"We realized the concerns of the Torrey Pines community regarding the potential delay in emergency services reaching their community with the raised ADTs on Del Mar Heights Road. Our motion urged the establishment of a Rapid Response Team or the construction of a new fire station on the western side of Interstate 5 to mitigate those concerns."

**D. Density and Scale**

"We illustrated conditions in the motion to reduce the visual impact of the residential buildings to the community. Our measures included limitation of height, 3-dimensional and terraced building elevation design. We suggested the consideration of underground parking for the office buildings to further lower the residential building height by spreading the density."

**E. Transit**

"The community of Carmel Valley is in need of public transportation. We have bus stops designed in the community but no buses. Our motion proposed to the city and Kilroy to think outside of the box to establish a public-private partnership and bring transit to Carmel Valley. Nevertheless, One Paseo would provide a multilooped shuttle service as

Please see responses 1, 4-5, 11,12, 14, 16-19 above for responses to A-F.

described in the motion. We also suggest further study to determine which shuttle option/route would achieve the greatest ridership, community benefit and not be redundant to existing services.”

**F. Community Benefits**

“We desire our community to have workforce housing provided for workers in our employment districts. To this end we conditioned that One Paseo provide 20% rather than 10% of affordable housing. We also saw the need for park space within the project and therefore proposed thinking outside of the box (once again) to provide a rooftop passive park or garden offset by FBA contributions.”

Please see responses 1, 4-5, 11,12, 14, 16-19 above for responses to A-F.

<p><b><u>Motion #2 continued</u></b>  <b>It is also important, due to the split decision of the board to know the opposing side’s decision making. The five (5) board members speaking against the project and motion did so for the following areas of unresolved concerns.</b></p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><b>1. Density</b>  “They could not support a project of 1.2 million square feet that was not acceptable to many in the community and that would be outside of the size and scale of the community plan. The density would impact home values and the quality of life in the community. The New One Paseo has not gone far enough to reduce the impact to the community. It has been a massive campaign to portray working with the community and board but in actuality has done little to alter the goal of the largest project possible. You will recall that on September 11, 2014 the board rejected One Paseo but supported the Reduced Mixed Use alternative with an increase to 876,300 square feet.”</p>	<p>Comment noted. The most substantial land use difference between the approved project and the proposed project include the elimination of the cinema, a nearly 61 percent reduction in the retail square footage (sf) from 198,500 sf to 95,871 sf, the reduction in office space by 43 percent and the 19 percent overall project reduction by from 1,454,069 to 1,175,871 sf. The number of residential units remains the same at 608 units.</p>
<p><b>2. Community Plan</b>  “The project would be non-compliant to the Community Plan. It is outside of the size and scale allowed by the community plan.”</p>	<p>The project has been analyzed by staff, and upon approval of the proposed land use plan amendments, the project would be consistent with the land use designations and associated density and intensity proposed.</p>
<p><b>3. Impact to Schools, Traffic and Emergency Response</b>  “The density of the project would impact our schools, traffic and the safety of our residents due to emergency response times being impacted by the increase in traffic along Del Mar Heights Road.”</p>	<p>Impacts to schools, traffic, and emergency response times were all analyzed in the previously certified EIR. The Addendum includes an analysis to demonstrate that potential environmental impacts associated with the New One Paseo Project will not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than what was analyzed in the One Paseo EIR.</p>

<p><b>4. Retail Component</b></p> <p>“The decreased retail component of the project, as designed, is not enough to create a town center, but will instead mostly benefit the residents of the project rather than the community at-large.”</p>	<p>The retail is connected to the residential and office uses via landscaped and identified paseos which draw the visitor from one use to another with large mature trees leading the way through the main plazas and paseos. The architecture will be pedestrian in scale with neutral tones and a mixture of material elements. The retail use connects to the central plaza, which is the main unifying element of the project. Vehicles can pass through the plaza but it has been designed to deter use as a shortcut for vehicles by creating a traffic-calming table. The purpose of the central plaza is to create a community gathering space that could accommodate community events, markets, and holiday activities.</p>
<p><b>5. Office Buildings</b></p> <p>“The office building heights would not be compatible to the surrounding neighborhoods.”</p>	<p>The office building heights have been reduced from the approved project and upon approval of the proposed land use plan amendments, the project would be consistent with the land use designations and associated density and intensity proposed. The height for the proposed project is governed by the underlying zone (CVPD-MC), which once amended, will state “The maximum allowable height shall be in accordance with the CC-5-5 zone except that maximum allowable height for development where the primary use is commercial office shall be 120 feet.”</p>
<p><b>6. Affordable Housing Increase</b></p> <p>“One opposing member felt that the board should not propose additional “low income” housing. 10% is sufficient. It was added that there are 2 developments that are 100% low income housing already approved being built in Solana Beach (South Sierra), Del Mar (off Jimmy Durante Blvd.) and Pacific Highlands Ranch is adding units as well. Another board member opposed to the project, however welcomed additional work force housing at One Paseo.”</p>	<p>Per City Council direction on 2/23/15, the project is subject to the City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and has been conditioned to provide 61 units on site affordable to households earning at or below 65% of Area Median Income.</p>

<p><b>7. Residential Component</b></p> <p>“One board member discussed that the 608 units should be reduced to about 304 units instead. The lower density would allow for larger units of around 2,000 SF which would allow Kilroy Realty the same financial business model. This reduction would reduce ADT and reduce impact of students attending the schools. However, another board member who was opposed to the project indicated that the proposed 608 units should not be reduced as San Diego is experiencing a housing shortage.”</p>	<p>Comment noted. The most substantial land use difference between the approved project and the proposed project include the elimination of the cinema, a nearly 61 percent reduction in the retail square footage (sf) from 198,500 sf to 95,871 sf, the reduction in office space by 43 percent and the 19 percent overall project reduction by from 1,454,069 to 1,175,871 sf. The number of residential units remains the same at 608 units.</p>
<p><b>PRECISE PLAN AMENDMENT</b></p> <p><b>1.</b> “The Precise Plan Amendment (PPA) says that the PPA must be updated before a new zone is approved. It indicates on page 5, section 1.3 Purpose and Authorization that, “The implementation section of the Carmel Valley Community Plan establishes that precise plans be approved for each identified development unit prior to approval of zoning changes, planned development permits, subdivision maps or issuance of grading/building permits.” Is this section to mean that any zoning changes, planned development permits, subdivision maps or issuance of grading/building permits can only be approved after the precise plan amendment is approved?”</p>	<p>Yes, the community plan requires approval of precise plans prior to zoning and development permits. A precise plan was previously approved for the Employment Center per the community plan, and, if approved, the proposed precise plan amendment would allow approval of development permits for the proposed project. The applicant is processing all discretionary actions concurrently for the proposed project. Future development permits at this site would be reviewed for consistency with the precise plan (as amended). This section is only to provide context for the community plan and the precise plans.</p>
<p><b>2.</b> “The PPA should be clear that One Paseo is part of a larger village. The PPA document, such, as on page 4, section 1.2 Description reads like One Paseo is a stand-alone village. However, in reality it is a continuation of the Town Center zone, which includes the library, school, a recreation center, housing and shopping. One Paseo’s additional housing, retail and office will complement the existing Town Center and supplement our Village.”</p>	<p>Additional language was added to the PPA in Section 1.5 to further explain the core area of Carmel Valley and how it relates to the surrounding development and exhibits General Plan village characteristics.</p>

<p><b>3.</b> “Please verify and clarify whether the Shuttle, bike racks and charging stations are specifically for employees and residents only. Documents that we have reviewed indicate that through the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan these benefits are only for employees and residents. The community needs assurances that the Shuttle is for everyone’s use and benefit.”</p>	<p>The TDM’s main purpose is to reduce trips from the project site. The project’s location in the center of the community will facilitate use of the shuttle by those working in the adjacent Employment Center and commercial areas as well as the residents of the project. The bike racks and charging stations are available to anyone utilizing any components of the site.</p>
<p><b>4.</b> “The proposed parking ratios should be spelled out somewhere. The numbers that come from Kilroy’s website are: 6.0 per thousand for retail, 4.0 per thousand for office and 2.1 per unit for residential.”</p>	<p>Parking ratios aren’t typically a component of a Precise Plan as they relate to codified implementation and are found within the City’s Municipal Code. The project has been conditioned to provide 2,747 parking spaces throughout the site upon build out, where 2,587 parking spaces are required resulting in a surplus of 160 parking spaces, based on the Shared Parking Analysis. Parking facilities include subterranean garages, two multi-level, aboveground parking structures, and surface parking. Shared parking opportunities would be provided among all the proposed on-site uses except residential, which would assign designated parking spaces to each unit.</p>

**CARMEL VALLEY COMMUNITY PLANNING BOARD**

**Attn: Allen Kashani, CVCPB Secretary  
13400 Sabre Springs Pkwy, Ste. 200  
San Diego CA 92128  
858-794-2571 / Fax: 858-794-2599**

January 26, 2016

Renee Mezo, Project Manager  
City of San Diego  
Development Services Department  
1222 First Avenue, MS 501  
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: The New One Paseo  
PTS# 451328

Dear Renee:

The Carmel Valley Community Planning Board considered the above project on January 13, 2016. This application presented an unusual dilemma for the board. The New One Paseo was designed in an open transparent charrette process wherein the One Paseo Working Group, composed of community members and opponent litigant groups and the Community at large participated in several Community Workshops to create a One Paseo that would be acceptable to the community and meet the requirements of the settlement agreement. The Working Group and Workshop sessions had progressed over several months of discussions, designs and redesigns before the project would be formally submitted to the City and presented to the Board for a decision.

The litigant groups that successfully championed a referendum to overturn the City Council's approval of the project were now in favor of the New One Paseo. However, many other community members spoke against the project at the board meeting.

After the conclusion of the presentation and public testimony the Chair put forth a motion for approval (**attached**) for deliberation as revised and amended for the New One Paseo. The motion to approve New One Paseo failed 5 ayes and 5 naves with 2 recusing. ***It is most important to read the ATTACHED motion for more detail and clarity and to understand the Board's thought process for the decision we reached which is summarized for you below.***

The five (5) board members in favor of the motion expressed that it captured the concerns and needs of many in our community; our neighbor Torrey Pines to the West; those who opposed the project before but supported it now, and; the litigant groups. Several board members who were against the motion to approve the project were nevertheless supportive of the board's conditions contained in the motion. The board motion listed conditions to provide resolution and implementation of many matters of concern.

**I. BOARD MOTION**

**A. Implementation**

We strongly support that mitigation requirements must be Project Conditions of Approval to guarantee that all mitigations, project requirements and benefits are enforceable. We further required that any future SCR or development changes be brought to the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board for review.

**B. Traffic**

We in favor of the motion strongly supported the terms of the settlement agreement that allows for a maximum ADT of 14,000. We put forth conditions in the motion that met the major concerns and desires of the adjacent residential communities and litigants regarding traffic and turn lanes on Del Mar Heights Road, High Bluff and Interstate 5.

**C. Emergency Services**

We realized the concerns of the Torrey Pines community regarding the potential delay in emergency services reaching their community with the raised ADTs on Del Mar Heights Road. Our motion urged the establishment of a Rapid Response Team or the construction of a new fire station on the western side of Interstate 5 to mitigate those concerns.

**D. Density and Scale**

We illustrated conditions in the motion to reduce the visual impact of the residential buildings to the community. Our measures included limitation of height, 3-dimensional and terraced building elevation design. We suggested the consideration of underground parking for the office buildings to further lower the residential building height by spreading the density.

**E. Transit**

The community of Carmel Valley is in need of public transportation. We have bus stops designed in the community but no buses. Our motion proposed to the city and Kilroy to think outside of the box to establish a public-private partnership and bring transit to Carmel Valley. Nevertheless, One Paseo would provide a multi-looped shuttle service as described in the motion. We also suggest further study to determine which shuttle option/route would achieve the greatest ridership, community benefit and not be redundant to existing services.

**F. Community Benefits**

We desire our community to have workforce housing provided for workers in our employment districts. To this end we conditioned that One Paseo provide 20% rather than 10% of affordable housing. We also saw the need for park space within the project and therefore proposed thinking outside of the box (once again) to provide a rooftop passive park or garden offset by FBA contributions.

It is also important, due to the split decision of the board to know the opposing side's decisionmaking. The five (5) board members speaking against the project and motion did so for the following areas of unresolved concerns.

**1. Density**

They could not support a project of 1.2 million square feet that was not acceptable to many in the community and that would be outside of the size and scale of the community plan. The density would impact home values and the quality of life in the community. The New One Paseo has not gone far enough to reduce the impact to the community. It has been a massive campaign to portray working with the community and board but in actuality has done little to alter the goal of the largest project possible. You will recall that on September 11, 2014 the board rejected One Paseo but supported the Reduced Mixed Use alternative with an increase to 876,300 square feet.

**2. Community Plan**

The project would be non-compliant to the Community Plan. It is outside of the size and scale allowed by the community plan.

**3. Impact to Schools, Traffic and Emergency Response**

The density of the project would impact our schools, traffic and the safety of our residents due to emergency response times being impacted by the increase in traffic along Del Mar Heights Road.

**4. Retail Component**

The decreased retail component of the project, as designed, is not enough to create a town center, but will instead mostly benefit the residents of the project rather than the community at-large.

**5. Office Buildings**

The office building heights would not be compatible to the surrounding neighborhoods.

**6. Affordable Housing Increase**

One opposing member felt that the board should not propose additional "low-income" housing. 10% is sufficient. It was added that there are 2 developments that are 100% low income housing already approved being built in Solana Beach (South Sierra), Del Mar (off Jimmy Durante Blvd.) and Pacific Highlands Ranch is adding units as well. Another board member opposed to the project, however welcomed additional work force housing at One Paseo.

**7. Residential Component**

One board member discussed that the 608 units should be reduced to about 304 units instead. The lower density would allow for larger units of around 2,000 SF which would allow Kilroy Realty the same financial business model. This reduction would reduce ADT and reduce impact of students attending the schools. However, another board member who was opposed to the project indicated that the proposed 608 units should not be reduced as San Diego is experiencing a housing shortage.

Renee Mezo, Project Manager  
January 26, 2016  
pg 4

Another important point raised by a board member was regarding the Precise Plan Amendment (PPA). The PPA should be corrected or clarified as we discussed in the following topics.

## II. PRECISE PLAN AMENDMENT

1. The Precise Plan Amendment says that the PPA must be updated before a new zone is approved. It indicates on page 5, section 1.3 Purpose and Authorization that,

"The implementation section of the Carmel Valley Community Plan establishes that precise plans be approved for each identified development unit prior to approval of zoning changes, planned development permits, subdivision maps or issuance of grading/building permits."

Is this section to be mean that any zoning changes, planned development permits, subdivision maps or issuance of grading/building permits can only be approved after the precise plan amendment is approved?

2. The PPA should be clear that One Paseo is part of a larger village. The PPA document, such, as on page 4, section 1.2 Description reads like One Paseo is a stand-alone village. However, in reality it is a continuation of the Town Center zone, which includes the library, school, a recreation center, housing and shopping. One Paseo's additional housing, retail and office will complement the existing Town Center and supplement our Village.
3. Please verify and clarify whether the Shuttle, bike racks and charging stations are specifically for employees and residents only. Documents that we have reviewed indicate that through the Transportation Demand Management Plan these benefits are only or employees and residents. The community needs assurances that the Shuttle is for everyone's use and benefit.
4. The proposed parking ratios should be spelled out somewhere. The numbers that come from Kilroy's website are: 6.0 per thousand for retail, 4.0 per thousand for office and 2.1 per unit for residential.

As I mentioned earlier, the New One Paseo presented an unusual dilemma for the board with the conflicting thought processes, discussions and the testimonies for the favorable or unfavorable position of our community. I hope that this letter explaining our actions will help you understand our difficulty in reaching a decision to approve One Paseo.

Sincerely,  
Carmel Valley Community Planning Board



Frisco White, AIA, Chair

cc: Council President Sherri Lightner, Council District 1  
James Gwilliams, Applicant's Representative  
Bernard Turgeon, City of San Diego Planning

**MOTION for New One Paseo**  
**Carmel Valley Community Planning Board**  
Meeting of January 13, 2016

The vision for New One Paseo was first presented to the Community and the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board on August 19, 2015.

Having the benefit of working with a core focus group and conducting community-wide workshops Kilroy Realty strived to redesign the project to be more compatible and acceptable to the community. Nevertheless, One Paseo to some will never be accepted or desired, but we must understand that a development of some sort will be constructed on the site and that we must at times reach a decision that will be beneficial.

Therefore, the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board supports the New One Paseo and its Community Plan and Precise Plan Amendments, Site Development Permit, Neighborhood Development Permit and Vesting Tentative Map for 608 Residential Units, 280,000 SF of Commercial (multi-tenant) Office and 95,871 SF of Retail on a 23.6-acre site at the SW corner of Del Mar Heights Road and El Camino Real in the CVPD-MC Zone of the Carmel Valley Community Plan, including all mitigation, project requirements and community benefits as the submitted documents so detail and require.

The Carmel Valley Community Planning Board, further stipulates its support with the following project requirements, conditions and understanding:

**I. Implementation**

1. That all project mitigation requirements and community benefits shall become Permit Conditions.
2. That the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board may revisit the project if new information and city review documents, such as the Amendment to the FEIR, staff review analysis and Traffic Studies are received that warrant such.
3. That One Paseo shall monitor the construction phasing so as to not overstress the capacities of Del Mar Heights Road and take appropriate measures to reduce the impacts that were not anticipated by the FEIR.
4. That One Paseo, if the need arises in the future, may use the Substantial Conformance Review (SCR) if appropriate and allowed. However, any SCR application must include notification of the community through the input and recommendation of the CVCPB.
5. That One Paseo, if the need arises in the future to make material changes to the mix of development uses on the site shall proceed using the appropriate city Process that engages and considers the views and concerns of the community, but shall not exceed the 14,000 ADT cap (calculated using the Settlement Agreement formula).

## **II. Traffic**

6. That One Paseo shall not generate more than 14,000 ADTs, as calculated using the Settlement Agreement Formula.
7. That the City of San Diego and One Paseo shall construction the Dual Lane mitigation option Westbound on Del Mar Heights Road at Interstate 5 that requires one lane extending to the West curb cut and the second lane to the East curb cut of the AT&T building.
8. That the City of San Diego and One Paseo shall eliminate the triple West bound turning lanes from High Bluff to Del Mar Heights Road.
9. That the City of San Diego and One Paseo shall eliminate the mid-block pedestrian crossing to the project on Del Mar Heights Road.
10. That Kilroy Realty shall not oppose the Roundabout traffic solutions for Via de la Valle, Showpark, El Camino Real and San Dieguito Road.
11. That One Paseo shall install an Adaptive Traffic Control system, including Emergency Service Pre-emption on Del Mar Heights Road.

## **III. Emergency Services**

12. That Kilroy Realty and the City of San Diego shall work with the community of Torrey Pines to ensure that public safety and emergency vehicles are not delayed beyond what is considered the acceptable response time. The establishment of a temporary Rapid Response Team shall be considered.
13. That Kilroy Realty and the City of San Diego work with the City of Del Mar to provide a Fire Station on the West side of Interstate 5 to better serve the Torrey Pines community.

## **IV. Density and Scale**

14. That the Residential Buildings shall not exceed the heights illustrated and designated on the drawings dated Amendment Second Submittal December 18, 2015. The residential buildings along the Del Mar Heights Road and High Bluff frontages also shall not exceed the heights illustrated and designated on the drawings and shall be designed 3-dimensionally with offsetting planes and terracing (stepping) effects as shown.
15. That One Paseo shall consider subterranean parking at the office buildings rather than the proposed multi-story parking structure. This will allow the footprint expansion of the residential buildings to lower the height and density of the residential components.

## **V. Transit**

16. That One Paseo, the City of San Diego and other agencies as necessary shall engage in a serious dialog to create a Public-Private Partnership for Transit in the greater Carmel Valley area. In keeping with the City of Villages vision, this system should connect existing villages, such as the Pacific Highlands Ranch community and the Cities of Del Mar and Solana Beach to reduce the vehicular impact of additional development. The favored route would run East-West on Del Mar Heights Road, and then North on the Coast Highway to the Solana Beach Transit Station. This route includes the Pacific Highlands Ranch Village to the East, the Carmel Valley Town Center, and the cities of Del Mar and Solana Beach. As an option, it may include Jimmy Durante Boulevard, to provide access to the Fairgrounds. Other suggestions include a southbound connection to the Sorrento Valley Transit Station, and the possibility of creating multiple local loops that bring community residents into the Town Center.
17. If a public transportation system is not forthcoming, then the proposed One Paseo shuttle system shall be multi-loop with various stops to serve the surrounding Carmel Valley neighborhoods.
18. The creation of a public-private transportation system should not fulfill One Paseo's mitigation requirement for the shuttle system, allowing them to stop contributing to the system. Only the creation of true public transit should meet this obligation.

## **VI. Community Benefits**

19. That One Paseo shall provide for more Workforce Affordable Housing by increasing its commitment for Workforce Affordable Housing to 20% or 122 units.
20. That the City of San Diego and One Paseo shall engage in a discussion to provide a rooftop passive public park or garden above the retail parking structure along Del Mar Heights Road as an extraordinary community benefit. One Paseo will construct the facilities and the cost will be deleted from its FBA obligation. One Paseo shall grant an irrevocable Public Use Easement and will control and maintain the public-use facility but shall not deny reasonable hours of use.

The Carmel Valley Community Planning Board considered the aforementioned motion by Chair Frisco White and seconded by Christian Clews on January 13, 2015 and voted **5 Yay** and **5 Nay** with **2 Recusing**.

END OF MOTION