

From: [Diane Nygaard](#)
To: [Growth Management Committee](#)
Cc: [Eric Lardy](#)
Subject: Comments on Draft Performance Standards and Quality of Life Memo
Date: Wednesday, March 22, 2023 5:18:04 PM

Honorable Chair and Commissioners

We appreciate the effort that you have all expended to modify the city's performance standards to meet the needs of the future. It has not been easy, but the end is in sight.

We offer the following comments on the draft reports:

Performance Standards

Parks

1. The Committees action was to modify the standard- not to accept it. The staff report does not accurately reflect the actual committee vote. The modification was to recommend that the City Council consider adding a park distance standard.
2. "Other considerations" should note the extensive discussion about the inequity of counting Veteran's Park in all four quadrants which was part of the basis for recommending adding a distance performance standard.
3. "Other considerations" should also note the extensive discussion about the need for a coastal access park in the southern half of the city. That discussion was not just about a specific park, but about the concept of coastal access. It was that concern that prompted the request for a special presentation about the changes to Carlsbad Blvd and whether that could help address the specific issue about the lack of coastal access in the southern half of the city. That was a specific concern raised by several Commissioners that was not mentioned in the draft.
4. "Status" discussion should note the impact of allocating Veteran's Park acres in all four quadrants and how that impacts compliance with the standard. There was substantial comment about how that single park was treated differently than all others and that is the reason that the three quadrants where it is not located are shown as meeting the performance standard.

Open Space

5. "Other considerations" does not reflect the extensive discussion about the basis for the exemption of 11 of the 25 LFMZ's . It was that discussion that led to adding the changed language to make it clear that the Committee supported open space in all 25 FMZ'z- but was concerned about the impact of making the 15% a requirement for all considering the state of development and availability of land to add more open space.
6. 'Status" that shows all 25 LFMZ's meet the performance standard is inaccurate and misleading.

Funding

7. The draft report should also mention the potential for future voter approved measures to fund quality of life infrastructure- particularly for parks and open space. Every time voters

have been given a choice to allocate funds for those purposes the ballot measures have passed. Such funding opportunities should be considered in the future as a way for the broader community to indicate their preferences for the use of tax funds.

On the Draft Quality of Life Memo

Open Space

8. The Committee recognized the importance of actively considering opportunities to add open space- including updating the property list considered by the Open Space Citizens' Committee from several years ago. It was for that reason they recommended assigning that to the Recreation and Parks Commission- but it could also be addressed by a new Open Space Committee, or in another way as determined by the City Council.

Climate Change

9. Failure to address climate change could impact the city's ability to meet many of the performance standards and the goals in the Vision statement. The City Council adopted a Climate Emergency Resolution. While this issue is not one that is best addressed through a simple statement of a performance standard, it remains an important consideration impacting the quality of life for future residents.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Diane Nygaard
On behalf of Preserve Calavera

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Paige DeCino](#)
To: [Growth Management Committee](#)
Subject: Tomorrow Carlsbad Draft Growth Management Plan
Date: Wednesday, March 22, 2023 10:45:42 PM

Dear Tomorrow Carlsbad committee members,

Thank you for your year-long work on reviewing city standards that affect our quality of life. I would like you to consider my comments below on some of the draft report.

Parks Standard

The Performance standard for parks (p. 27) indicates on first reading that no modification is recommended in spite of the reading of p. 30 that the committee recommends consideration of a distance-based standard. It is misleading to note “keep as is” rather than “modify. In addition, Carlsbad cannot be considered a leader in sustainability when its park standard is lower than our neighbors to the north and south.

Also, given the concern over the distance to parks – hopefully walkable – Veterans Park does not contribute to anything resembling a neighbor (and walkable) park for 3 of our city’s 4 quadrants.

Open Space Standard

Under “Status” the report indicates all but one LFMZ has >15% open space which sounds good. However, since this is just a snapshot in time (now) it doesn’t mean there’s a guarantee of at least 15% open space in each of the zones in the future. Without a modified standard, the future of open space in zones 1-10 is in doubt.

Thank you,
Paige DeCino

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Mike McMahon](#)
To: [Growth Management Committee](#)
Subject: Open Space and Parks
Date: Thursday, March 23, 2023 1:09:02 PM

I wish to thank the Carlsbad Tomorrow Committee for compiling their historical review of our open space standard and how it impacts us today. Based on community survey results, 20-30 percent of residents say their park needs are unmet. This percentage of dissatisfaction can begin to be addressed by adding a 10 minute walking goal standard for 3-4 acres per 1,000 per quadrant. A high priority should be placed on actively finding any opportunities to add parks and open space as this has much proven voter funding support.

Thank you for your consideration,
Mike McMahon
District 2

[CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.](#)

From: [Jeff Segall](#)
To: [Michele Hardy](#); [Eric Lardy](#)
Cc: [Eric Larson](#); [mike Howes](#)
Subject: Recommended Wording for Carlsbad Tomorrow Report
Date: Thursday, March 23, 2023 12:08:15 PM
Attachments: [GMP - Considerations for the Draft Report of the Carlsbad Tomorrow Committee.docx](#)

To: Carlsbad Tomorrow Committee Members

cc: Committee Chair and Vice Chair

Committee members were asked to make comments to the draft Carlsbad Tomorrow Report. Below is a list of my potential draft wording/additions for sections Report we will be discussing tonight.

My intent is not to wordsmith this document, nor add anything not discussed by the committee, but to share elements I believe are either missing in the report or to add clarify comments to sections of the report.

Jeff

Considerations for the Draft Report of the Carlsbad Tomorrow Committee

Executive Summary

The report needs an Executive Summary listing the recommendations of the Committee, recommendations explored by not made, and a reference to the Quality of Life memo, not included in this report but sent separately to the City Council.

Included in Introduction or Executive Summary

The current Growth Management Plan addresses, among other things, how growth and development in the city will be paid for or financed. The current plan puts such a burden on new development. As a city faced mainly with infill development, and not large-scale developments as was the case when the GMP was established, the question of how the limited number of new developments will pay for such improvements came up repeatedly in meetings. The city estimates that about 3,900 new housing units are required under the new Housing Element, of which about 2,100 units need to be affordable.

The committee was concerned with how an equitable financing plan would impact the remaining 3,900 units, or even more if state law requires such in the future, and what such a burden would be on developers who would pass such costs on to new home buyers or renters, thereby making projects more costly and less affordable. Further, the committee felt that such requirements could actually prevent development rather than managing it.

The committee recognizes this dilemma but does not have enough data to make recommendations at this stage of the process. Further, the committee does not believe its charge was to take in such financial considerations. As such, all recommendations are made with the financial impacts of its recommendations lacking. Committee members understand that the City Council will have to direct staff to investigate those issues as the Council proceeds with considering Committee recommendations.

Page 19

Work Product

In the scope of its work, the committee also reviewed a number of potential new recommendations beyond the current 11 standards in the current Growth Management Plan, but upon presentation by appropriate staff, ended up not recommending additions to the Plan. As such, these concepts are presented in this report as standards discussed but not recommended, and why. Further, when the committee liked such concepts, but felt they did not fit as a GMP standard, they made such recommendations to the City Council in the Quality of Life memo that is separate from this report.

(Example – Police and Public Safety Standard. List others.)

Page 30

Park Standards

Under Additional recommendation, clarify whether this recommendation is retroactive for all parks or just those tied to new developments and infill projects.

Page 32

Open Space Standard

Under Proposed new standard, clarify whether this recommendation is retroactive for all open space or just that tied to new developments and infill projects.

Page 34

Mobility Standard

Under Other considerations, add a bullet saying the Committee recognizes that traffic impacts in the city occur through many means, including but not limited to traffic from other cities passing through Carlsbad to get to other locations such as I – 5, and through traffic outside of Carlsbad coming to the city for work or shopping amenities or traffic leaving the city to outside destinations. As such, Committee members understand that not all traffic impacts are the result of increased residential development, but from pass through traffic and traffic generated by commercial and industrial development as well.

Page 39

Add Potential Standards Discussed but Not Recommended Section (See Work Product above)

Page 40

Add preamble verbiage repeating that the impacts to the costs and financing mechanisms associated with the standards recommended beginning on page 26 the committee felt were not the purview of the committee, and that if the City Council wanted such data, that they would have to instruct the staff to evaluate such costs and impacts.

CAUTION: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jeff Segall

C: 760.419.4901

JeffSegall@me.com

Considerations for the Draft Report of the Carlsbad Tomorrow Committee

Executive Summary

The report needs an Executive Summary listing the recommendations of the Committee, recommendations explored by not made, and a reference to the Quality of Life memo, not included in this report but sent separately to the City Council.

Included in Introduction or Executive Summary

The current Growth Management Plan addresses, among other things, how growth and development in the city will be paid for or financed. The current plan puts such a burden on new development. As a city faced mainly with infill development, and not large-scale developments as was the case when the GMP was established, the question of how the limited number of new developments will pay for such improvements came up repeatedly in meetings. The city estimates that about 3,900 new housing units are required under the new Housing Element, of which about 2,100 units need to be affordable.

The committee was concerned with how an equitable financing plan would impact the remaining 3,900 units, or even more if state law requires such in the future, and what such a burden would be on developers who would pass such costs on to new home buyers or renters, thereby making projects more costly and less affordable. Further, the committee felt that such requirements could actually prevent development rather than managing it.

The committee recognizes this dilemma but does not have enough data to make recommendations at this stage of the process. Further, the committee does not believe its charge was to take in such financial considerations. As such, all recommendations are made with the financial impacts of its recommendations lacking. Committee members understand that the City Council will have to direct staff to investigate those issues as the Council proceeds with considering Committee recommendations.

Page 19

Work Product

In the scope of its work, the committee also reviewed a number of potential new recommendations beyond the current 11 standards in the current Growth Management Plan, but upon presentation by appropriate staff, ended up not recommending additions to the Plan. As such, these concepts are presented in this report as standards discussed but not recommended, and why. Further, when the committee liked such concepts, but felt they did not fit as a GMP standard, they made such recommendations to the City Council in the Quality of Life memo that is separate from this report.

(Example – Police and Public Safety Standard. List others.)

Page 30

Park Standards

Under Additional recommendation, clarify whether this recommendation is retroactive for all parks or just those tied to new developments and infill projects.

Page 32

Open Space Standard

Under Proposed new standard, clarify whether this recommendation is retroactive for all open space or just that tied to new developments and infill projects.

Page 34

Mobility Standard

Under Other considerations, add a bullet saying the Committee recognizes that traffic impacts in the city occur through many means, including but not limited to traffic from other cities passing through Carlsbad to get to other locations such as I – 5, and through traffic outside of Carlsbad coming to the city for work or shopping amenities or traffic leaving the city to outside destinations. As such, Committee members understand that not all traffic impacts are the result of increased residential development, but from pass through traffic and traffic generated by commercial and industrial development as well.

Page 39

Add Potential Standards Discussed but Not Recommended Section (See Work Product above)

Page 40

Add preamble verbiage repeating that the impacts to the costs and financing mechanisms associated with the standards recommended beginning on page 26 the committee felt were not the purview of the committee, and that if the City Council wanted such data, that they would have to instruct the staff to evaluate such costs and impacts.