

CITY OF ENCINITAS



Workshop #3 Summary

August 2024

Prepared for:



Prepared by:



RICK – Planning + Design Division
5620 Friars Rd, San Diego CA 92110



Table of Contents

1. Workshop #3 Background.....	2
2. Workshop #3 Overview.....	2
2.1 Presentation.....	2
2.2 Open House.....	5
3. Workshop #3 Input Summary.....	5
3.1 Workshop #3 Themes	5
4. Conclusion.....	7
Appendix A Public Review Comments and Responses	8

1. Workshop #3 Background

The third workshop for the El Camino Real Specific Plan Project (Project) was held in-person on June 11, 2024, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Encinitas Library in the Community Room (540 Cornish Dr, Encinitas, CA, 92024). Approximately forty (40) people attended in-person. Community members who were not able to attend or who had additional input to share following the workshop were able to provide comments using the interactive online platform, supported by SocialPinpoint. The virtual platform was made publicly available between June 11, 2024 and July 2, 2024 and recorded 9 user comments.

The main objectives of Workshop #3 were to:

- Provide an overview of the change in scope of the Project;
- Present the Public Review Draft El Camino Real Specific Plan;
- Obtain input on design elements of the streetscape improvements and objective design standards; and
- Receive written comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND).

Community members and stakeholders were notified of the meeting through a series of City email blasts and posts on the project website. The website hosts project materials such as the Project Fact Sheet, Workshops #1 and #2 summary and recordings, presentation slides, and other background information. The project website includes a link for community members to sign-up for project updates and review the latest events and analyses conducted by the City of Encinitas Planning Staff and RICK Planning + Design project team staff (Project Team). The project website is available here:

<https://www.encinitasca.gov/el-camino-real-sp>

All input received from the in-person workshop, online platform, and email has been recorded in this Workshop #3 summary. The input will be used to form the Final El Camino Real Specific Plan.

2. Workshop #3 Overview

Workshop #3 was organized into two main components, a presentation and an open house. The components are outlined in the section below.

2.1 Presentation

A 30-minute presentation summarized the project process, the change in direction to the project scope, legislative changes affecting the project area, and highlights of the streetscape and objective design standard components. The presentation was given by City of Encinitas Housing Services Manager, Melinda Dacey, and Project Team land use planning consultant, Brooke Peterson, AICP. During the course of the presentation, a few members in attendance asked the following questions during the course of the presentation:

Q: Will the presentation be recorded and posted online?

A: Yes

Q: Does the Specific Plan explain why the project changed to an EIR to and MND?

A: We will go over the project changes and why those occurred. No, the change to an MND will not be memorialized in either the Specific Plan or the MND.

Q: How is the specific plan going to prevent excessive development?

A: We will go over the Objective Design Standards as part of the presentation which are the City's best tool to direct appropriate scale and design of future development.

Q: Where are you from?

A: San Diego

The presentation included the following topics:

Project Team Introductions

Melinda introduced the Project Team members present at the workshop who would be available for discussions during the open house portion of the workshop. The project team included City officials such as Kerry Kusiak, Director of Development Services, and Melinda Dacey, Housing Services Manager, alongside planners from the City and the Project Team consultant RICK: Brooke Peterson and Shannon Baer.

Workshop Agenda

The workshop agenda included an approximately 30-minute presentation including the City's opening remarks. Following the presentation, the workshop attendees were invited to visit six different stations of the open house organized by topic to ask project team members questions and review project components in more detail.

Project Process

Participants were informed about the steps taken since the project's inception, highlighting the importance of community surveys and feedback from previous workshops. The Plan's primary goals are to expedite permit approvals and develop new design standards that reflect community needs and values. The presentation highlighted the background work that lead to the development of the El Camino Real Specific Plan including:

- The project being part of the HCD's Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) Grant Program to expedite permit approvals and establish objective design standards for the El Camino Real corridor.
- Community surveys and Workshops 1 and 2 which helped understand community needs and values.
- Developer Roundtable and the El Camino Real Task Force which were instrumental in the development of the standards established in the Specific Plan.

Changes in Project Direction

The presentation highlighted the recent changes in project direction in response to recent State housing legislation including Assembly Bill (AB) 2011 and Senate Bill (SB) 6, which mandate cities to approve by-

right high-density housing projects with an affordable component if they meet certain criteria. Additionally, following City Council direction on June 21, 2023, the Mixed-Use Overlay Zone was removed from the Specific Plan, allowing AB 2011 and SB 6 to replace the residential allowances. Other important changes include:

- Project boundary modifications: The Encinitas Ranch Specific Plan area and the Mobile Home Park were removed from the project boundary as they are excluded under State housing legislation.
- New emphasis on streetscape improvements and objective design standards: due to the unique challenges of the El Camino Real corridor, with its vehicle-focus, this corridor is prime for streetscape improvements and objective design standards to transform the area to cohesively and tastefully take on residential and mixed use development.

AB 2011 and SB 6 require future development to adhere to local objective design standards; therefore, making the El Camino Real Specific Plan imperative for the inclusion of objective design standards. The City is currently undergoing a separate City-lead effort for the implementation of AB 2011 and SB 6, including an Eligible Sites Mapping Tool expected this summer and an Implementation Ordinance expected in 2025. Participants were encouraged to ask Melinda questions about the separate AB 2011 and SB 6 implementation tools during the open house.

Land Use and Development Standards

The presentation provided a brief overview of key aspects of land use and development standards, such as allowed uses, and development standards such as floor area ratio (FAR), building height, setbacks, stepbacks, neighborhood adjacency, useable open space, and parking.

Objective Design Standards

The presentation provided a brief overview of objective design standards that address topics such as site design, buffers and screening, streetscape and public realm, frontage zone, building scale, massing and articulation, architectural design, and building materials.

Streetscape Standards

The presentation provided an example of streetscape standards. The example was “Where there is additional public ROW width beyond the five-foot sidewalk, a parkway will be placed between the sidewalk and the curb to create a safer and more pleasant walking experience.”

Mobility Improvements

The presentation summarized proposed mobility improvements including:

- Bus stop enhancements like signage, benches, shelters, accessible pads, removal of sidewalk obstructions, trash receptacles, and lighting.
- Bicycle improvements like cycle tracks (Class IV Bikeways) along El Camino Real and buffered Class II bike lanes.
- Pedestrian improvements like high visibility crosswalks, advance stop bars, pedestrian countdown signals, and ADA detectable warning surfaces.

Community Benefits

The presentation described how community benefits will be tied to incentives based on the number of points achieved and provided several examples. The points achieved could be exchanged for reduced parking requirements or streamlined permit processing. The community benefits program does not apply to projects using state housing law.

2.2 Open House

Following the presentation, attendees were invited to visit the open house stations to learn more about the draft Specific Plan and interact directly with the project team, ask questions, and provide written comments. Open house stations included:

- a. Overview
- b. Mobility
- c. Streetscape Renderings
- d. Objective Design Standards
- e. Community Benefits
- f. Written Comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration

At the Written Comments station, community members were given the option to write hand-written comments on a comment card and drop their comment in a submittal box or scan a QR code to an online comment submittal form. The open house encouraged a collaborative environment to ensure the draft plan aligns with the community's vision for the El Camino Real corridor. For those unable to attend, the City encouraged reviewing the draft plan available on the project website and submitting any comments or questions directly to the project team.

Comments gathered during this workshop are summarized into the themes outlined in section 3 of this report.

3. Workshop #3 Input Summary

Fourteen (14) written comments were collected during Workshop #3 and nine (9) written comments were received online through SocialPinPoint following Workshop #3, and six (6) comments were received via email to City staff. These comments were summarized into overarching themes and outlined in the section below. The themes with the most comments have been sorted towards the top of the list to signify importance.

3.1 Workshop #3 Themes

Streetscape Enhancement

Many comments were provided concerning the Specific Plan's streetscape enhancements. Comments included the desire for future designs of intersections that increase pedestrian and cyclist safety. Respondents expressed the need for updated traffic light controllers in the future to support new development and increased traffic. Respondents felt that the streets should be made for people and not for cars. This includes ensuring the streetscape is aesthetically pleasing and accessible, and hardscape areas should be reduced as much as possible.

Traffic Flow

Respondents expressed their concern for reducing traffic lanes and its impact on traffic flow, as well as the impact of narrowing travel lanes on the safety of all roadway users. Respondents expressed support for traffic calming measures and providing roadway connections between shopping centers to divert traffic from the main street.

Land Use

Comments about land use discussed the need to prioritize no net loss of commercial space when implementing new developments. Further, commercial development should focus on high quality retail stores rather than low-priced retail stores. Comments noted the need to ensure housing is strategically located along El Camino Real to reduce traffic issues. Smart growth principles should be employed when planning for new development in this area. Comments expressed support for mixed-use developments to provide both housing and commercial space.

Bike Lane Improvements

Many respondents expressed their appreciation for the bike lane improvements and bicycle infrastructure within the El Camino Real Specific Plan, however some felt that additional barriers and buffering would increase safety for cyclists.

Pedestrian Improvements

Many comments expressed the desire to see additional pedestrian improvements in the El Camino Real area to increase safety and walkability. This includes creating wider sidewalks with additional trees. Respondents would like to see stop lights and crosswalks noted on the City's Circulation maps.

Housing

Comments surrounding housing included the need for additional multi-unit housing along El Camino Real and the need to address homelessness throughout the city in future planning efforts. Respondents underlined the community's vision for more and affordable housing units to be added with all planning efforts.

Parking

Respondents expressed their concerns for ongoing parking challenges, and the desire to maintain adequate parking spaces with additional development. Some comments suggested implementing paid parking for certain commercial areas.

Design Standards

Many submitted comments focused on design standards being implemented through the El Camino Real Specific Plan. Respondents would like to maintain building height, protect views from new development, and incorporate a sense of community into future building design. Respondents hope that the City will encourage the incorporation of trees and landscaping into new developments.

Transit Improvements

Many comments expressed the desire for additional transit improvements by partnering with regional transit authorities. This includes increased service and additional stops along El Camino Real.

Specific Plan Administration

Some comments expressed the desire for zoning amendments rather than a Specific Plan process. In future they would like to see additional opportunities to provide input, wider community participation and representation at community engagement events. Respondents expressed the desire to have Encinitas unique character reflected within the Specific Plan

Public Space

Respondents would like to see developers be encouraged to provide public space within the Specific Plan area including outdoor seating, gathering places and additional green space. Respondents would like to incorporate coastal and nature inspired design into the public spaces to reflect the community's identity.

State Legislation

Given the implications of recent State Legislation, comments surrounded requests for additional information about how the legislation will affect the City of Encinitas future development and how it impacts the El Camino Real Specific Plan.

4. Conclusion

Workshop #3 gathered meaningful feedback, with a total of 33 comments collected during and after the event. Key themes highlighted the community's priorities and concerns, including pedestrian and cyclist safety, aesthetically pleasing designs, and reducing hardscape areas. Traffic flow, land use, bike lane improvements, and pedestrian enhancements were major topics, with calls for maintaining commercial space, strategic housing locations, and additional safety measures. Housing feedback emphasized more multi-unit and affordable housing, addressing homelessness, and aligning planning with community needs. Concerns about parking, design standards, size and scale of future development, and transit improvements were also prevalent. Respondents outlined the desire for robust community engagement in all future planning efforts.

Appendix A Public Review Comments and Responses

The table below discloses all public comments received during the public comment period from June 3, 2024 to July 2, 2024. While prior workshop summary documents do not include direct responses to comments received, direct responses are included herein as a part of the public record to respond to all comments received during the public comment period.

Received Via	Related to SP or MND	Comment	Response
Email	Specific Plan	<p>I just received the draft document. Thank you for also following up with me that it is finally available even though with such a short advance as to be really an insult and deletion of real public input and considerations.</p> <p>It is impractical and contrary to transparency and public interest for there to be just a week to review the draft, particularly since also it refers to many other documents not presented. Also, the judgments of impacts are mostly self-serving and ignore or try to circumvent legitimate concerns</p> <p>In short the draft should not be approved AT ALL before extensive detailed public and concerned outreach and specific response and consideration of feedbacks. Also, the plan must incorporate specific detailed prohibitions, fees for public infrastructure (including schools), and requirement that NO residential development be treated as "right" without major locally affected public input and court challenges.</p> <p>Just as an example, and a major one: the draft should incorporate specific development requirements, including impact of the neighborhoods and on traffic, particularly as to any residential development.</p> <p>Another example is the ignored discussion of "shared parking". At an earlier public meeting the city planner asserted there was no impact. However, importantly and ignored is that work and shopping schedules do not coincide to make parking available. E.g., many people work from home and/or at irregular hours that conflicts with the shopping parking access which extends from 7AM-11PM, or more, depending on the site, and many need to shop at irregular hours (meaning up 24/7) due to work, family, and emergencies.</p> <p>Another example is the ignoring of the many traffic and safety impacts of narrowing traffic lanes. Also, as seen along PCH south of Swamis there is a significant unconsidered danger to bikers and to passing cars and pedestrians.</p> <p>Adding such biker set asides along additional residential corridors, like Mountain View and Garden View are destructive of safety along these necessary residential corridors.</p>	<p>C-1: Comment noted. The Draft IS/MND was circulated for public review consistent with the requirements of CEQA. The Draft IS/MND was posted on both the State Clearinghouse website and City’s website on June 3rd. The Draft IS/MND and the Public Notice of Availability included contact information for the City project manager for the public to submit comments.</p> <p>C-2: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This comment has been provided to the decision makers for consideration.</p> <p>C-3: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND, which discloses all potential impacts associated with the project. This comment has been provided to the decision makers for consideration.</p> <p>C-4: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. Parking is not a topic that requires analysis under CEQA. This comment has been provided to the decision makers for consideration.</p> <p>C-5: Section XVII.a of the Final IS/MND has been revised to state the following: Additional lane narrowing may be considered to increase separation from vehicular traffic and further improve bicyclist comfort and safety. Existing lane widths on the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA are 10.5 feet for the innermost lane, 10 feet in middle lane, and 11 feet in the outermost lane. The project would reduce the width of the inner most lane by 0.5 feet and retain the existing widths of the other two lanes. Therefore, the project would not change the width of the outermost roadway lane adjacent to the proposed cycle track along the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Similarly, retention of the 11-foot width of the outermost roadway lane would preserve existing travel conditions for buses utilizing the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Regarding safety associated with reduction of the width of the innermost lane, the California Highway Design Manual allows for use of 10-foot-wide lanes in local jurisdictions. Text added to Section XVII.a has also been added to Section XVII.c of the Final IS/MND. Furthermore, the project would increase safety by adding buffers to the existing Class II bike lanes along Garden View Road and Mountain Vista Drive.</p>
Workshop 3: hand-written	Specific Plan	1. Update the circulation map to show stop lights & crosswalks; 2. Are there any plans to add new bus stops? Any changes or existing stops approved by NCTD? 3. Pictures of adaptive controllers; 4. any plans to change lights on Encinitas Blvd turning into Ralphps/TJ and into the LA Fitness given potential development.	Comment noted. No revisions have been made to the ECRSP. Figure 5-1, Roadway Network shows locations of Adaptive Signal Controller which are signalized intersections with crosswalks. As North County Transit District determines the locations of bus stop locations, no new bus stops have been included. The ECRSP does not include specific details such as signal timing.
Workshop 3: hand-written	Specific Plan	For Class IV bike lanes please consider not using asphalt curbs(Like the Cardiff corridor) as I believe and have seen that these do more harm then good.	Comment noted. Divider design will be identified pursuant to City Public Road standards.
Workshop 3: hand-written	Specific Plan	PG. 1 - Continued Mobility improvements are so important considering All road users' bikes & pets too. Focus on making the corridor more for PEOPLE, not cars(? Cut thru traffic) Street & Housing/Mixed use forward-thinking stance should include a car lane reduction! Housing Mixed use. Well done Brooke w/ early interruptions of attendees. Be respectful people. PG.2 - Bikes>for class IV limit # of bollards/no wheel stops. Stop calling them protected. Separated better. Needs to improve connectivity street crossings missing to segments together current. Developer benefits - encourage outdoor seating, gathering spaces/places & green space, no turf but rather native	Comment noted. Divider design will be identified pursuant to City Public Road standards.

		plants, trees, etc.... Love class I in proposed circulation for Encinitas Blvd & Leucadia Blvd. Other proposed changes good too. Circulation bus stop entrance. much needed. Can partnership w/NCTD make it all happen even sooner? Maintaining 4 lanes in the end direction on ECR is crazy not forward thinking & misses the mark transforming the corridor requires this current to continue to change less is more. 3 lanes max in each direction. More roadway connected to space for bikes, peds, 3 people. shade trees too. Objective design standards overall look good. Mixed-use. Repurpose parking lots standards for the amount of parking requirements. Lower embraces idea of paid parking for remaining commercial parking. Too much focus on parking currently needs to change. -housing, parking, outdoor dining, gathering places. Overall format of workshop; more slides & talk time & Q&A vs board time; consultants have to have same/similar conversations over & over; just do once while going & then split off into time w/displays/boards for following discussions. (dense & intense) C of Encinitas really needs to better educate residents around. Housing - what is now local control vs CA State mandate please? Better format info. Provide clipboards to use to facilitate writing comments in front of boards. Come on single-use water bottles. No! Be a solid example aluminum cans instead.	
Workshop 3: hand-written	Specific Plan	Please show data from other cities that have narrowed lanes for many years and show their accidents rates increase. Thanks :-)	Section XVII.a of the Final IS/MND has been revised to state the following: Additional lane narrowing may be considered to increase separation from vehicular traffic and further improve bicyclist comfort and safety. Existing lane widths on the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA are 10.5 feet for the innermost lane, 10 feet in middle lane, and 11 feet in the outermost lane. The project would reduce the width of the inner most lane by 0.5 feet and retain the existing widths of the other two lanes. Therefore, the project would not change the width of the outermost roadway lane adjacent to the proposed cycle track along the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Similarly, retention of the 11-foot width of the outermost roadway lane would preserve existing travel conditions for buses utilizing the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Regarding safety associated with reduction of the width of the innermost lane, the California Highway Design Manual allows for use of 10-foot-wide lanes in local jurisdictions. Text added to Section XVII.a has also been added to Section XVII.c of the Final IS/MND. Furthermore, the project would increase safety by adding buffers to the existing Class II bike lanes along Garden View Road and Mountain Vista Drive.
Social Pin- Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	<p>Please accept these comments and suggestions. I apologize in advance if they sound overly detailed. I don't mean to edit staff/consultant work, but to help suggest clarifications.</p> <p>Page 40 4.4.1 Intent - consider adding that additional site design intents are to visually blend with the context, and improve pedestrian and alternate modes circulation function and safety.</p> <p>Standards: consider adding to item 4. Internal pedestrian paseos should strive to create choices - creatively address access using existing slopes and also provide alternate accessible routes.</p> <p>Page 41 6.b. what is meant by "non-contiguous sidewalks shall be provided"? Why non-contiguous?</p> <p>Page 43 - the city's street tree list is decades old, and no longer serves us. Most planners don't even know it exists. Many of the species listed are high water users, and high maintenance. Can we please update our "approved street tree list" referenced in general, or at least make the effort on this project to define a palette of acceptable trees for ECR? Our consultant can do that, they are landscape architects.</p> <p>Streetscape furniture and bike racks etc. should have a local art component. These off-the-shelf ideas shown are generally attractive, but we also want the streetscape to be unique and have personality. Each block could develop a unique theme, and artists invited to be integral to both the public and private realm design.</p> <p>Page 43 3.b. Why 2' tall? sight visibility is 18" if that is what is being said. Defensible space is also 18" and tree canopy trimmed up to 5'.</p> <p>Frontage Zone and public realm should both cover daylighting the drainage ways so that they can be revegetated and convey stormwater.</p> <p>Page 47 - I didn't see mention of permeable pavers. Where are we requiring pavement we should consider requiring it be permeable so we reduce our stormwater runoff and improve the health of the plants and open space.</p> <p>page 48 Frontage Zone: consider all permeable paving or permeable surfacing here too.</p>	<p>Chapter 4 – Design Standards, Sections 4.1 and 4.4.2 – Streetscape and Public Realm have been revised to add language regarding the importance of context sensitive design.</p> <p>Section 4.4.1, no. 4 has been revised to specifically note providing for additional pedestrian mode choice.</p> <p>Non-contiguous refers to sidewalks that are separated from the private drive by a landscaped parkway. Non-contiguous sidewalks separate the pedestrian from the vehicular travel which can improve the pedestrian experience.</p> <p>Revisions and updates to the City's approved Street Tree List is beyond the scope of the ECRSP.</p> <p>Chapter 4 – Design Standards, Section 4.4.3 – Frontage Zone, 2. contains provisions intended to encourage public art within the El Camino Real Corridor. Chapter 6 – Community Benefits includes Public Art as a stand-alone option in the list of Community Benefit options and public art is encouraged in other options listed in the table. The Specific Plan has also been revised to encourage Local Public Art in the list of Community Benefit options in Table 6-1 of the Specific Plan.</p> <p>Pg 43, 3.b of the ECRSP has been revised to note sight visibility of 18 inches.</p> <p>To encourage daylighting of Cottonwood Creek, Chapter 6 – Community Benefit of the ECRSP has been revised to include daylighting of Cottonwood Creek in the list of Community Benefit options in Table 6-1, Menu of Community Benefit Options .</p> <p>Section 4.4.3 - Frontage Zone of the ECRSP has not been revised to require all permeable paving or permeable surfacing. Section 4.4.6 – Circulation and Parking, 5.c. of the ECRSP requires surface parking design to utilize pervious paving treatments.</p>

		<p>1.d. Whose responsibility will maintenance of site furnishing in frontage zone be? It will be helpful to clarify maintenance of this zone.</p> <p>What is meant by the "applicable regional standards"? Companion seating for ADA compliance maybe? What percentage and how frequently should ADA compliant . seating be?</p> <p>page 51 4.4.5 Placemaking - consider how the developer will count these 3 things. Does one piece of art count as 3 pieces if there is an inch between 3 tiles? Does one shade tree count for 1 feature. or how long of a pedestrian path qualifies for 1 feature? One segment of 15' widened sidewalk or the whole length of the sidewalk?</p> <p>page 52- permeable paving consider adding to this section.</p> <p>page 64 - 9. Why is drip irrigation excluded? Drip irrigation can be efficient depending on what is being planted, and our landscape code doesn't exclude it.</p> <p>12. Consider clarifying - are we asking the city to provide a biologist to review the native riparian species in the 100' of naturalized area next to Encinitas Creek? I think this is a good idea, but this document is meant to direct the developer.</p> <p>Page 88 LEED could also include "LEED for Neighborhood Development - LEED-ND" https://www.usgbc.org/leed</p>	<p>Maintenance of site furnishings in the frontage zone would be the responsibility of the private property owner/leasee.</p> <p>The entire piece of art would be considered one piece regardless of distance between tiles.</p> <p>As noted in 4.4.5 - Placemaking 1.b. of the ECRSP, shade trees shall be provided on both sides of the pedestrian paths/sidewalks.</p> <p>Section 4.4.5 1.f of the ECRSP has been revised to note that the entire length of the project frontage shall be widened with a minimum of 15-ft. In addition, Section 4.4.5 - Placemaking, 1. has been revised to note three <i>distinct</i> features.</p> <p>Section 4.4.3 - 1.d of the ECRSP has been revised to note "site furnishings shall meet applicable City of Encinitas regional quality standards."</p> <p>Section 4.4.15 - Landscaping of the ECRSP has been revised to remove the explicit exclusion of drip irrigation.</p> <p>Section 4.4.15 - Landscaping, 12 of the ECRSP does not specify the responsible party as it shall apply to whichever public or private entity is proposing landscape improvements within 100 feet of naturalized Encinitas Creek segments.</p> <p>Chapter 6 – Community Benefits of the ECRSP, Table 6-1: Menu of Community Benefit Options, has been revised to add LEED for Neighborhood Development certification.</p>
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	<p>I've attended all but one of the public input events and outings. Thank you for allowing our input! After attending and reviewing renderings at the last meeting, I'd like to note the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As our city logo implies, we are a city with a history steeped in flowers. To preserve the history as a flower producer, it would be really nice to incorporate a lot of hanging flower pots and/or planted flowers along the corridor, as seen in parts of downtown Encinitas. 2. The fig leaf vine that fills in the outer walls along Leucadia Blvd (between Saxony and Quail Gardens) is not only a lovely a low maintenance backdrop, but acts as a graffiti deterrent. There is quite an uptick in graffiti around town. Would be a great consideration for the half wall in front of the trailer park, and on side walls of new buildings. 3. Encinitas is known for its unique character. The benches, lamp posts, and trash receptacles depicted at the meeting were very generic and unappealing. So many new areas in CA are using contemporary versions of these accessories, and it would be really nice to distinguish our town from every other inland city. Our town deserves some non-generic options! Something like the remodeled UTC mall seating areas, perhaps? 4. Bus stops are a great place to really add some nice character with wood, glass, planters. Have seen some really nice looking bus stops in the past few years that are not generic. Happy to provide photos of examples, wherever possible. 5. It would be nice to add gold string lights to sitting areas visible to the street, to create a “village” feel, at night 6. PLEASE consider using 3000 kelvin or lower lighting for all new areas, as this is a health concern for some people and wildlife. Considering “dark sky compliant” lighting would be a welcome reprieve and balance to all the new development. Residents would be so grateful!! <p>Thank you again for welcoming public input - it really means a lot to us, as longtime residents!</p>	<p>All lighting associated with development within the ERSP boundary would be required to comply with CA building standards.</p>
Workshop 3: hand-written	Specific Plan	<p>Re: Community Benefits - Figure 6-1 very dated and ?? fountains, playgrounds & public area. Would love to see contemporary & Nature inspired features (costal)...UTC is newly developed area for example. I do design work - I'm very interested in the over street sign being proposed at intersection. ECR & Leucadia Bl/Encinitas Bl. Backlit signs have been repaired due to community complaints. I'd love to find out more about these signs and would love to offer ideas!</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
Workshop 3: hand-written	Specific Plan	<p>Where are all the potential tenants in new developments going to park since parking requirements for new developments is now so low?</p>	<p>A parking study was prepared during the initial phase of the project that took an inventory of the existing parking lots where parking occupancy was manually counted and mapped. The study found that existing parking conditions demonstrate a significant surplus of parking in the Specific Plan Area. While the ECRSP does not directly propose residential, the parking study noted that the addition of residential development in the Specific Plan Area would complement the current parking demand patterns.</p>

			<p>As discussed on page 6-85, Section 6.2.1, Applicability of the ECRSP, the parking reduction incentive included in the Community Benefits Program only applies to projects that utilize the underlying uses of Office Professional, General Commercial, and Public/Semi-Public. Residential and mixed-use projects utilizing State housing legislation may not receive these additional incentives but are strongly encouraged to incorporate these types of community benefits into their plans. As such, residential projects will not get reduced parking through the ECRSP.</p> <p>In addition, Section XVII.a of the Final IS/MND has been revised to state the following: Additional lane narrowing may be considered to increase separation from vehicular traffic and further improve bicyclist comfort and safety. Existing lane widths on the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA are 10.5 feet for the innermost lane, 10 feet in middle lane, and 11 feet in the outermost lane. The project would reduce the width of the inner most lane by 0.5 feet and retain the existing widths of the other two lanes. Therefore, the project would not change the width of the outermost roadway lane adjacent to the proposed cycle track along the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Similarly, retention of the 11-foot width of the outermost roadway lane would preserve existing travel conditions for buses utilizing the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Regarding safety associated with reduction of the width of the innermost lane, the California Highway Design Manual allows for use of 10-foot-wide lanes in local jurisdictions. Text added to Section XVII.a has also been added to Section XVII.c of the Final IS/MND. Furthermore, the project would increase safety by adding buffers to the existing Class II bike lanes along Garden View Road and Mountain Vista Drive.</p>
Workshop 3: hand-written	Specific Plan	Landscape - Soften the buildings. More tree line STREET El Camino Real	See Section 4.4.2 Streetscape and Public Realm of the El Camino Real Specific Plan, for street tree standards and cross-sections that include street trees along El Camino Real.
Workshop 3: hand-written	Specific Plan	Worried about lack of parking. Also, I am concerned about the narrow lanes & having my view blocked behind my house.	<p>A parking study was prepared during the initial phase of the project that took an inventory of the existing parking lots where parking occupancy was manually counted and mapped. The study found that existing parking conditions demonstrate a significant surplus of parking in the Specific Plan Area. While the ECRSP does not directly propose residential, the parking study noted that the addition of residential development in the Specific Plan Area would complement the current parking demand patterns.</p> <p>As discussed on page 6-85, Section 6.2.1, Applicability of the ECRSP, the parking reduction incentive included in the Community Benefits Program only applies to projects that utilize the underlying uses of Office Professional, General Commercial, and Public/Semi-Public. Residential and mixed-use projects utilizing State housing legislation may not receive these additional incentives but are strongly encouraged to incorporate these types of community benefits into their plans. As such, residential projects will not get reduced parking through the ECRSP.</p>
Workshop 3: hand-written	Specific Plan	Do not cut back on parking. If this is going to be a successful shopping and living area - it must have adequate parking. I don't shop where parking is difficult. Some mixed-use residential is good, but not at the lessening of commercial space. Max should be 50-50 with less restriction preferred. Safety for pedestrians is primary. Would like to see sound transportation available to Hi Country Village area & other neighborhoods. The current focus of low-price retail stores is sad - not quality retail. Shopping centers should connect where possible. Pull traffic off El Camino.	<p>A parking study was prepared during the initial phase of the project that took an inventory of the existing parking lots where parking occupancy was manually counted and mapped. The study found that existing parking conditions demonstrate a significant surplus or parking in the Specific Plan Area. While the ECRSP does not directly propose residential, the parking study noted that the addition of residential development in the Specific Plan Area would complement the current parking demand patterns.</p> <p>As discussed on page 6-85, Section 6.2.1, Applicability of the ECRSP, the parking reduction incentive included in the Community Benefits Program only applies to projects that utilize the underlying uses of Office Professional, General Commercial, and Public/Semi-Public. Residential and mixed-use projects utilizing State housing legislation may not receive these additional incentives but are strongly encouraged to incorporate these types of community</p>

			benefits into their plans. As such, residential projects will not get reduced parking through the ECRSP.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	The one spot for housing makes sense by Armstrongs. The one main concern would be lowering the car lanes to 10'. Studies have shown this does not make it safer because it is too narrow and cars and trucks are not safe. A sense of community would be great amongst all of the commercial buildings.	<p>Section XVII.a of the Final IS/MND has been revised to state the following:</p> <p>Additional lane narrowing may be considered to increase separation from vehicular traffic and further improve bicyclist comfort and safety. <u>Existing lane widths on the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA are 10.5 feet for the innermost lane, 10 feet in middle lane, and 11 feet in the outermost lane. The project would reduce the width of the inner most lane by 0.5 feet and retain the existing widths of the other two lanes. Therefore, the project would not change the width of the outermost roadway lane adjacent to the proposed cycle track along the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Similarly, retention of the 11-foot width of the outermost roadway lane would preserve existing travel conditions for buses utilizing the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Regarding safety associated with reduction of the width of the innermost lane, the California Highway Design Manual allows for use of 10-foot-wide lanes in local jurisdictions.</u></p> <p>Text added to Section XVII.a has also been added to Section XVII.c of the Final IS/MND.</p> <p>Furthermore, the project would increase safety by adding buffers to the existing Class II bike lanes along Garden View Road and Mountain Vista Drive.</p>
Email	Specific Plan and MND	<p>1. As I pointed out several times last night, there is still as of 5 minutes ago no link at the proposed Draft website for public comments.</p> <p>2. As I pointed out several times last night, July 2 as the deadline for public comments A) is less than 30 days since the Draft was published online and distributed to the public. As I wrote you before that just publishing it a few days before the June 11 Public meeting was inadequate for the public to read, digest, or question. B) There is no justification for rushing public comments. There should be far wider distribution and much longer opportunities to comment. July 2 is a wrongful and artificial attempt to rush this defective Draft to the City Council.</p> <p>3. A) Holding the June 11 meeting at the downtown library, far away from the affected area and the nearby residents, is a negligent or purposeful attempt to reduce awareness and opportunity for the directly affected residents to weigh in. B) Not allowing any public comments during the June 11 meeting was another blockage of sharing views by the public, or to the media.</p> <p>4. It was revealed at the June 11 meeting that there is a separate effort to make City policy in support of the various State housing laws, to which the Draft repeatedly refers that the Specific Plan would commit this and future City Councils to accept whatever Sacramento says regardless of defects, local impacts, or the City Council's obligation to protect Encinitas by legal challenges. The Specific Plan Draft is a thinly veiled attempt to still impose on ECR a residential overlay, and despite mostly opposition by residents.</p> <p>5. There is NO need for the Specific Plan at all. Beautification and zoning changes already have a process. The Specific Plan draft and attempt is only a payoff to builders and their donations to City Council members. Media and legal investigations will reveal the corruption at play here, and to the harm of Encinitas and its residents.</p> <p>6. The Draft also contains many dangerous elements, such as the narrowing of traffic lanes despite no multiple independent measured proof that narrowed lanes increase safety rather than reduce safety. Narrowed lanes is just an ideological assertion without independent proof, and no such measurements within Encinitas.</p> <p>7. The costs of the Draft are not disclosed, The \$60-million spent on PCH in Leucadia and another \$20-million plus needed there are indicative of the misuse of Encinitas funds, and no excuse for the Council's efforts to increase our sales taxes or other fees. The Draft is fiscally reckless and denies Encinitas true needs for other more pressing obligations.</p>	<p>D-1: Comment noted. The Draft IS/MND was circulated for public review consistent with the requirements of CEQA. The Draft IS/MND was posted on both the State Clearinghouse website and City's website on June 3rd. The Draft IS/MND and the Public Notice of Availability included contact information for the City project manager for the public to submit comments.</p> <p>D-2: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. The City regularly holds meetings at the downtown library, which serves as public gathering space in the City. This comment has been provided to the decision makers for consideration.</p> <p>D-3: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This comment has been provided to the decision makers for consideration.</p> <p>D-4: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This comment has been provided to the decision makers for consideration.</p> <p>D-5: Section XVII.a of the Final IS/MND has been revised to state the following:</p> <p>Additional lane narrowing may be considered to increase separation from vehicular traffic and further improve bicyclist comfort and safety. Existing lane widths on the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA are 10.5 feet for the innermost lane, 10 feet in middle lane, and 11 feet in the outermost lane. The project would reduce the width of the inner most lane by 0.5 feet and retain the existing widths of the other two lanes. Therefore, the project would not change the width of the outermost roadway lane adjacent to the proposed cycle track along the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Similarly, retention of the 11-foot width of the outermost roadway lane would preserve existing travel conditions for buses utilizing the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Regarding safety associated with reduction of the width of the innermost lane, the California Highway Design Manual allows for use of 10-foot-wide lanes in local jurisdictions.</p> <p>Text added to Section XVII.a has also been added to Section XVII.c of the Final IS/MND.</p> <p>D-6: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This comment has been provided to the decision makers for consideration.</p>
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	Adding large amounts of housing to the main thoroughfare in Encinitas is insane. Traffic is already bad and will be getting much worse due to the developments pushed by Catherine Blakespear and Tony Kranz. Nothing should be done until Kranz is voted out of office and people who actually love this City are sworn in	The proposed Specific Plan does not directly propose residential uses along El Camino Real. Residential development applicants may be able to use State housing law to propose residential

			or residential mixed-use along commercial corridors such as El Camino Real, however, that is outside the purview of the City and the El Camino Real Specific Plan and MND.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	I live near the apex of Via Cantebria and Via Montoro. I LOVE all the planned safe pedestrian friendly walking spaces along El Camino Real, in addition to making the entire area more aesthetically pleasing and accessible. Right now, it is just ugly strip mall after strip mall. I thank you for your thoughtful innovation plans to make our community a more beautiful pedestrian area.	Comment noted.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	Stoked for more bike safety, beautification, pedestrian-ability and to SLOW DOWN traffic any way possible :)	Comment noted.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	Love the new streetscape for el camino. It will make it safer for walkers with a small plant barrier when with kids. The separated bike lane is a must for ebikes and current biking situation. Next stop is Saxony street. A major traffic road that is dangerous to bikers and drivers alike.	Comment noted.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	I am opposed to the removal of the Mixed-Use Overlay. It is discouraging that the business-as-usual approach of the Public Review Draft Specific Plan no longer supports development of additional housing units, particularly affordable units. I believe this is inconsistent with the overall community vision, State and regional goals, and good planning practice. I would encourage the City to reconsider the draft land use map within the Specific Plan to allow for mixed-use development within the El Camino Real corridor and to follow Smart Growth principles to: -create a greater diversity of housing types within Encinitas; -create more walkable and bikeable neighborhoods; -direct investment and economic benefits to commercial properties within Old Encinitas; -preserve existing open space and vacant properties by focusing housing within infill areas.	While the mixed-use overlay has been removed, residential development applicants may be able to use State housing law to propose residential or residential mixed-use along commercial corridors such as El Camino Real. To address the potential mix of residential with commercial development to the extent feasible outside of State housing law, the Specific Plan provides objective design standards that may apply to such residential or mixed-use residential development within the El Camino Real Specific Plan area. See Section 5.4.1 Recommended Bicycle Improvements and Section 5.5.1 Recommended Pedestrian Improvements of the Specific Plan, intended to create more a walkable and bikeable corridor.
Email	Specific Plan	NCTD is currently reviewing the Draft El Camino Real Specific Plan, and I had one clarifying question. Does Figure 5-4 indicate which amenities are recommended to be added to the existing bus stop amenities, or does the map indicate the only amenities that will be there after the plan? For example, the two stops at El Camino Real and Mountain Vista Dr currently have a bench and trash can receptacle. The map indicates that only an ADA compliant bus pad is recommended for these stops. Does this mean that the plan recommends removing the bench and trash can, or just adding the ADA pad to the existing condition?	Section 5.3.1, Recommended Transit Improvements, of the ECRSP has been revised to state, "To ensure the established bus stops provide the recommended amenities, Figure 5-4, Recommended Amenities by Bus Stop, identifies the recommended transit-related amenities to be added to existing bus stops throughout the SPA."
Email	Specific Plan	https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Y6vKnsVbr4RZnsUNMzkxcHvCgDbrxShPK6p3GBAQVsk/edit	Comment noted. Chapter 4 – Design Standards, Sections 4.4.2 – Streetscape and Public Realm, 4.4.4 - Buffers and Screening, 4.4.5 – Placemaking, and 4.4.6 – Circulation and Parking of the Specific Plan contain provisions requiring street trees. We recognize the history of the El Camino Real corridor and its significance. A Historical Significance description is included on page 2 of the Specific Plan. For Sale Housing has been added to list of Community Benefit options in Table 6-1 of the Specific Plan. A comprehensive design theme will be determined at a later date based on a separate future branding effort, as conducted by the Development Services Department and approved by the City Council. Chapter 4 – Design Standards of the Specific Plan, Sections 4.4.2 – Streetscape and Public Realm, 4.4.4 - Buffers and Screening, 4.4.5 – Placemaking, and 4.4.6 – Circulation and Parking contain provisions requiring street trees. Sections 4.4.4 – Buffers and Screening and 4.4.15 – Landscaping contain provisions addressing landscape requirements. Section 4.4.6 – Circulation and Parking, 5.c. of the Specific Plan requires surface parking design to utilize pervious paving treatments. Chapter 4 – Design Standards, Section 4.4.10, 4.a. and 8 contain provisions regarding architectural design including awnings, overhands, trellises, etc. The Specific Plan has been revised to incorporate additional illustrative examples of streetscape elements and greenspace.

			Chapter 4 – Design Standards, Section 4.4.3 – Frontage Zone, 2. contains provisions intended to encourage public art within the El Camino Real Corridor. Chapter 6 – Community Benefits includes Public Art as a stand-alone option in the list of Community Benefit options and public art is encouraged in other options listed in the table. The Specific Plan has also been revised to encourage Local Public Art in the list of Community Benefit options in Table 6-1 of the Specific Plan. In addition, the Specific Plan has been revised to incorporate additional illustrative examples of amenities that could occur within the Corridor, including public art. The Specific Plan has been revised to incorporate additional illustrative examples of streetscape elements and creative design.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	<p>Comments on El Camino Real Specific Plan presentation January 23, 2024</p> <p>My main comments relate to the cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. Slide 16 shows bike lanes adjacent to cars with trees separating bikes from pedestrians. I would prefer to have the landscaping separating the bikes from the cars and the bikes adjacent to pedestrians. Cars are heavy and kill cyclists in collisions. Bicycles are relatively light and rarely kill pedestrians during collisions. And if there is sufficient land, it’s always nice to separate the bikes from the pedestrians also.</p> <p>Slide 18 shows five options for cyclists. I favor the top, center option – with cyclists completely separated from the road by planters and from the pedestrians by more planters.</p> <p>Slide 28 shows tress with grates. The more soil we can have around the trees, the better. Hardscape up to the trunk seems unhealthy for the tree. All of those trees will grow and their trunks will be stunted by the surrounding hardscape.</p> <p>I don’t see any design standards for intersections. Intersections are the most dangerous spots for pedestrians and cyclists. Please add protected intersections with bulb outs to the plan.</p>	<p>Bicycle facilities are proposed to stay within the curb-to-curb right-of-way. Proposed improvements per Section 5.4 Bicycle Network set forth 7-foot bike lanes which exceed the Caltrans Highway Design Manual which states the minimum width for a Class II bike lane is 4 feet, except when the posted speed is greater than 40 miles per hour, the minimum width should be 6 feet.</p> <p>See Section 4.4.2 Streetscape and Public Realm of the El Camino Real Specific Plan for tree grate standards. Section 4.4.2 of the Specific Plan has been revised to require that sidewalk panels adjacent to a street tree in the parkway shall be comprised of tree grate extension panels. See Section 4.4.2 Streetscape and Public Realm of the El Camino Real Specific Plan for bulb-out standards.</p>
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan and MND	<p>1. There is no need or justification for a Specific Plan. The matters at issue are ordinary zoning matters.</p> <p>2. A Specific Plan locks in Encinitas to the provisions, which may be inappropriate, need modifications in the future, are arbitrary, and/or lack reliable independent measurements and scientific polling of nearby residents affected.</p> <p>3. The only polling has not been scientific, fully representative, and have been "push Polling" that obstruct or deny other alternatives and views.</p> <p>4. Similarly, the few workshops have not been representative, and have been packed with City Council supporters. Similarly the City Council appointees to the Task Force were not representative but instead members already favorable to virtually anything the City Council does or says and/or to making profit fro residential overlay.</p> <p>5. A) The explicit residential overlay had to be excised as wrongful and inappropriate and unlawful. What remains is not necessary, except as a "backdoor" (as mentioned below about state laws) to locking in residential overlays to come. B)The remaining document is entirely useless and harmful as a Specific Plan, and should be rejected in entirety. C) The outside Planners are from San Diego City and in repeated questioning in public fail to actually understand Encinitas, have its character at heart, offer actual renderings from Encinitas but instead unidentified photos fro other cities, and really seek urbanized notions inappropriate to Encinitas' suburban character.</p> <p>6. Nonetheless, the overwhelming views expressed have been opposed to any residential along ECR, and to narrowed traffic lanes as dangerous and obstructing free and safe flows of traffic, and the addition of buffered bike lanes neither protect bikers and make auto traffic more unsafe.</p> <p>7. All references to obeying State residence laws must be removed: A) This is not a residential plan, so it is unnecessary to be included; B) It locks this and future City Councils into blind and rigid obedience regardless the "grey" issues rather that legal and court challenges or to negotiations.</p> <p>8. Adding bike bollards and narrowing lanes on Garden View will not add safety and will obstruct traffic that already backs up a block due to it being a main thoroughfare for residents and for the businesses and office buildings there. In addition, it is likely that in the future a large apartment building may be added at the current gym and parking site at the end of Garden View Drive.</p> <p>9. Narrowed lanes as a safety measure is not a multistudied independently measured multisite established fact but an ideological assertion. Instead it leads to reduced safety, especially for elderly drivers as well as the common</p>	<p>E-1: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This comment has been provided to the decision makers for consideration.</p> <p>E-2: Section XVII.a of the Final IS/MND has been revised to state the following: Additional lane narrowing may be considered to increase separation from vehicular traffic and further improve bicyclist comfort and safety. Existing lane widths on the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA are 10.5 feet for the innermost lane, 10 feet in middle lane, and 11 feet in the outermost lane. The project would reduce the width of the inner most lane by 0.5 feet and retain the existing widths of the other two lanes. Therefore, the project would not change the width of the outermost roadway lane adjacent to the proposed cycle track along the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Similarly, retention of the 11-foot width of the outermost roadway lane would preserve existing travel conditions for buses utilizing the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Regarding safety associated with reduction of the width of the innermost lane, the California Highway Design Manual allows for use of 10-foot-wide lanes in local jurisdictions.</p> <p>Text added to Section XVII.a has also been added to Section XVII.c of the Final IS/MND.</p> <p>This comment does not provide any evidence that the addition of buffered bike lanes neither protect bikers and make auto traffic more unsafe.</p> <p>E-3: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This comment has been provided to the decision makers for consideration.</p> <p>E-4: This comment does not provide any evidence that adding bike bollards would not increase safety, nor that narrowing lanes on Garden View will obstruct traffic. The introduction of buffers the existing Class II bike lanes along Garden View Road would increase safety. Regarding traffic congestion, Section XVII.a of the IS/MND states that the project proposes to introduce adaptive signal controllers to better manage left-turn demands and adapt to fluctuating travel patterns, which could lead to shorter or fewer left-turn lanes, thereby improving traffic flow and reducing congestion.</p> <p>E-5: See response to comment E-2 above.</p>

		driver who is not and will not be always 100% attentive. It is an ageist disregard for senior residents, and a harmful risk for all others.	
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	Homelessness needs to be addressed before building more areas that homeless can take over and cause danger and non-use by local residents.	Comment noted.
Email	Specific Plan and MND	See pdf letter	<p>B-1: Introductory comment. See responses to specific comments below.</p> <p>B-2: Comment noted. The City acknowledges the North County Transit District (NCTD) design requirements for bus stops provided in this comment and will construct bus stops identified in the specific plan consistent with these requirements. Section XVII.a of the Final IS/MND has been revised to state that the following: Additional lane narrowing may be considered to increase separation from vehicular traffic and further improve bicyclist comfort and safety. Existing lane widths on the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA are 10.5 feet for the innermost lane, 10 feet in middle lane, and 11 feet in the outermost lane. The project would reduce the width of the inner most lane by 0.5 feet and retain the existing widths of the other two lanes. Therefore, the project would not change the width of the outermost roadway lane adjacent to the proposed cycle track along the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Similarly, retention of the 11-foot width of the outermost roadway lane would preserve existing travel conditions for buses utilizing the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA. Regarding safety associated with reduction of the width of the innermost lane, the California Highway Design Manual allows for use of 10-foot-wide lanes in local jurisdictions.</p> <p>Text added to Section XVII.a has also been added to Section XVII.c of the Final IS/MND.</p> <p>B-3: Comment noted. The construction contractor for future implementing projects that may affect NCTD bus routes will provide notification via the email provided in this comment two weeks prior to construction. The construction contractor will also meet with an NCTD supervisor to determine whether construction would affect NCTD bust stops.</p> <p>B-4: Comment noted. The City acknowledges that enhanced transit access will help fulfill both Citywide and Statewide climate action plan goals.</p> <p>B-5: Conclusory remarks. See responses to specific comments above.</p> <p>B-6: The attachments to this comment letter do not introduce any new comments that address the adequacy of the IS/MND.</p>
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	More high density housing should be planned as part of the El Camino Real update. Specifically on the north west portion of the street (near the mobile home parks).	Comment noted. Housing may occur according to provisions contained in State Housing Law (SB 6, 9, AB 2011)
Email	Specific Plan and MND	See pdf letter	<p>A-1: Introductory comment. See responses to specific comments below.</p> <p>A-2: As described in Section XVIIb) of the IS/MND, future site-specific development would be subject to independent environmental review, which would include a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis and/or Transportation Impact Study (TIS) as necessary. Preparation of a TIS for future site-specific development would include near-term and long-term safety and operational issues on, or adjacent to, any existing or proposed state facilities.</p> <p>A-3: Section XVII.a) of the Final IS/MND states the following regarding project facilities that would be consistent with Caltrans' goals related to complete streets and mobility: <i>The project would improve access to public transit by allowing for a future micro-transit system, integration of new bus stop amenities such as signage, benches, shelter, accessibility compatible bus pads, removal of sidewalk obstructions, trash receptacles, and lighting. The project would improve bicycle access through planned installation of cycle tracks along El Camino Real from the intersection of Leucadia Boulevard and Olivenhain Road to south of Encinitas Boulevard. These separated facilities would be implemented by placing physical separations within the existing marked buffer zone of the bicycle lane. Additional lane narrowing may be considered to increase separation from vehicular traffic and further improve bicyclist comfort and safety. Existing lane widths on the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA are</i> </p>

			<p><u>10.5 feet for the innermost lane, 10 feet in middle lane, and 11 feet in the outermost lane. The project would reduce the width of the inner most lane by 0.5 feet and retain the existing widths of the other two lanes. Therefore, the project would not change the width of the outermost roadway lane adjacent to the proposed cycle track along the segment of El Camino Real within the SPA.</u></p> <p>The project would also introduce Class II buffered bike lanes on Garden View Road and Mountain Vista Drive, Class II bike lanes on Via Montoro and Via Molena, and Class I multi-use paths along the south sides of Encinitas Boulevard side of Leucadia Boulevard extending westward of El Camino Real.</p> <p>The project would improve pedestrian access by enhancing intersection safety and accessibility by upgrading crosswalks to high-visibility designs, adding advanced stop bars, implementing curb extensions, introducing pedestrian countdown signals, and introducing accessibility-compliant surfaces.</p> <p>A-4: Comment noted. The City shares Caltrans’ goal land use and smart growth, and will continue to coordinate with Caltrans to implement necessary improvements at intersections and interchanges where the agencies have joint jurisdiction.</p> <p>A-5: Comment noted. Should future site-specific development or mitigation affect Caltrans’ right-of-way, the City will notify Caltrans and invite them to participate as a Responsible Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act.</p> <p>A-6: Comment noted. The City shares the goal of reducing VMT and greenhouse gas emissions in order to address climate change, and looks forward to collaborating with Caltrans as applicable.</p> <p>A-7: Comment noted. The City recognizes the importance of affordable and reliable, high speed broadband as a key component in supporting travel demand management and reaching the state’s transportation and climate action goals.</p> <p>A-8: Comment noted. The City understands that an encroachment permit would be required for any work within Caltrans’ ROW prior to construction.</p> <p>A-9: Conclusory remarks. See responses to specific comments above.</p>
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan and MND	As an Encinitas resident who lives in the Community of New Encinitas, I appreciate the City going through a process with input from residents and a concern about esthetics and updating the ECR corridor's appearance. However, I am very concerned about how this will play out in terms of congestion and impact on our economy and quality of life. Will people still be able to shop and visit medical and other facilities, or will they choose other communities/cities to spend their time and money? Will people, especially older people who don't feel safe on bicycles, still be able to drive and park in this corridor. How will this affect the economic engine of the city that is the ECR corridor?	<p>F-1: As described in Section I of the Draft IS/MND, development that would be approved under the project would be limited to transportation facility improvements, such as bike lanes and crosswalk enhancements, streetscape improvements, and monument signage. Additionally, the Land Use and Development Regulations Chapter of the ECRSP includes streetscape amenity standards that would ensure that proposed transportation improvements are implemented in a way that would improve visual quality. Future site-specific development and redevelopment within the SPA would be subject to the development standards of the ECRSP Land Use and Development Regulations Chapter. Many buildings and existing land uses within the SPA were developed before the City was incorporated in 1986 without comprehensive planning to guide development. As future site-specific development and redevelopment occurs, implementation of the intensity standards, setbacks, step backs, neighborhood adjacency standards, streetscape amenity standards, and useable open space standards would create a more cohesive and aesthetically pleasing visual environment compared to the existing condition. Guidance in the Land Use and Development Regulations Chapter has been tailored specifically to the aesthetic needs of the SPA, and therefore would achieve the goals related to scenic quality as envisioned in the City’s zoning code.</p> <p>F-2: As described in Section XVII.a of the IS/MND, the project proposes to introduce adaptive signal controllers to better manage left-turn demands and adapt to fluctuating travel patterns, which could lead to shorter or fewer left-turn lanes, thereby improving traffic flow and reducing congestion.</p> <p>F-3: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. Parking and</p>

			economic considerations are not topics that require analysis under CEQA. This comment has been provided to the decision makers for consideration.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	Currently, there is a 24 hour drive through (Cotixan) which abuts a neighborhood. I would recommend considering not allowing 24-hour drive through unless there is a plan to mitigate the noise from 10pm-6am.	Comment noted.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	I strongly support the inclusion of a Class IV cycleway along ECR.	Comment noted.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	Not in favor of trail extension in the SDGE easement down behind The Home Depot and connecting to ECR. Bad idea. We have had chronic problems there with trespassers, e-bike gangs and other shenanigans. An improved trail in vegetation behind houses is a great escape route. Sheriff helicopters already circle over this area warning the community about fugitives. A designated/improved trail would just exacerbate these issues and compromise neighborhood safety. Also not in support of reducing ECR down to 3 lanes. Traffic volumes on ECR are not going to decrease as it is one of only 3 heavily traveled north-south commuter routes. When one of the 3 three routes is compromised (as has happened already with the coast hwy changes) ECR takes the overflow. If it gets even worse, travelers are going to shift to residential roads to avoid ECR gridlock. I know because I do this myself already. The plan to add more residential housing on ECR will add to the congestion. Keep the 4 lanes for vehicular traffic.	Comment noted.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	I do not agree with any new housing or added traffic to ECR. It is already a mess. With that said, if some change does occur with building height/housing, DO NOT but them up to already existing neighborhoods and houses. Choose the sites so they will not destroy a neighborhood's view or privacy. Also consider more parking on neighborhood streets and avoid those areas as well. Adequate parking spots should come with any new housing to prevent overflow into the neighborhoods. Saying you will put in green areas to buffer between new and old neighborhoods is not adequate. There are plenty of places that could be used where already existing g homes are not destroyed.	Comment noted. The ECRSP contains provisions regarding buffering, screening and adjacency to residential neighborhoods to minimize impacts of future development.
Social Pin-Point: Virtual	Specific Plan	This seems like a lot of expense and B.S. to go through if the only real change is to add R-30 residential to ECR near Gardendale. What am I missing? Why not study mixed-use / 2 story high-density at the Kohl's or the Ralph's as well?	Comment noted.