

**Date:** March 21, 2023

**To:** Carlsbad Tomorrow/Growth Management Citizens Committee

**From:** Steve Linke, Traffic & Mobility Commission primary representative

**Subject:** March 23, 2023 report review/proposed amendments

## **GROWTH MANAGEMENT REPORT**

I propose that the “Other Considerations” sections of the Parks and Open Space Standards be amended as follows to better reflect the Committee’s votes and stated rationales:

### **Parks Standard “Other Considerations” amendment**

~~The committee discussed a number of options for amending the standard. Some committee members preferred a citywide standard of 4 acres per 1,000 population- and/or exploring alternative ways to document what constitutes a park, excluding acreage inaccessible to humans, and/or restricting the acreage of Veterans Memorial Park to the northwest quadrant given its reduced scope.~~ In the end, the majority voted to retain the existing standard. To address the access to parks, a majority of the committee also voted to request that City Council direct staff to evaluate the feasibility of a standard based upon a distance measure to any publicly accessible park.

### **Open Space Standard “Other Considerations” amendment**

When growth management was first implemented, several zones were exempted from the open space standard based on their 1986 planning and development status. Because planning changes and re-development have and likely will continue to alter the status in the exempt zones over time, ~~Some committee members preferred to look at ways to reverse the exemptions, apply a citywide standard, and/or look into linkage fees. The majority of the members preferred to keep the spirit of the original standard in place and augment with a statement regarding open space policies that apply to all zones.~~

### **Open Space status deletion/amendment**

In addition, the Open Space Standard “Rationale” and “Status” sections, including the status table, contain potentially misleading claims about most of the zones having more than 15% open space, so I propose removing them.

The 15% performance standard must be calculated **after** subtraction of “environmentally constrained non-developable land.” However, the statements and table are based on calculations made from **total** open space—**without the subtraction**. This creates the false impression that 24 of the 25 zones would pass the standard, regardless of exemption status.

The actual 15% performance standard calculations presumably could have been provided for each zone, but the response to my requests for those numbers at our last committee meeting and in a follow-up email was simply that they “live in other documents.” So, we will not get to see the actual relevant numbers.

Accordingly, the two misleading statements and table should be removed, and the most we should say in the Status section is:

The 14 of 25 zones that are not exempt from the open space standard are currently meeting the 15% minimum standard according to staff.

## **QUALITY OF LIFE STATEMENTS**

### **Combine with the Growth Management Report**

I have never understood why the quality of life statements/recommendations need to be in a separate document, instead of including everything in a single report.

In the revised “Parks” section of the main Growth Management Report, the acres/population standard is provided first, but the next section is entitled “Additional recommendation” and contains the further recommendation to explore the feasibility of an additional travel distance-based standard.

That same approach should be taken for the “Open Space” and “Transportation and Mobility” portions of the Quality of Life document—move those bullet points to “Additional recommendations” sections in the corresponding topics in the Growth Management Report.

Then, just make a new section at the end of the Growth Management Report called “ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS” for the rest of the “Quality of Life Statements” with headings similar to the growth management sections. Or, promote them by placing them before the list of standards that we are just recommending eliminating.

Or, promote them even further by putting them at the very beginning—before the performance standards. Frankly, the only meaningful recommendations with any vision for the future are in these statements (e.g., Energy and “Proposition H”). For the growth management portion, we are largely just eliminating or keeping unchanged all of the original 1986 performance standards, so it could be argued that those should be the part relegated to an appendix. That said, I also agree with the sentiment expressed at our last meeting that some of the Quality of Life statements are also vague to the point of being meaningless (e.g., “Homelessness” and “Seniors/Aging Community”).

## **Open Space amendments**

I believe the following more fully reflects the discussion leading up to the committee consensus:

Additionally, the committee recommends that the City Council add the topic of open space to the purview of the Parks & Recreation Commission or a separate citizen committee to address open space needs throughout the city, ~~address potential open space deficits and evaluate opportunities to acquire more open space~~ by updating the list of candidate properties for proactive open space acquisition and by developing a plan that prioritizes zones with less unconstrained open space or that are subject to loss due to sea level rise.

Please also consider adding the following recommendation to council:

Adopt a policy that discourages exceptions to development standards that would decrease open space.

## **Transportation and Mobility amendments**

Please also consider adding the following recommendations to council:

Complete the city's typology-based street network, as described in the General Plan Mobility Element.

Adopt a policy that discourages land use changes that allow developers to convert planned commercial/mixed use to residential uses that increase vehicle miles traveled.