

Any amendment to the Specific Plan requires extensive, city-wide resident outreach.

Comments Regarding Park Villas Proposal

1. Project must be limited to 32 units consistent with the city allocation of the maximum of 300 total units allowed on site.

Our primary concern with this project is the increase in the allowed residential units on this parcel from 32 to 70 units. This more than doubles the allowed number of units on this parcel. This major change is not consistent with the adopted Specific Plan, the EIR for the Specific Plan, or the City's Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) with the master developer for the park. Exhibit "C" of the DDA outlines the allocation of housing units as 268 to Sudberry and 32 to this privately held parcel. This also confirms the total allocation of 300 residential units to the entire site.

The park at El Corazon was never planned to be a housing development. In fact, placing any housing on El Corazon was the single most controversial public issue during the entire planning process. Making such a change will essentially throw out the Master Plan, and years of community planning for this site. The staff report concludes that adding these 38 units is in compliance with the vision of the SP. We vehemently disagree with this conclusion. The community's vision is for a park in the heart of Oceanside- not a housing development, and not more than twice the number of units allowed for this part of the site.

2. The project will permanently result in the loss of substantial commercial land- adversely impacting our jobs/housing ratio

The staff report states that the May 4, 2016 SPA "allows the transfer of commercial, office and non-residential building square footage from the "VC" to the "OBC" Zone development site." Saying that the SPA "allows" it does not mean it would in fact happen. The SPA does not change the DDA which identifies the allocation of these uses between two land owners. Sudberry has publicly stated they cannot accommodate the transfer of this sq. footage and they have no obligation to do so under the existing DDA. This project will result in the permanent loss of a substantial portion of the commercial/office land planned for ELC. This proposed change adversely impacts our jobs/ housing ratio by both reducing the job producing land uses and more than doubling the residential uses.

The staff report also states that 3,605 DU's would be needed to support the amount of commercial uses in the SP. This assumes that analysis of the jobs/housing ratio occurs at the project level. If that were the case every single project would have to be half housing and half commercial which is ludicrous. We currently have too many housing units for the amount of commercial uses. We need to add proportionately more commercial uses to get to the desired 1:1 ratio. The adopted ELC Specific Plan would help us improve our city wide jobs/housing ratio. This change makes it worse.

The EDC did not see the two small planned commercial buildings as viable. We can create a bad commercial site today, build housing on most of the land, and thereby cause the permanent loss of future potential commercial opportunities. We think it is better to let the land stay vacant until there is a plan that makes sense. Otherwise this will just become another short term mistake that leads to a long term loss for our community.

3. Ignores key traffic and other mitigation measures in the EIR for the ELC Master Plan

The EIR identified significant cumulative adverse environmental impacts for Air Quality and Transportation and Traffic. A long list of mitigation measures was required for each of these- but not all are appropriate for each individual project. Nor does the EIR specify how these might be apportioned among projects. But even with this mitigation the overall project will still be in failure. There is no discussion as to which of the identified mitigation measures, if any, will be required for this project. In fact, there is no discussion as to how this project will contribute to these cumulative adverse impacts and which, if any, of the Mitigation Measures in the EIR will be applied. It discussed project specific impacts but failed to consider these already identified cumulative impacts. (See att 4 pages of MM from EIR).

A key concern is that the project submittals included no pedestrian or bicycle circulation maps. We do not think that the project circulation and compliance with the TDM requirements of the SP EIR can be evaluated without that. Housing was included in the SP primarily because of the proximity to the light rail station and the opportunity to provide housing where alternative transportation is available. We also found a symbol for a bike rack on the key, but we could not find bike racks on the plans. Strong support for alternative transportation is a key element of TDM plans but none of this has been discussed. Another key issue with pedestrian circulation is how residents will access the Coaster and other transit stops- none of that was discussed

4. Failure to discuss compliance with numerous provisions of the SP

The staff report discusses compliance with the Village Commercial “At a glance” summary of the Village Commercial guidelines. But it fails to discuss compliance with many of the general guidelines for Village Commercial and discusses none of the general guidelines that apply to all development on the site. It says the project is “substantially” consistent with the SP guidelines but fails to identify those instances where it is not fully consistent. For example:

- Provisions on page 2-74 for landscaping as a “significant feature in the overall presence of the site”
- Page 2-74 guidelines for landscaping in the commercial area to reinforce the pedestrian circulation and plazas, better equip pedestrians to navigate the area in a “safe and efficient manner” and a planting style that complements “the architectural style and building hierarchy.”
- Page 2-75 says that outdoor dining areas can be counted toward the required public open space- but only if the area is not for the exclusive use of one business. It seems to be assumed these are shared spaces, but this should be specified, and be included as a project condition so this could not change over time.

- Plant Palette and landscaping plan

The following plants are included in the project plans, but either are invasive or could have a native plant easily substituted for a non-native. This is not consistent with provisions in the SP.

Trees: Chinese Flame Tree - seeds self-sow and may impact riparian areas

Peppermint Willow (*Agonis Flexuosa*) - seeds are also a concern for invasiveness

Bioswale palette

Fesuca Mairei - an African plant that can easily be replaced with a native Deergrass. Non native grasses should not be considered unless absolutely necessary due to invasiveness of seedlings and roots.

Callistemon Little John - use native Fairy Duster (*Calliandra californica*). Invasive Australian bottle brush has been observed in Buena Vista Lagoon area.

Elaeagnus Pungens - potentially invasive - replace with Toyon, Lemonade Berry or Saltbush among others.

Osmanthus Frangrans - concern for riparian areas

- No discussion of compliance with sustainability provisions of SP

On the most recent public presentation on the Swim Center staff added an excellent discussion about water use. The public had commented on this at prior meetings. Staff took this seriously, did further analysis and responded in a way that showed they heard the concern. The general sustainability provisions in the SP are an important part of the community's vision for this site. We see there are several areas with permeable pavement- great. But what else has been done to make this sustainable (and not just comply with the new Building Code requirements)? Low energy use, recycled water, provisions for composting, electric vehicle charging stations, - and taking further steps like adding rooftop solar needs to all be part of the review of this project. Failure to do so is not consistent with provisions of the SP for sustainable development.

5. Open space, both common area and private areas for each unit, need to be consistent with SP. The use of rooftop decks creates the following problems that have not been evaluated: height compliance, visual impacts, light pollution, aesthetics, and degrades the architecture. All of these issues would need to be addressed. Furthermore, the staff report mentions a rooftop deck Management Plan- but no such plan has been provided.
6. The staff report failed to include our email of August 11 to Jeff Hunt following review of the original staff report to the EDC. Many of the issues raised in that email still have not been addressed.

Missing Project Conditions that must be added if this project moves forward:

- 1.. For berms (along the entrance road) specify conditions for mounding and higher level of maintenance to assure appearance remains consistent with an entrance to a park
2. Condition project so that entrance road landscaping (both sides of road), signage, trail, and feature tree in the roundabout are required to be built at beginning of project. This will result in a uniform entrance to the park.
- 3.. Monument signs (on both sides of entrance) to be installed at beginning of project. Sign needs to have El Corazon in largest size and include the word "park". Exact details TBD. (We like the concept included in the proposal).
4. There need to be disclosures to owners about planned adjacent uses (park and Sudberry) so this doesn't become an issue later.

Recommendation:

1. Reject this project for failure to comply with the provisions of the Specific Plan.
2. If project moves forward, provide a public comment period on CEQA – especially the air quality and traffic mitigation measures.

At: 4 pages of mitigation measures from the El Corazon EIR March 2009