Clairemont CPU Ad-hoc Subcommittee Meeting

July 9, 2019

MEETING NOTES

Non-Agenda Public comment

* Is there any consideration for using Floor Area Ratio (FAR) as opposed to Dwelling Units per Acre (DU/AC)? More information should be provided.
* What’s going on with the idea of using form-based code?

Green Spine Presentation

* Center of the SDG&E easement is not open at all. Some areas fenced in.
* This could happen, but it’s a political issue
* Creating open space and a park could be expensive
* Community gardens can be proposed in some segments of the easement – opportunities right under our noses
* Recommendations in plan could identify the easement as a central core or create links as a central organizing principle
* Easement is 150 feet wide
* Gardens in the easement could provide opportunities for native gardening and sponsorship opportunities with local schools
* Liability is the main concern of SDG&E. There is also a high-pressure gas line running down the easement as well. It’s fee owned and the City could pursue purchase. SDG&E is not in the business of creating amenities.
* Kids on motorbikes is a concern if the easement is opened up
* Tecolote section is steep
* The Green Spine could be considered for carbon offsets with the creating of parks and incorporation of trees
* The environmental benefits can be measured to offset housing units
* This concept relates to wanting more infrastructure – low hanging fruit
* Glen has meet with the CD2 and CD6 offices and they are supportive of the concept
* More green and more trees is one of the comments from the Planning Commission
* The concept should be considered for an off-leash dog park
* A similar open space project is located south of the El Segundo

Mobility Wishlist Ideas

* Emphasis on pedestrian and cyclist safety as in the City’s Vision Zero plan
* Utilize an alternative bike route along Morena Boulevard similar to the concept using Conrad Avenue
* Support a closed loop system/shuttle to serve the community
* Improve existing MTS system, create more transit options – people work and move on Sundays. MTS needs to come talk and present to us
* We need to have better connections to adjacent community – similar to what was said at the Planning Commission workshop
* Seattle has a rideshare/shuttle service
* Pedestrian/bike safety is paramount
* Supportive of Integrated management of traffic signals and signal prioritization (e.g. ITS)
* Clairemont should have bus service 7 days a week
* Mobility goals are broad
* Bike lanes should also be accounted for in Rose Canyon
* Incorporate safe crossing over the I-805

Mobility Goals Discussion

* Ensure complete streets and goals of vision zero. Clairemont should have high-frequency transit that connects to commercial nodes and other areas
* Include complete streets throughout – accommodate all modes safely. Don’t forget that the complete streets idea includes a green streets component. Include street trees, alternate routes for parking, shared lanes and Class I facilities.
* Pacific Beach has a good example where they took bike lanes off of Cass Street and put them on safer streets
* Need safe connections to other plan areas - more connectivity to the Rose Canyon bike path
* Existing objectives failed. Would like to see closed loop systems in the community with connections from the Bay to the major shopping areas
* Don’t see bikes as transportation. Now one rides bikes to school.
* Need to see high-frequency bus in the community. MTS needs to come to our meeting. Foolish to think that people ride buses.
* There is consensus that an alternate bike route could work in Bay Park
* Bike routes are not only for the spandex crowd but for commuters too
* What would be the cost of a bike lane?
* How will the City address traffic pinch points with new development?
* San Marcos did complete streets study. Consider building elevated walkways
* Massage reduction in parking, so more biking can happen.
* Bicycle safety needs to align with vision zero
* Safety is needed for all road users. Support shuttle system within the community. More transit options equal better alternatives to driving for old, young, poor, etc.

According to census 2% of population bikes. Need connections between communities, don’t let planning stop at the community boundary.

* Support shuttle system like in Park City and like during the Del Mar/County Fair. Wil infrastructure happen before density?
* Do we need something in writing to include transportation improvements with density?