

The City of Carlsbad Planning Division  
**A REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Item No.

1

P.C. AGENDA OF: May 2, 2018

Application complete date: N/A

Project Planner: Scott Donnell

Project Engineer: N/A

SUBJECT: **GPA 16-01/ZCA 16-01/ZC 16-01/MP 14-01/LCPA 14-01/MCA 16-01 (DEV08014) – VILLAGE AND BARRIO MASTER PLAN** - Request for a recommendation to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and a recommendation to approve a General Plan Amendment, Zone Code Amendment, Zone Change, Master Plan, and Local Coastal Program Amendment for the Village and Barrio Master Plan. The request also includes a recommendation to repeal the Village Master Plan and Design Manual. The Notice of Intent (NOI) to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration was published in the newspaper February 12, 2016, and sent to the State Clearinghouse (SCH#2016021056) for a 30-day public review (February 16, 2016 – March 16, 2016). The Village and Barrio are generally west of interstate 5 and between Laguna Drive and Tamarack Avenue in the city's Northwest Quadrant and Local Facilities Management Zone 1.

**I. RECOMMENDATION**

That the Planning Commission **ADOPT** Planning Commission Resolution No. 7293 **RECOMMENDING ADOPTION** of a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, **ADOPT** Planning Commission Resolution No. 7294 **RECOMMENDING APPROVAL** of a General Plan Amendment (GPA 16-01), Zone Code Amendment (ZCA 16-01), Zone Change (ZC 16-01), Master Plan (MP 14-01), and Local Coastal Program Amendment (LCPA 14-01), based on the findings and subject to the conditions contained therein, and **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** of errata dated April 18, 2018.

**II. OVERVIEW**

At its April 18, 2018, meeting, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Village and Barrio Master Plan. The Commission opened the public hearing, received public comment from 18 speakers, and closed the public testimony portion of the meeting. Then, the Commission voted to continue discussion of the master plan to its May 2, 2018, meeting.

Since the printing of the staff report, the city has received additional public comments on the master plan. Those comments are attached.

Additionally, staff has updated the master plan website, [www.carlsbadca.gov/villagebarrio](http://www.carlsbadca.gov/villagebarrio), to include links to the April 18 staff report and meeting video. Staff has split the report into multiple parts to improve its use.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. April 18, 2018, Planning Commission staff report (previously distributed and available online)
2. Public comments received since printing the April 18, 2018, Planning Commission staff report



April 10,2018 VILLAGE AND BARRIO MASTER PLAN COMMENTS

Planning Commissioners,

I am in Europe visiting villages hundreds of years old that have been redeveloped many times. We only have one village and this plan should encourage redevelopment into a flower that draws people from Carlsbad and beyond as it has for the past 100 years. The suggested changes to the Master Plan are looking 30-50 years ahead.

Master plan comments;

Page 1-20 Using Grand Promenade as an open space park for events requires the entire width be available for event use. A cycle track defeats one of the main purposes of creating the Grand Promenade. It also has short blocks with many stops and placing bi directional bicycle traffic on one side will be dangerous or motorists.

For the Village to be funded by Village Events and compete with other local Main Streets and be weaned off City General Fund subsidy we must create the funding capacity for the group assisting the master plan area. This group or groups need areas to operate farmers markets, auto shows, craft fairs, music festivals that can raise funds and attracts pedestrian traffic to the village.

Promote the Grand Promenade test blocks immediately, ideally as submitted. A detailed plan for use within 6 months was submitted to engineering a year ago.

Page 2-9\*\*\*\*\*Provide boundary for ground floor commercial on figure 2-2. NO PARKING OR RESIDENTIAL ON FIRST FLOOR (60 FEET DEEP) from any street AND MINIMUM COMMERCIAL HEIGHT required in this area. Otherwise developers will use the first floor for parking and provide token commercial on some frontage taking a loss to get residential parking for residential units which can go everywhere in the village but the core commercial area. Commercial cannot be added in the residential areas but residential can go in 90% on the village and barrio.

Page2-20 2.6 B Sidewalk Cafes 5 make 8 feet and in drawing 8 feet.

Page 2-21 2.65 number 5 make 8 feet. All sidewalks in the core area (green cross hatch) should be 8 feet wide. All other sidewalks may be 5 feet wide.

#### PARKING

1. Bank of America and other lots are already used in the evening, without permission by restaurant patrons and employees. With the increased redevelopment proposed and encouraged, buildings such as Bank of America will be redeveloped and that parking will be lost, and additional need will be created by the purchase of in-lieu parking for the commercial space on the first floor and perhaps the office space on the upper floors. Eventually we will run out of spaces which will choke off mixed use development which we are trying to encourage.
2. The study is now out of date as many new restaurants have opened since the initial survey of available spaces. While we are successful, this is encouraging 10-20 year adaptive reuse of

buildings, converting from retail to restaurant without paying for parking. This discourages rebuilding of older buildings with office or residential at this time due to the savings of adaptive reuse of parking, while new buildings must provide at least residential parking on side and pay for the commercial uses.

3. Since we want both adaptive reuse and new buildings to occur concurrently, we need a better formula both to encourage new buildings and get more income into the in-lieu fee fund.
4. The in-lieu feet fund should not be used to lease parking. The fees are a one time source of revenue and if parking is not purchased or built, we will run out of money and parking just like the National Debt. Buy land, build a garage, or subsidize others building a garage. All of you own homes and invest for a reason and your city government should operate in a similar manner.
5. \*\*\*\*\*Offering a financial incentive to developers can give us the Municipal Parking we need on a permanent basis. Leasing spaces on properties that will soon be developed just kicks the can down the road, and not very far.
6. \*\*\*\*\*If we offer \$25,000 per Municipal Parking space built and maintained by a developer, substandard space can be efficiently used in the village and new units can be build smaller and more affordable to buyers. A minimum of 25 spaces to be provided to make use of the incentive. A similar paragraph to this one must be in the parking section of the Master Plan to encourage developers to add municipal parking to their projects early in the planning process.

There are several landowners interested in parking and the financial incentive must be stated in the new master plan to encourage the preferred use of the in-lieu fees collected which is permanent Municipal Parking.

Encouraging a change in use without providing parking is a taking of another landowner's property as we know that new customers will park in another owners parking lot. This has been demonstrated by the Village Faire taking measures to discourage outside use of their spaces by converting to 1 hour and valet parking for their customers only.

Subsidizing the creation of Municipal Parking by a public private partnership would encourage redevelopment by the Village Faire and NCTD of their surfaced parking into a mixed use parking

PS Please take a few minutes to drive or walk to look over the Grand Madison, under construction at the Packard Dental site at Grand and Madison. Walk the alley and note that you cannot see cars or pedestrians as you exit on the alley onto Grand Avenue. We asked that this be corrected in the new plan, and it has been addressed. But it has been discussed with staff for years and should have been incorporated into this and the proposed building on Carlsbad Village Drive and State Street. Cutting the 1<sup>st</sup> floor only at 45 degrees 10 feet along the alley and Carlsbad Village Drive gives the pedestrians and driver some sight line of the sidewalk and cars. Staff members who are different for each project, need rules for the architects to follow so these points are not missed in reviewing each large project.

Gary Nessim  
Imagine Carlsbad

**From:** [Planning](#)  
**To:** [Scott Donnell](#)  
**Subject:** FW: comments on V-B mp for Commissioners  
**Date:** Friday, April 13, 2018 9:19:34 AM  
**Attachments:** [PC 4-2018.pdf](#)

---

FYI – This email came in today.  
Michele

---

**From:** Robert Wilkinson [mailto:[bob@wdesigngroup.net](mailto:bob@wdesigngroup.net)]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 13, 2018 9:16 AM  
**To:** Planning <[Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov](mailto:Planning@CarlsbadCA.gov)>  
**Subject:** comments on V-B mp for Commissioners

Please see that the attached comments on the Village-Barrio master plan get to all of the planning commissioners before next week's hearing, thank you

***Respectfully,***

**Robert Wilkinson**  
Wilkinson Design Group  
*Land Planning +  
Landscape Architecture*

[bob@wdesigngroup.net](mailto:bob@wdesigngroup.net)

P.O. Box 4237  
Carlsbad Ca, 92018-4237

760 434 2152

OUR COMMENTS ON THE JANUARY 2018 PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT OF THE V-B MP  
MOST OF THESE REQUEST ARE FOR THE THREE USE DISTRICTS THAT MAKE UP  
THE COMMERCIAL CORE OF THE VILLAGE - VC; HOSP & FC

#### CORNER PROPERTIES

The current draft MP has not yet taken the steps needed to respond to the community's desire to maintain and truly enhance the Villages as our "Special Place/District" as thought of by the community and labeled by the city. This fact was recently illustrated by the put pouring from the community that produced the denial of approval for the new development at the corner of State and CVD. This strong community voice may well rise again as another corner site gets its newly approved development at Grand and Madison. As that development takes shape, form and character it will be upsetting from what the community wants to see in new development in the Village.

As now stated in the MP these two developments illustrate that corner properties are extra important as leading edges that are focal within the street-scene. To that we ask that the new MP go further and contain the following standard for all properties on the corner of the main streets in the core area;

#### FORTH FLOOR SETBACK

The forth floor setback stated in Section 2.7.1 page 2-39 be increased to 40 feet from both street edge pls. Producing a maximum plate height of 35 feet within this setback area. Additionally we should require that only a small percentage of this 35 foot roof edge critical to the appearance of the building is allowed to have a flat roof (30%), with the remaining area to have a more traditional angled roof line.

#### CORNER PLAZA OPEN SPACE

The corner plaza space required in section 2.7.1 on page 2-37 be expanded to all intersection corners on both Grand and CVD from Harding to the boulevard. The additional corner lots can provide a slightly smaller plaza area than key locations in the current draft. They provide a 300 sf area but all of these spaces must be free of any upper level producing a ceiling. All of these plazas must be well integrated into the overall building facade.

#### VILLAGE MAIN STREET-SCENE - A SERIES OF INDIVIDUAL STORE FRONTS

We request that an additional standard be added to Sections 2.7.1 & 2.7.4. Add standards that promote the look and feel of a "Village" that has been built over a greater span of time rather than the current development cycle. Require that any property with a street frontage of over 60 linear feet have it's street edge facade broken down into multiple facades with different looks. The intent is to get street scenes that has a series of smaller buildings (village scale) and not having one expansive look along the street. We do hope to see that the smaller properties are purchased and combined into larger developments so that we can get the larger uses that are critical for a self contained neighborhood i.e. new grocery, new hardware, pharmacy with their requirement for back of house truck service access. However, these larger footprint uses do not have to appear large from the street.

## A COMMON VOCABULARY FOR ARCHITECTURAL STYLE

A critical guideline still missing in the current draft is the guidance of a design vocabulary of a building's exterior appearance. Over the last year what we have achieved in terms of quality and character from remodeled or new development in the Village has been hit and miss at best. Adding this guideline will benefit all involved in the review and approval process by providing a common vocabulary of what our objectives should be in new or remodeled buildings. Without denying any architectural style lets provide a common expectation of character driven architecture. Lets identify 6 architectural styles common and fitting to our setting and in written and graphic form provide 6 objectives for each style we all agree will benefit in enhancing the overall character the community desires for the core area of our downtown Village. This should be viewed as a helpful tool for all involved in the review and approval process.

## SETBACK FOR ON SITE STREET LEVEL PARKING IN MIXED USE PROJECTS

Table 2-1 & figure 2-2 illustrate well the restriction of residential uses on the ground floor within the hatched area of the Village Core . This a request we made to protect a viable and thriving "Main Street" commercial environment. However this only gets us part way in that protection.

Currently, mixed use development in this area has produced a common model, were the building industry responds to a hot residential market along the immediate coast and builds as many million dollar homes on the upper levels as it can park (Grand Madison). Since our standards continue to require all residential parking to be onsite this requirement eats up too much of a small property's street level area and pushes commercial uses into shallow "boutique" spaces. This is not a well balanced "Mixed Use" development as it limits the street level commercial uses and dilutes the opportunity for a vibrant "Main Street". In response the MP needs to include a setback with a 50 foot average for all parking, other than handicapped, on-site at street level within all of the area hatched in Figure 2-2 on page 2-9. A setback from all street edge property lines.

The Master Plan must make it know that we expect the use of some of the more creative parking solutions seen recently here. That is the use of a lift on small lots that carry all parking to a sub level and / or individual lifts that stack a homes two cars placing one below grade. We all need to remember that development here in the Village may and should look different from most all other areas of Carlsbad as we strengthen it as a transit oriented neighborhood were use of the car is on a more limited basis.

## STREET TREES

To its credit the MP makes many statement of the ultimate importance of quality streets to achieve a quality Village. To that end we request that the MP makes a statement that a concerted effort needs to be made over the next year to collect interest and input from the community on a master street tree program that selects themed species and planting locations / practices.

#### MINIMUM SIDE WALK WIDTHS

We request that the standard in Section 2.6.5 AREA WIDE RIGHT OF WAY USES pages 2-19 to 2-21 be modified to provide a wider minimum than the proposed 5 feet of clear sidewalk. The MP proposes 5 foot width for as much as 40 linear feet (two car spaces) is not adequate for a pedestrian oriented area, it is barely adequate today and the sidewalks are going to get more and more active in the near future. A 5ft width will create a bottle neck chock point for any active walkway and can alter the path strollers will use in moving around the Village. This can easily mean some shops /store fronts get less activity We want street edge cafes but not at the expense of a first class pedestrian network around the Village. Lets not build in 2<sup>nd</sup> class standards. We recommend a min of 6ft width for a max of 10 feet in length and a 8 foot width if the length is over 10 feet.

We hope to hear these issues brought up and discussed with staff at the hearing and then have the issues effect the recommendations the Commission makes to the Council.

Thank you,

Robert Wilkinson

**From:** sjchoueiry@ca.rr.com  
**To:** [Scott Donnell](#)  
**Subject:** Village and Barrio Plan  
**Date:** Saturday, April 14, 2018 10:38:05 AM

---

Dear Scott,

I am not sure if this the right avenue to comment on the Village and Barrio current Master Plan.

I live on 3515 Madison St. I have been keeping an eye on the portion of the plan to provide access to the beach thru the rail crossing at Chestnut Ave. Looking thru the current Master Plan (Draft) it seems that this project is given the least priority in the implementation section. I think this should be re-evaluated and given a higher priority. The access to the beach thru this crossing will greatly improve overall beach accessibility and reduce the hassle of having to walk all the way to Carlsbad Village Dr or Tamarack.

I hope the city will consider expediting the implementation of this project in order to help the community and visitors alike in having better access to the beach areas.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joe Choueiry



**From:** [Council Internet Email](#)  
**Cc:** [Scott Donnell](#); [Don Neu](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CBV Draft Master Plan Feedback  
**Date:** Monday, April 16, 2018 3:02:54 PM  
**Attachments:** [CBV Draft Plan Comments FABRIC Inv.pdf](#)

---

**From:** Brendan Foote [mailto:brendan@fabricinvestments.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 16, 2018 2:58 PM  
**To:** Council Internet Email <CityCouncil@carlsbadca.gov>; Matthew Hall <Matt.Hall@carlsbadca.gov>; Claudia Huerta <Claudia.Huerta@carlsbadca.gov>; Keith Blackburn <Keith.Blackburn@carlsbadca.gov>; Cori Schumacher <Cori.Schumacher@CarlsbadCA.gov>; Michael Schumacher <michael.schumacher@carlsbadca.gov>  
**Subject:** CBV Draft Master Plan Feedback

Hi All,

Hope this email finds you well!

I was planning on attending the Wednesday night Council Meeting in order to express my views on the draft Village Master Plan, but baby #2 had other ideas and we are going to be in delivery that day.

Hence, I have attached a summary of my comments upon review of the latest draft.

I currently own property in the Village at 2659 State Street and also have the Antique Mall (on State St) under control and am in planning mode on that site. I consider myself a community developer - I tend to work on boutique projects and invest significant effort into aligning my projects with the community in which they reside. Looking at scale, design, activation, integration and sustainability are several of the driving forces behind what I do on a daily basis.

As a local developer, I am all for preserving the quaint coastal character of Carlsbad Village and other like communities. I am also for progress and creating spaces that the community can enjoy. I think the plan, in its draft form, allows for both of these things to happen simultaneously. Preserving the 45' height limitation is one of the biggest elements that I see as important. This allows for developers to provide much needed housing while creating architecturally significant and unique projects (not big boxes).

If you have any questions on the attached, please let me know. I look forward to working with you all going forward to create a dynamic Village.

Take care,

**Brendan Foote** | principal

(m) 619.840.7721

[www.fabricinvestments.com](http://www.fabricinvestments.com)



## Carlsbad Village [DRAFT] Master Plan Feedback

Below is feedback as it relates to the Draft Village Master Plan from the perspective of a private developer with three active projects in the Village. Hopefully this input is helpful as you consider all angles of this plan update. For me, these are the most critical issues:

### **1. Must Preserve 45' height limitation in the Village.**

It is essential that the 45' height limitation be preserved in the updated Village Master Plan. Allowing for a 45' height limit by no means determines that the Village will become too dense. For proper scale in a coastal village such as CBV and in order to allow for a proper variety of uses, it is important that the height limitation not be reduced. In many cases, given the trending demand for high ceilings and open spaces, 45' could still mean three story buildings. With land prices on the rise, a general housing shortage County-wide and the potential for the City to realize an increased property tax basis over the next several cycles, its vital that developers can continue to build up to 45'.

### **2. Parking Flexibility and Regulations.**

In a transitional era where transit is evolving, it's vital that City's look forward and consider flexible parking requirements for new development. Preserving the existing parking regulations, in-lieu fee options and not imposing net new parking additions on existing properties that are not being expanded is very important. Let the market reasonably determine the amount of parking that is needed. Developers will not abuse parking regulations if the market doesn't respond well to their lack of parking. Look for opportunities to encourage bike sharing, car sharing and other efficient transportation options within new developments.

Ref: Table 2-4: Allow for shared parking arrangements for different uses within a mixed-use development. Opportunities such as utilizing shared parking for office and a restaurant whereas the office is likely to utilize the majority of the spaces during the day and restaurant in the evening. Developers should be able to propose shared parking arrangements for compatible uses. This is important!

Parking requirements for restaurants are getting increasingly prohibitive. If the parking requirement for a restaurant hovers around the 1:170sf ratio, that's pretty unattainable in most scenarios. It's even more prohibitive for smaller, boutique restaurants/cafes. Imagine a 1000 sf café needing 6 off-street parking spaces – there are virtually no options. Furthermore, only front of house space in a restaurant should be considered when determining the parking requirements (not sure if that was made clear).

State Street retail should benefit from NCTD lot. There should be compromises available on State Street retail parking requirements given the evening availability of the NCTD lot.



Table 2-4 – The ability to utilize stackers, lifts and other advanced parking efficiency solutions – why is this on a case-by-case basis? What does that mean? Challenging to plan for unknowns.

Definitely should preserve the parking regulation that if you acquire an existing building and are not expanding its square footage, you should not be required to provide additional off-street parking. Same goes with intensifying the use of an existing building while not expanding its footprint. To avoid mass vacancy, retail space should have some flexibility in uses without having the burden of additional parking requirements or burdensome permitting processes.

Studio Residential units should be parked at .5 spaces/unit, not 1. Studios are becoming the millennials ability to reside in the communities they desire without necessarily worrying about rising housing costs. Many of these dwellers are equally as efficient and resourceful with transit and do not require cars and or parking stalls.

### 3. Density

Two main issues with the proposed density regulations:

- A) Dwelling Unit per Acre for VC should be adjusted. 35 d.u./acre is simply too little to justify a 3-4 story mixed use development on an acre of land. I would suggest that this number be increased to at least 44 d.u./acre. With a County wide housing shortage, there is no need to severely limit the dwelling unit counts as is being done. We already have a height limitation and parking requirements that will serve to keep it from becoming to residentially dense.
- B) Minimum Dwellings Unit per Acre should not exist in the VC. As the Village grows, there will be increased need for office and other commercial uses. In the VC, a developer should be able to elect to build a straight commercial building to accommodate these demands and not have to be subject to a minimum number of dwelling units.

Again, thank you for your consideration and I would be more than happy to speak with any group discussing this plan and the community's diverse feedback.

Kind regards,

**Brendan Foote** | principal  
Fabric Investments, Inc.  
[brendan@fabricinvestments.com](mailto:brendan@fabricinvestments.com)  
619-840-7721



April 17, 2018

Planning Department  
City of Carlsbad  
1635 Faraday Avenue  
Carlsbad, CA 92009

Re: Support for Planning Commission Recommendation of the Village and Barrio Master Plan

Planning Commission,

On behalf of the Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce, I respectfully urge the Planning Commission to make a recommendation on the Village and Barrio Master Plan to the City Council to facilitate approval of the plan later this spring.

The Village and Barrio are Carlsbad's first neighborhoods and both have been undergoing revitalization projects recently with more planned in the future. The Village and Barrio Master Plan will seek to create a vibrant, pedestrian-friendly, downtown center and a rejuvenated Barrio, and can also improve the relationship between the two distinct neighborhoods.

For over 95 years, the Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce has worked to promote a favorable business climate for the 1,600 businesses and more than 75,000 employees in and around the City of Carlsbad. With nearly 400 of those businesses located in our downtown center during this time of growth and revitalization, we believe that the timing is critical to approve the new Village and Barrio Master Plan to replace the Carlsbad Village Master Plan and Design Manual adopted in 1996.

We understand that portions of the Barrio and Village are in the Coastal Zone, and that the master plan will require separate approval for those areas by the California Coastal Commission before it is effective in the Coastal Zone, but for portions of the master plan not in the Coastal Zone, Coastal Commission approval is not required, and plan provisions will take effect following approval by the City Council.

Both neighborhoods are designated a "smart growth opportunity area." The proposed Village and Barrio Master Plan embodies the principals of smart growth, with a mix of commercial and residential land uses, a variety of housing choices, walkable neighborhoods and multiple transportation choices. The master plan will help capitalize on proximity to transit and other attributes that give the Village and Barrio this designation, and direct future parking management needs. It will also help guide decisions surrounding the option of trenching the coastal railroad tracks through the Village and Barrio underground.



The new plan will establish the vision for the ideal future character and development of the two areas and will set forth the strategy or "roadmap" for achieving that vision through goals and policies, standards and guidelines, and an implementation plan.

The Village and Barrio Master Plan has been a work in progress for nearly four years with tremendous input from the community through hands-on design sessions, an online forum, technical sessions and numerous public meetings. The Chamber of Commerce has spent considerable time studying the plan throughout the draft revisions and feels that the latest, third draft, is ready for recommendation to the City Council by the Planning Commission on April 18<sup>th</sup>.

We look forward to being a part of the ongoing effort and are excited to be part of a brighter future for the Village and Barrio.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ted Owen", written in a cursive style.

Ted Owen  
President & CEO

CC: Carlsbad City Council

## THE BAILEY LEGAL GROUP

25014 Las Brisas Road South, Suite B  
Murrieta, California 92562  
Telephone: (951) 304-7566  
Facsimile: (951) 304-7571

April 23, 2018

Scott Donnell  
Senior Planner  
City of Carlsbad  
Community and Economic Development  
1635 Faraday Avenue  
Carlsbad, CA 92008-7314

Via email and U.S. mail

Re: Carlsbad Zoning/Village & Barrio Master Plan  
(Revised January 2018) - Public Record

Dear Scott:

I want to complement you on a great presentation to the Planning Commission on April 18, 2018, regarding the Village & Barrio Master Plan ("Master Plan").

As you know, the staff report, together with the resolutions and underlying documents (consisting of approximately 500 pages), were not released until a couple days before the April 18 Planning Commission meeting. For that reason, myself and many other speakers at the meeting were not able to address in depth the staff report and the underlying findings in that report.

As you know from my comments at the Planning Commission meeting on April 18, I support the proposed draft of the Master Plan, with the exception of a couple items regarding: a) the proposed revised parking standards (page 2-22, Master Plan 1-16-18); and b) "Minor Site Development Plan" under section 6.3.3 (page 6.4, Master Plan - 1-16-18).

I was pleased to hear you indicate at the meeting that the language under the Minor Site Development Plan will be revised to clear up the ambiguities in that section.

I have now had an opportunity to research and analyze the Municipal Code Parking Standards for the "peer cities" (Dana Point, Encinitas, Huntington Beach, Laguna Beach, Monterey, San Clemente, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Monica) which you mentioned at the April 18 Planning Commission meeting, and as referenced in the staff report (appendix C, Responses to Comments, at pg. RTC-11).

Preliminarily, I am not sure how Laguna Beach, Monterey, Santa Monica and/or San Luis Obispo are considered "peer cities" as they are not similar to Carlsbad's current Village & Barrio topography, amenities and/or current

Page Two  
April 23, 2018

density. However, assuming that these other cities are comparable to Carlsbad, my research reflected that the current "parking standards" as established in the peer cities respective Municipal Codes, essentially either meet or exceed the current parking standards now set forth in Carlsbad's Municipal Code section 21.44.020 Table A.

Enclosed for your reference is another copy of the "Sample of Local Minimum Parking Requirements (Revised 2/15/18)" which I sent to you under my letter dated February 20, 2018. As you can see from the Parking Summary, San Clemente and the City of Encinitas's parking standards are significantly higher than current Municipal Code section 21.44.020 Table A.

As to the other "peer cities," I have prepared and enclose herewith a "Sample 'Peer City' Minimum Parking Requirements, as of 4/23/18" for the Cities of Dana Point, Huntington Beach, Laguna Beach, Monterey (rental and condo), San Luis Obispo and Santa Monica.

Based upon my research and calculations, it is readily apparent that these other "peer cities" currently have Municipal Code parking standards which essentially equal or exceed Carlsbad's current Code section 21.44.020 Table A. In other words, these "peer cities" standards provide no support or justification to reduce by more than one-third Carlsbad's current parking standards in the Village and Barrio.

I understand that all these peer cities may have significant parking issues or problems, and their "strategies" may be helpful in terms of evaluating Carlsbad's situation. However, it makes absolutely no sense to propose a reduced parking standard for Carlsbad which will only exacerbate, in the long run, an already difficult parking situation in the Village and Barrio.

The proposed one-third reduction in parking standards contained in the 1/16/18 Master Plan (page 2-22) will unavoidably create the very problems you are seeking to prevent and/or manage by adopting strategies from other peer cities with existing parking problems and already higher parking standards. Thus, the Master Plan's proposal to reduce parking standards makes absolutely no sense. In fact, if those reduced standards are implemented, within ten years, the new structures being built with inadequate parking will clearly create more problems than it solves, when the Village and Barrio residents are forced to park on the streets instead of on-site.<sup>1</sup>

In light of the above, I renew my request that the Master Plan not adopt these highly reduced parking standards and, instead, retain the current standards set forth in Carlsbad Municipal Code section 21.44.020 Table A.

---

<sup>1</sup> About 85% of Southern California residents commute to work by car, and nothing in the Master Plan addresses this issue. Please see my 12/22/2015 letter, pgs. 2-3 under "Parking Requirements" Section "A Existing And Future Needs" (Appendix C Responses to Comments, at pgs. RTC 15-16).



Page Three  
April 23, 2018

Again, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation for your professional courtesy and cooperation in working through this long process to finalize the Master Plan and implement it as soon as possible, with these slight revisions.

Sincerely,

**THE BAILEY LEGAL GROUP**

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John L. Bailey

JLB:kg

Enclosures

cc: **City Council (Email only)**

Honorable Matt Hall, Mayor (matt.hall@carlsbadca.gov)  
Honorable Keith Blackburn (keith.blackburn@carlsbadca.gov)  
Honorable Mark Packard (mark.packard@carlsbadca.gov)  
Honorable Cori Schumacher (cori.schumacher@carlsbadca.gov)  
Honorable Michael Schumacher (michael.schumacher@carlsbadca.gov)

cc: **Planning Commission Members (Email only)**

Honorable Marty Montgomery, Chairman  
Honorable Velyn Anderson, Vice Chairman  
Honorable Jeff Segall  
Honorable Arthur Niel Black  
Honorable Roy Meenes  
Honorable Carolyn Luna  
(c/o Planning Commission Clerk at planning@carlsbadca.gov)

Pam Drew, Associate Planner (via email only)

Barrio Neighbors (via email only)

**Sample "Peer City" Minimum Parking Requirements As of 4/23/18**

Below is a table listing the "peer" cities' general minimum parking requirements for multi-family housing, that also references the Municipal Code section under which the requirements are established. For comparison purposes, the required off-street parking spaces, including guest parking, was calculated for a hypothetical 120 unit development consisting of: 30 one bedroom units, 30 two bedroom units, and 60 three bedroom units. The municipalities are listed from the lowest average required spaces per unit to the highest.

	Minimum Required Parking Spaces per Unit Multi-Family Developments (by Unit Type, Guest for all Units)				Hypothetical 120 Unit Development	
	1 BR	2BR	3BR	Guest	Total Spaces	Spaces Per Unit
Dana Point 9.35.080(E)	1.5	2.0	2.5	.20 per unit	279	2.32
Huntington Beach 231.04 Sched. A	1.0	2.0	2.5	.50 per unit	300	2.5
Laguna Beach 25.52.012(G)	1.5	2.0	2.0	.25 per unit	255	2.12
Monterey Rental	2.0	2.0	2.0	-0-	240	2.0
Monterey Condo 38-115 Sched. A	2.0	2.0	3.0	-0-	300	2.5
San Luis Obispo 17.16.060 Table 6	1.5	2.0	2.5	.20 per unit	279	2.32
Santa Monica Citywide Standard 9.28.060 <sup>1</sup>	1.5	2.0	2.0	.20 per unit	249	2.07

<sup>1</sup> Small sections of the pier and downtown area of Santa Monica do have lower parking standards under this Code. However, the pier and downtown areas of Santa Monica are not comparable in topography, density, building height standards, amenities, etc., to the Village and Barrio in order to make a fair comparison.

Sample of Local Minimum Parking Requirements (Revised 2/15/18)

Below is a table listing some local beach cities' general minimum parking requirements for multi-family housing, that also references the Municipal Code section under which the requirements are established. For comparison purposes, the required off-street parking spaces, including guest parking, was calculated for a hypothetical 120 unit development consisting of: 30 one bedroom units, 30 two bedroom units, and 60 three bedroom units. The municipalities are listed from the lowest average required spaces per unit to the highest.

	Minimum Required Parking Spaces per Unit Multi-Family Developments (by Unit Type, Guest for all Units)				Hypothetical 120 Unit Development	
	1 BR	2BR	3BR	Guest	Total Spaces	Spaces Per Unit
Oceanside 31.3103	1.5	2	2	1 plus 20% of total units	250	2.08
Carlsbad 21.44.020 Table A	1.5	2	2	.25/unit	255	2.12
Solana Beach 17.52.040	1.5	2	2	.25/unit	255	2.12
San Clemente 17.64.050 Table	1.5	2	2.5	0.333/unit	295	2.45
Encinitas 35.54.030	2	2	2.5	.25/unit	300	2.5
San Diego 142.0525 Table 142.05C <sup>1</sup>						
a) Basic	1.5	2.0	2.25	20% of total off street parking required	288	2.4
b) Transit/low income <sup>2</sup>	1.25	1.75	2.0		252	2.1
c) Beach/school impact	1.75	2.25	2.5		324	2.7
<b>Proposed Draft Master Plan (Revised January 2018)</b>						
Village/Surrounding Area	1	1.5	1.5	-0-	165	1.37
Barrio Center/ Perim.	1	1.5	1.5	.25/unit	195	1.63

Note: All of the above are merely the number of required parking spaces. This list does not include the additional regulations cities impose such as requiring that at least one space per unit be covered, etc.

<sup>1</sup> San Diego Code requires more parking for developments that are "... at least partially within a designated beach impact area ..." and transit/affordable housing areas so all three calculations are provided.

<sup>2</sup> San Diego Code allows some flexibility for common area/visitor parking to increase or decrease based on the area affected by the development.

<sup>3</sup> "Development qualifying for both a reduced parking ratio (transit area or very low income parking ratio) and an increased parking ratio (Parking Impact Area) shall also use the basic parking ratio." (Footnote 1 for Table 142.05C)