AGENDA

Joint REGULAR Meeting

Wednesday, September 27, 2017 * 6:00 P.M.

City Hall / Council Chambers, 635 S. Highway 101, Solana Beach, California

- City Council meetings are video recorded and archived as a permanent record. The video recording captures the complete proceedings of the meeting and is available for viewing on the City's website.
- Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time prior to meetings for processing new submittals. Complete records containing meeting handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request.

PUBLIC MEETING ACCESS

The Regular Meetings of the City Council are scheduled for the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays and are broadcast live on Cox Communications-Channel 19, Time Warner-Channel 24, and AT&T U-verse Channel 99. The video taping of meetings are maintained as a permanent record and contain a detailed account of the proceedings. Council meeting tapings are archived and available for viewing on the City’s website.

AGENDA MATERIALS

A full City Council agenda packet including relative supporting documentation is available at City Hall, the Solana Beach Branch Library (157 Stevens Ave.), La Colonia Community Ctr., and online www.cityofsolanabeach.org. Agendas are posted at least 72 hours prior to regular meetings and at least 24 hours prior to special meetings. Writings and documents regarding an agenda of an open session meeting, received after the official posting, and distributed to the Council for consideration, will be made available for public viewing at the same time. In addition, items received at least 1 hour 30 minutes prior to the meeting time will be uploaded online with the courtesy agenda posting. Materials submitted for consideration should be forwarded to the City Clerk’s department 858-720-2400. The designated location for viewing public documents is the City Clerk’s office at City Hall during normal business hours.

SPEAKERS

Please submit a speaker slip to the City Clerk prior to the meeting, or the announcement of the Section/Item, to provide public comment. Allotted times for speaking are outlined on the speaker’s slip for each agenda section: Oral Communications, Consent, Public Hearings and Staff Reports.

AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT TITLE 2

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, persons with a disability may request an agenda in appropriate alternative formats as required by Section 202. Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct such request to the City Clerk’s office (858) 720-2400 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

As a courtesy to all meeting attendees, please set cellular phones and pagers to silent mode and engage in conversations outside the Council Chambers.

CITY COUNCILMEMBERS

Mike Nichols, Mayor
Ginger Marshall, Deputy Mayor
Jewel Edson, Councilmember
David A. Zito, Councilmember
Judy Hegenauer, Councilmember

Gregory Wade
City Manager

Johanna Canlas
City Attorney

Angela Ivey
City Clerk
SPEAKERS:
Please submit your speaker slip to the City Clerk prior to the meeting or the announcement of the Item. Allotted times for speaking are outlined on the speaker's slip for Oral Communications, Consent, Public Hearings and Staff Reports.

READING OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS:
Pursuant to Solana Beach Municipal Code Section 2.04.460, at the time of introduction or adoption of an ordinance or adoption of a resolution, the same shall not be read in full unless after the reading of the title, further reading is requested by a member of the Council. If any Councilmember so requests, the ordinance or resolution shall be read in full. In the absence of such a request, this section shall constitute a waiver by the council of such reading.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

CLOSED SESSION REPORT: (when applicable)

FLAG SALUTE:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

PROCLAMATIONS/CERTIFICATES: Ceremonial
- Dr. Wolf Berger
- Bocce Ball

PRESENTATIONS: Ceremonial items that do not contain in-depth discussion and no action/direction.
- Solana Beach Sunset 5K

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:
This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the City Council on items relating to City business and not appearing on today's agenda by submitting a speaker slip (located on the back table) to the City Clerk. Comments relating to items on this evening’s agenda are taken at the time the items are heard. Pursuant to the Brown Act, no action shall be taken by the City Council on public comment items. Council may refer items to the City Manager for placement on a future agenda. The maximum time allotted for each presentation is THREE MINUTES (SBMC 2.04.190). Please be aware of the timer light on the Council Dais.

COUNCIL COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMENTARY:
An opportunity for City Council to make brief announcements or report on their activities. These items are not agendized for official City business with no action or substantive discussion.
A. CONSENT CALENDAR: (Action Items) (A.1. - A.6.)

Items listed on the Consent Calendar are to be acted in a single action of the City Council unless pulled for discussion. Any member of the public may address the City Council on an item of concern by submitting to the City Clerk a speaker slip (located on the back table) before the Consent Calendar is addressed. Those items removed from the Consent Calendar by a member of the Council will be trailed to the end of the agenda, while Consent Calendar items removed by the public will be discussed immediately after approval of the Consent Calendar.

A.1. Register Of Demands. (File 0300-30)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Ratify the list of demands for August 26 – September 8, 2017.

Item A.1. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.

A.2. General Fund Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2017-2018 Changes. (File 0330-30)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Receive the report listing changes made to the Fiscal Year 2017-2018 General Fund Adopted Budget.

Item A.2. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.

A.3. Submit List of Projects to Receive Road Maintenance Rehabilitation Account Funding as Required by Senate Bill 1. (File 0820-35)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-141
   a. Authorizing the City Engineer to establish a project list for the 2017 Local Streets and Roads Funding Program using funds from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account and designating the 2018 Annual Pavement Management Program, as identified in the City’s 2018/19 Capital Improvement Program list, to receive the funding from this new program.
   b. Authorizing the City Engineer to submit the project list to the California Transportation Commission for the 2017 Local Streets and Roads Funding Program using funds from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account.

Item A.3. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.


Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Approve Resolution 2017-147 authorizing the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Community Grant Program.

Item A.4. Document (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.
A.5. Minutes of the City Council.

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Approve the Minutes of the City Council Meetings held May 24, 2017 and June 14, 2017.

Item A.5. Document (click here)

B. PUBLIC HEARINGS: (B.1. – B.2.)

This portion of the agenda provides citizens an opportunity to express their views on a specific issue as required by law after proper noticing by submitting a speaker slip (located on the back table) to the City Clerk. After considering all of the evidence, including written materials and oral testimony, the City Council must make a decision supported by findings and the findings must be supported by substantial evidence in the record. An applicant or designee for a private development/business project, for which the public hearing is being held, is allotted a total of fifteen minutes to speak, as per SBMC 2.04.210. A portion of the fifteen minutes may be saved to respond to those who speak in opposition. All other speakers have three minutes each. Please be aware of the timer light on the Council Dais.


The proposed project meets the minimum zoning requirements under the SBMC, may be found to be consistent with the General Plan and may be found, as conditioned, to meet the discretionary findings required as discussed in this report to approve a DRP. Therefore, Staff recommends that the City Council:


2. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and

3. If the City Council makes the requisite findings and approves the project, adopt Resolution 2017-069 conditionally approving a DRP to demolish the existing residence and construct a new 2,857 square foot, two-story, single-family residence with an attached carport and associated site improvements at 246 Barbara Avenue, Solana Beach.

Item B.1. Report (click here)
B.2. Public Hearing: 960 Avocado Place, Applicant: Clipper NSPP FA, Case # 17-17-02 (File 0600-40)

The proposed project meets the minimum zoning requirements under the SBMC, may be found to be consistent with the General Plan and may be found, as conditioned, to meet the discretionary findings required as discussed in this report to approve a DRP and administratively issue a SDP. Therefore, Staff recommends that the City Council:


2. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and

3. If the City Council makes the requisite findings and approves the project, adopt Resolution 2017-143 conditionally approving a DRP and an administrative SDP to construct a new single-level, single-family residence with an attached two-car garage, a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit with an attached single-car garage and perform associated site improvements on a vacant lot at 960 Avocado Place, Solana Beach.

C. STAFF REPORTS: (C.1. - C.5.)
Submit speaker slips to the City Clerk.

C.1. La Colonia Skate Park. (File 0720-30)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Provide feedback on the various design features of the hybrid design concept plan.

2. Adopt Resolution 2017-145 authorizing the City Engineer to complete the design plans and specifications package and advertise for construction bids.

Item B.2. Report (click here)

Item C.1. Report (click here)
C.2. **Lomas Santa Fe Corridor Feasibility Study Update.** (File 0820-75)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt **Resolution 2017-022** authorizing the City Manager to execute an amendment to the Professional Services Agreement with STC Traffic, Inc., in the amount of $65,000, for Phase 2 of the Lomas Santa Fe Corridor Feasibility Study that will allow for technical analysis of the data collected in Phase 1 of the Feasibility Study and preparation of 30% preliminary engineering plans and cost estimates.

**Item C.2. Report (click here)**

*Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.*

C.3. **Climate Action Commission Member Appointment.** (File 0120-06)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Make one appointment (by Council-at-large) to the vacant professional position on the Climate Action Commission with a term expiration date of January 2018.

**Item C.3. Report (click here)**

*Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.*

C.4. **Adopt (2\textsuperscript{nd} Reading) Ordinance 480 - Expedited Streamlined Permitting Process for Electric Vehicle Charging Stations.** (File 0600-95)

Recommendation: That the City Council


**Item C.4. Report (click here)**

*Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.*

C.5. **Establish the Solana Beach-Del Mar Council Standing Committee.**

Recommendation: That the City Council


2. Consider the appointment of two Councilmembers to serve on the Standing Committee.

**Item C.5. Document (click here)**

*Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.*
WORKPLAN COMMENTS:
Adopted June 8, 2016

COMPENSATION & REIMBURSEMENT DISCLOSURE:
GC: Article 2.3. Compensation: 53232.3. (a) Reimbursable expenses shall include, but not be limited to, meals, lodging, and travel. 53232.3 (d) Members of a legislative body shall provide brief reports on meetings attended at the expense of the local agency at the next regular meeting of the legislative body.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Regional Committees: (outside agencies, appointed by this Council)
   a. City Selection Committee (meets twice a year) – Nichols (Edson, alternate).
   b. County Service Area 17 – Marshall (Nichols, alternate).
   c. Escondido Creek Watershed Authority – Marshall/Staff (no alternate).
   d. League of Ca. Cities’ San Diego County Executive Committee – Nichols (Edson, alternate) and any subcommittees.
   e. League of Ca. Cities’ Local Legislative Committee – Nichols (Edson, alternate)
   f. League of Ca. Cities’ Coastal Cities Issues Group (CCIG) – Nichols (Edson, alternate)
   g. North County Dispatch JPA – Marshall (Edson, alternate).
   h. North County Transit District – Edson (Nichols, alternate)
   i. Regional Solid Waste Association (RSWA) – Nichols (Hegenauer, alternate).
   j. SANDAG – Zito (Primary), Edson (1st alternate), Nichols (2nd alternate) and any subcommittees.
   k. SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Committee – Zito (Hegenauer, alternate).
   l. San Dieguito River Valley JPA – Hegenauer (Nichols, alternate).
   m. San Elijo JPA – Marshall, Zito (City Manager, alternate).
   n. 22nd Agricultural District Association Community Relations Committee – Marshall, Edson.

Standing Committees: (All Primary Members) (Permanent Committees)
   c. Fire Dept. Management Governance & Organizational Evaluation – Edson, Hegenauer
   e. Parks and Recreation Committee – Nichols, Zito
   g. School Relations Committee – Nichols, Hegenauer.

ADJOURN:
AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

I, Angela Ivey, City Clerk of the City of Solana Beach, do hereby certify that this Agenda for the September 27, 2017 Council Meeting was called by City Council, Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency, Public Financing Authority, and the Housing Authority of the City of Solana Beach, California, was provided and posted on September 20, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. on the City Bulletin Board at the entrance to the City Council Chambers. Said meeting is held at 6:00 p.m., September 27, 2017, in the Council Chambers, at City Hall, 635 S. Highway 101, Solana Beach, California.

Angela Ivey, City Clerk
City of Solana Beach, CA

UPCOMING CITIZEN CITY COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS:

Regularly Scheduled, or Special Meetings that have been announced, as of this Agenda Posting. Dates, times, locations are all subject to change. See the City’s Commission’s website or the City’s Events Calendar for updates.

- **Budget & Finance Commission**
  Thursday, October 19, 2017, 6:30 p.m. (City Hall)

- **Climate Action Commission**
  Wednesday, October 18, 2017, 5:30 p.m. (City Hall)

- **Parks & Recreation Commission**
  Thursday, October 12, 2017, 4:00 p.m. (Fletcher Cove Community Center)

- **Public Arts Commission**
  Tuesday, October 24, 2017, 5:30 p.m. (City Hall)

- **View Assessment Commission**
  Tuesday, October 17, 2017, 6:00 p.m. (Council Chambers)
STAFF REPORT
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT: Finance
SUBJECT: Register of Demands

BACKGROUND:

Section 3.04.020 of the Solana Beach Municipal Code requires that the City Council ratify a register of demands which represents all financial demands made upon the City for the applicable period.

Register of Demands- 08/26/17 through 09/08/17
Check Register-Disbursement Fund (Attachment 1) $ 243,401.84
Net Payroll August 30, 2017 5,704.84
Federal & State Taxes August 30, 2017 2,928.96
Net Payroll September 8, 2017 194,783.66
Federal & State Taxes September 8, 2017 55,247.98
PERS Retirement (EFT) September 8, 2017 43,227.92

TOTAL $ 545,295.20

DISCUSSION:

Staff certifies that the register of demands has been reviewed for accuracy, that funds are available to pay the above demands, and that the demands comply with the adopted budget.

CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

Not a project as defined by CEQA.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The register of demands for August 26, 2017 through September 8, 2017 reflects total expenditures of $545,295.20 from various City funding sources.

WORK PLAN:

N/A

CITY COUNCIL ACTION: ______________________________

AGENDA ITEM A.1.
OPTIONS:

- Ratify the register of demands.
- Do not ratify and provide direction.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council ratify the above register of demands.

CITY MANAGER’S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Department Recommendation.

Gregory Wade, City Manager

Attachments:

1. Check Register – Disbursement Fund
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASH ACCT</th>
<th>CHECK NO</th>
<th>ISSUE DT</th>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>BUDGET UNIT</th>
<th>-----DESCRIPTION-----</th>
<th>SALES TAX</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90096</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>KAREN BYRNE</td>
<td>REND CXL FCC 11/25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,164.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90097</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>DATATICKET INC.</td>
<td>PRNG TCKT ADMIN-JUN</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>980.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90098</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>DIXELINE LUMBER CO INC</td>
<td>SCRNDVRYR/BULB-PW</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90099</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>KYLE KOSZEWNIK</td>
<td>KK-AP TRAINING 06/23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-149.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90099</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>KYLE KOSZEWNIK</td>
<td>KK-AP TRAINING 06/23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>167.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1,434.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-315.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,749.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-41.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>160.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1,030.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-220.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-200.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-153.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-117.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-118.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>270.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>419.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>542.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,250.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>81.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-3,012.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,012.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>251.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-4,694.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-3,459.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,694.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-640.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-425.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,362.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90001</td>
<td>06/29/17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>640.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90002</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>AFLAC</td>
<td>AUGUST 17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>980.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90003</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>4794</td>
<td>AMR</td>
<td>CSA17.18 MED SUPPLIES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>101.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90004</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>APPLE ONE, INC</td>
<td>TEMP HELP FE 08/12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>969.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90005</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5321</td>
<td>APPLIED VOICE &amp; SPEECH T</td>
<td>00150005450</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,239.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90006</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>2570</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA COMMERCIAL AS</td>
<td>00150006530</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>91.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>90007</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>CDW GOVERNMENT INC</td>
<td>SSD HARD DRIVE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>96.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH ACCT CHECK NO</td>
<td>ISSUE DP VENDOR</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>BUDGET UNIT</td>
<td>-----DESCRIPTION-----</td>
<td>SALES TAX</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90908</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5051</td>
<td>CINTAS CORPORATION NO. 2 00165006570</td>
<td>FIRST AID SUPPLIES-CH</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>92.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90909</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5285</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL &amp; INDUSTRIAL 459</td>
<td>9407-CH ROOF RPLC RTN</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-419.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90909</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5285</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL &amp; INDUSTRIAL 45994076510</td>
<td>9407-CH ROOF RPLC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,979.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90909</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5285</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL &amp; INDUSTRIAL 45994076510</td>
<td>9407-CH ROOF RPLC RTN</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>419.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CHECK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,979.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90910</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5171</td>
<td>CORELOGIC SOLUTIONS, LLC 00155005550</td>
<td>PROPERTY PRO DATA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>96.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90911</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>COX COMMUNICATIONS INC 00150005450</td>
<td>TV BROADCAST 08/10-9/09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,160.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90912</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>DEL MAR BLUE PRINT COMPA 00155005550</td>
<td>3 ZONING MAPS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>52.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90913</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>4218</td>
<td>DICK MILLER, INC 001</td>
<td>9327 STRT IMP PG07/31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-86,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90913</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>4218</td>
<td>DICK MILLER, INC 220</td>
<td>9327 ST IMP RT PG/31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-3,002.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90913</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>4218</td>
<td>DICK MILLER, INC 220</td>
<td>9327 ST IMP RT PG/31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1,545.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90913</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>4218</td>
<td>DICK MILLER, INC 22093276510</td>
<td>9327 STRT IMP PG07/31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29,358.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90913</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>4218</td>
<td>DICK MILLER, INC 22093276510</td>
<td>9327 STRT IMP PG/31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,545.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90913</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>4218</td>
<td>DICK MILLER, INC 22093276510</td>
<td>9327 STRT IMP PG07/31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>57,038.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90913</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>4218</td>
<td>DICK MILLER, INC 22093276510</td>
<td>9327 ST IMP RT PG/31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,002.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CHECK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>396.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90914</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>DIXIELINE LUMBER CO INC 00165006560</td>
<td>HAND SPRAYER</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90914</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>DIXIELINE LUMBER CO INC 00165006560</td>
<td>SPTY GLASSES/GLOVES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>39.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CHECK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>51.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90915</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>SHIPPING 8/04/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>78.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90916</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>HARRIS &amp; ASSOC. INC. 21355005550</td>
<td>1715.15 PROF SVC-JULY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>481.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90917</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5322</td>
<td>JENNIFER SKOLKIN 001</td>
<td>REND FCCC SDEP 08/20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90918</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>4189</td>
<td>KNOTT'S SOAK CITY 25560006180</td>
<td>JG FIELD TRIP 08/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,634.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90919</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>LEGAL SHIELD CORP 001</td>
<td>PFD LEGAL-AUG 17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90920</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>LUNAR PAINTING 001</td>
<td>9438.07 LCC EXT PAINT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-16,300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90920</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>LUNAR PAINTING 420</td>
<td>LCC EXT PAINT RST</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-788.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90920</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>LUNAR PAINTING 420</td>
<td>LCC EXT PAINT RST</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-76.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90920</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>LUNAR PAINTING 42094386510</td>
<td>LCC EXTERIOR PAINTING</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,986.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90920</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>LUNAR PAINTING 42094386510</td>
<td>LCC EXT PAINT RST</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>788.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90920</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>LUNAR PAINTING 42094386510</td>
<td>LCC EXTERIOR PAINTING</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,444.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90920</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>LUNAR PAINTING 42094386510</td>
<td>LCC EXT PAINT RST</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CHECK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>130.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90921</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>4040</td>
<td>MAD SCIENCE OF SAN DIEGO 25570007110</td>
<td>CAMP WRSKHP-8/22/6/25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>470.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90922</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>MISSION LINEN &amp; UNIFORM 21100007600</td>
<td>LAUNDRY-PUB WORKS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90922</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>MISSION LINEN &amp; UNIFORM 50900007700</td>
<td>LAUNDRY-PUB WORKS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90922</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>MISSION LINEN &amp; UNIFORM 00165006560</td>
<td>LAUNDRY-PUB WORKS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90922</td>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>MISSION LINEN &amp; UNIFORM 00165006530</td>
<td>LAUNDRY-PUB WORKS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND - 001 - GENERAL FUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH ACCT CHECK NO</strong></td>
<td><strong>ISSUE DT VENDOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>NAME</strong></td>
<td><strong>BUDGET UNIT</strong></td>
<td><strong>-----DESCRIPTION-----</strong></td>
<td><strong>SALES TAX</strong></td>
<td><strong>AMOUNT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90923</td>
<td>08/31/17 4582</td>
<td>MHI PLUMBERS SUPPLY</td>
<td>00165006570</td>
<td>FLUSH VALVES-FCP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90924</td>
<td>08/31/17 191</td>
<td>NAPA AUTO PARTS INC</td>
<td>00165006540</td>
<td>CR-BATTERY CORE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>266.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90924</td>
<td>08/31/17 191</td>
<td>NAPA AUTO PARTS INC</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>CHAINSAW FUEL STABILIZER</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90924</td>
<td>08/31/17 191</td>
<td>NAPA AUTO PARTS INC</td>
<td>00165006530</td>
<td>SA 30 MOTOR OIL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90924</td>
<td>08/31/17 191</td>
<td>NAPA AUTO PARTS INC</td>
<td>00165006540</td>
<td>MSG BOARD BATTERY (8)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,520.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90925</td>
<td>08/31/17 4522</td>
<td>NISSHO OF CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>REPLACE SPRINKLERS-LC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,324.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90926</td>
<td>08/31/17 5151</td>
<td>PHARMALINK, INC</td>
<td>27060006120</td>
<td>CSA17.18 ECOLINK FEE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>154.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90927</td>
<td>08/31/17 4658</td>
<td>PLACEWORKS, INC</td>
<td>21355005550</td>
<td>1714.20/959 GENEVIEVE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90928</td>
<td>08/31/17 1112</td>
<td>RANCHO SANTA FE SECURITY</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>REST RCM LCK/UNLCK-AUG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,800.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90928</td>
<td>08/31/17 1112</td>
<td>RANCHO SANTA FE SECURITY</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>ALARM MONITORING-AUG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>515.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90929</td>
<td>08/31/17 1847</td>
<td>SAN DIEGO GAS &amp; ELECTRIC</td>
<td>45999055550</td>
<td>9905.02 CCA DATA INFO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>174.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90930</td>
<td>08/31/17 5177</td>
<td>SAN DIEGUITO ENGINEERING</td>
<td>12050005460</td>
<td>CLM.1704 LAND SURVEY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90931</td>
<td>08/31/17 169</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E CO INC</td>
<td>00165006540</td>
<td>UTILITIES-6/30-08/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,432.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90931</td>
<td>08/31/17 169</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E CO INC</td>
<td>00165006530</td>
<td>UTILITIES-6/30-08/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>419.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90931</td>
<td>08/31/17 169</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E CO INC</td>
<td>00165006540</td>
<td>UTILITIES-6/07-06/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>844.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90931</td>
<td>08/31/17 169</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E CO INC</td>
<td>00165006530</td>
<td>UTILITIES-6/07-06/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,071.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90931</td>
<td>08/31/17 169</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E CO INC</td>
<td>00165006570</td>
<td>UTILITIES-6/07-06/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,987.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90931</td>
<td>08/31/17 169</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E CO INC</td>
<td>00165006570</td>
<td>UTILITIES-6/07-06/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,667.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90931</td>
<td>08/31/17 169</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E CO INC</td>
<td>21100007600</td>
<td>UTILITIES-6/07-06/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,610.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90931</td>
<td>08/31/17 169</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E CO INC</td>
<td>21100007600</td>
<td>UTILITIES-6/07-06/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,680.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90931</td>
<td>08/31/17 169</td>
<td>SDG&amp;E CO INC</td>
<td>21100007600</td>
<td>UTILITIES-6/07-06/08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19,864.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90932</td>
<td>08/31/17 1073</td>
<td>SEASIDES HEATING &amp; AIR CO</td>
<td>00165006570</td>
<td>RPR WIRING-PD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>227.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90932</td>
<td>08/31/17 1073</td>
<td>SEASIDES HEATING &amp; AIR CO</td>
<td>00165006570</td>
<td>THERMOSTAT RPR-PD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>565.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90933</td>
<td>08/31/17 3909</td>
<td>SECTRAN SECURITY INC</td>
<td>12050005460</td>
<td>COURIER SVC-AUG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>792.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90933</td>
<td>08/31/17 3909</td>
<td>SECTRAN SECURITY INC</td>
<td>12050005460</td>
<td>COURIER SVC FUEL-AUG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>706.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90934</td>
<td>08/31/17 4196</td>
<td>SPECTRA ASSOCIATES, INC</td>
<td>001650065150</td>
<td>CUSTOM MINUTE BOOK(3)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>113.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90935</td>
<td>08/31/17 3066</td>
<td>SUMMIT ENVIRONMENTAL GRO</td>
<td>21355005550</td>
<td>1714.25/SOL HGHLD-JUL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>435.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90935</td>
<td>08/31/17 3066</td>
<td>SUMMIT ENVIRONMENTAL GRO</td>
<td>21355005550</td>
<td>1714.25/SOL HGHLD-JUL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90935</td>
<td>08/31/17 3066</td>
<td>SUMMIT ENVIRONMENTAL GRO</td>
<td>21355005550</td>
<td>1714.25/SOL HGHLD-JUL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1,080.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90936</td>
<td>08/31/17 4842</td>
<td>SUPPLYWORKS, INC</td>
<td>00165006570</td>
<td>BLEACH/CAN LINERS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>292.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90936</td>
<td>08/31/17 4842</td>
<td>SUPPLYWORKS, INC</td>
<td>00165006580</td>
<td>BLEACH/CAN LINERS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>584.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# FUND - 001 - GENERAL FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASH ACCT CHECK NO</th>
<th>ISSUE DT VENDOR</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>BUDGET UNIT</th>
<th>-----DESCRIPTION-----</th>
<th>SALES TAX</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1011 90950 09/07/17 108</td>
<td>DEL MAR BLUE PRINT COMPA</td>
<td>25055005570</td>
<td>MOVIE NIGHT PRINTING</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>107.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90951 09/07/17 94</td>
<td>ESGIL CORPORATION</td>
<td>00155005560</td>
<td>BLDG PRNT 07/10-07/14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,292.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90952 09/07/17 223</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>00150005150</td>
<td>SHIPPING 08/08 &amp; 8/09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>106.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90953 09/07/17 11</td>
<td>ICMA RETIREMENT TRUST-45 001</td>
<td>ICMA PD 09/07/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,688.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90953 09/07/17 11</td>
<td>ICMA RETIREMENT TRUST-45 001</td>
<td>ICMA PD 09/08/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,618.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90953 09/07/17 11</td>
<td>ICMA RETIREMENT TRUST-45 001</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15,306.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90954 09/07/17 3659</td>
<td>ICMA RETIREMENT TRUST-RH 001</td>
<td>ICMA PD 09/08/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,022.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90955 09/07/17 5098</td>
<td>JOSE GARCIA</td>
<td>00165006560</td>
<td>MILEAGE-08/26/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90956 09/07/17 5277</td>
<td>LUNAR PAINTING</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>LCCM PAINT REV 07/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>864.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90957 09/07/17 4820</td>
<td>PRETER MACONVILLE</td>
<td>25055005570</td>
<td>MOVIE NIGHT SUPPLIES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>235.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90958 09/07/17 5219</td>
<td>JERUSALEM CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>45993716510</td>
<td>9371.17 SIDEWALK RPR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21,655.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90958 09/07/17 5219</td>
<td>JERUSALEM CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>45993716510</td>
<td>9371.17 SIDEWALK RPR RETN</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,139.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90958 09/07/17 5219</td>
<td>JERUSALEM CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>45993716510</td>
<td>9371.17 SIDEWALK RPR RET</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1,139.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90958 09/07/17 5219</td>
<td>JERUSALEM CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>45993716510</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21,655.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90959 09/07/17 54</td>
<td>1 STOP TONER &amp; INKJET, L</td>
<td>00150005300</td>
<td>TONER-FRNT CNTR/CATHR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>124.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90960 09/07/17 2260</td>
<td>REDPLEX TRAFFIC SYSTEMS</td>
<td>00165006540</td>
<td>RED LIGHT CAMERA-JULY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,159.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90961 09/07/17 2265</td>
<td>SANCION ENGINEERING, INC</td>
<td>45994566510</td>
<td>9456.17STRMOR EMG RPR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30,890.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90962 09/07/17 141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>GRP 6-01 07/01/08-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,208.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90962 09/07/17 141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>GRP 7-12 06/16-08/15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,035.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90962 09/07/17 141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>M#81967699 07/01/08-01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>120.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90962 09/07/17 141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>M#8138473 07/01-08/01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>617.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90962 09/07/17 141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>M#55662206 07/01-08/01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>855.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90962 09/07/17 141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>M#81967713 07/07-08/01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,367.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90962 09/07/17 141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>M#81967689 07/01-08/01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,507.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90962 09/07/17 141</td>
<td>SANTA FE IRRIGATION DIST</td>
<td>20475007520</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,722.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90963 09/07/17 13</td>
<td>SOLANA BEACH FIREFIGHTER 001</td>
<td>FD DUES PD 09/08/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>823.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90964 09/07/17 1231</td>
<td>STAPLES CONTRACT &amp; COMM</td>
<td>00150005300</td>
<td>SOAP/AIR FRESHENER</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90965 09/07/17 3066</td>
<td>SUMMIT ENVIRONMENTAL GRO</td>
<td>45909266190</td>
<td>9926 PROF SVC SND-JUL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90965 09/07/17 3066</td>
<td>SUMMIT ENVIRONMENTAL GRO</td>
<td>00150005550</td>
<td>PROF SVC JULY</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>880.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90965 09/07/17 3066</td>
<td>SUMMIT ENVIRONMENTAL GRO</td>
<td>00150005550</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,430.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90966 09/07/17 12</td>
<td>UNITED WAY OF SAN DIEGO 001</td>
<td>UNITED WY PD 09/08/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90967 09/07/17 2097</td>
<td>UT SAN DIEGO - NRTH COUN</td>
<td>00150005550</td>
<td>FUB LHRG-1715.24 CUP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>130.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90967 09/07/17 2097</td>
<td>UT SAN DIEGO - NRTH COUN</td>
<td>00150005550</td>
<td>FUB LHRG-1717.08 DRP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>164.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011 90967 09/07/17 2097</td>
<td>UT SAN DIEGO - NRTH COUN</td>
<td>00150005550</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>294.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH ACCT</td>
<td>CHECK NO</td>
<td>ISSUE DT</td>
<td>VENDOR</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>BUDGET UNIT</td>
<td>-----DESCRIPTION-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90968</td>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>3242</td>
<td>VAN DYKE LANDSCAPE ARCHI</td>
<td>42094386510</td>
<td>9438.10-SKT FRK DSGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90969</td>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>4844</td>
<td>WARWICK GROUP CONSULTANT</td>
<td>45099266190</td>
<td>9926 PROF SVC-JULY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90970</td>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>4503</td>
<td>WBSS TRANSPORTATION SERV</td>
<td>25570007110</td>
<td>DAY CAMP-08/16/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90970</td>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>4503</td>
<td>WBSS TRANSPORTATION SERV</td>
<td>25570007110</td>
<td>DAY CAMP-08/23/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90970</td>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>4503</td>
<td>WBSS TRANSPORTATION SERV</td>
<td>25570007110</td>
<td>DAY CAMP-07/19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90970</td>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>4503</td>
<td>WBSS TRANSPORTATION SERV</td>
<td>25570007110</td>
<td>DAY CAMP-07/12/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CHK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90971</td>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>4763</td>
<td>WESTERN AUDIO VISUAL</td>
<td>00150005450</td>
<td>CHAMBERS TECH-JULY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>90971</td>
<td>09/07/17</td>
<td>4763</td>
<td>WESTERN AUDIO VISUAL</td>
<td>00150005450</td>
<td>CHAMBERS TECH-AUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CHK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CASH ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT: Finance
SUBJECT: Report on Changes Made to the General Fund Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2017-2018

BACKGROUND:

Staff provides a report at each Council meeting that lists changes made to the current Fiscal Year (FY) General Fund Adopted Budget.

The information provided in this Staff Report lists the changes made through September 12, 2017.

DISCUSSION:

The following table reports the revenue, expenditures, and transfers for 1) the Adopted General Fund Budget approved by Council on June 14, 2017 (Resolution 2017-095) and 2) any resolutions passed by Council that amended the Adopted General Fund Budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Transfers from GF</th>
<th>Net Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reso 2017-165</td>
<td>Adopted Budget</td>
<td>17,611,500</td>
<td>(16,932,700)</td>
<td>(372,400) (1)</td>
<td>$ 306,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reso 2017-122</td>
<td>Marine Safety MOU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(11,340)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>295,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reso 2017-123</td>
<td>Salary and Comp Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(75,500)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>219,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reso 2017-126</td>
<td>Miscellaneous MOU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(53,600)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>166,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Transfers to:
Debt Service for Public Facilities 152,400
City CIP Fund 220,000 372,400

CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

Not a project as defined by CEQA

FISCAL IMPACT:

COUNCIL ACTION:

AGENDA ITEM A.2.
N/A

WORK PLAN:
N/A

OPTIONS:

- Receive the report.
- Do not accept the report

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council receive the report listing changes made to the FY 2017-2018 General Fund Adopted Budget.

CITY MANAGER’S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Department Recommendation

[Signature]
Gregory Wade, City Manager
TO:         Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM:  Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE:  September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT:  Engineering Department
SUBJECT:  Consideration of Resolution No. 2017-141 Authorizing
           Staff To Submit List of Projects to Receive Road
           Maintenance Rehabilitation Account Funding as Required
           by Senate Bill 1

BACKGROUND:

On April 28, 2017, the Governor signed Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Beall, Chapter 5, Statutes of
2017), which is known as the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017. To address
basic road maintenance, rehabilitation and critical safety needs on both the state
highway and local streets and road system, SB 1: increases per gallon fuel excise
taxes; increases diesel fuel sales taxes and vehicle registration fees; and provides for
inflationary adjustments to tax rates in future years.

Beginning November 1, 2017, the State Controller (Controller) will deposit various
portions of this new funding into the newly created Road Maintenance and
Rehabilitation Account (RMRA). A percentage of this new RMRA funding will be
apportioned by formula to eligible cities and counties pursuant to Streets and Highways
Code (SHC) Section 2032(h) for basic road maintenance, rehabilitation, and critical
safety projects on the local streets and roads system.

SB 1 emphasizes the importance of accountability and transparency in the delivery of
California’s transportation programs. Therefore, in order to be eligible for RMRA
funding, statute requires cities and counties to provide basic annual RMRA project
reporting to the California Transportation Commission (Commission). One of the
reporting requirements is that all projects proposed to receive funding must be included
in a city/county budget that is adopted by the applicable city council or county board of
supervisors at a regular public meeting.

This item is before the City Council for the consideration of Resolution No. 2017-141
(Attachment 1) to authorize Staff to submit to the Commission a list of projects proposed
to be funded with an apportionment of RMRA funds. The project list will include only the

CITY COUNCIL ACTION:

AGENDA ITEM A.3.
2018 Annual Pavement Repair Program for which streets to be repaired will be determined in Spring 2018.

**DISCUSSION:**

Pursuant to SHC Section 2030(a), the objective of the Local Streets and Roads Program is to address deferred maintenance on the local streets and roads system through the prioritization and delivery of basic road maintenance and rehabilitation projects as well as critical safety projects.

Cities and counties receiving RMRA funds must comply with all relevant federal and state laws, regulations, policies, and procedures. The main requirements for the program are codified in SHC Sections 2034, 2036, 2037, and 2038 and include the following:

- Prior to receiving an apportionment of RMRA funds from the Controller in a fiscal year, a city or county must submit to the Commission a list of projects proposed to be funded with these funds. All projects proposed to receive funding must be included in a city or county budget that is adopted by the applicable city council or county board of supervisors at a regular public meeting [SHC 2034(a)(1)].

- The list of projects must include a description and the location of each proposed project, a proposed schedule for the project's completion, and the estimated useful life of the improvement [SHC 2034(a)(1)].

- The project list does not limit the flexibility of an eligible city or county to fund projects in accordance with local needs and priorities so long as the projects are consistent with RMRA priorities as outlined in SHC 2030(b) [SHC 2034(a)(1)].

- The initial project list must be submitted to the Commission no later than Monday October 16, 2017.

- The Commission will report to the Controller the cities and counties that have submitted a list of projects as described in SHC 2034(a)(1) and that are therefore eligible to receive an apportionment of RMRA funds for the applicable fiscal year [SHC 2034(a)(2)].

- The Controller, upon receipt of the report from the Commission, shall apportion RMRA funds to eligible cities and counties pursuant to SHC 2032(h) [SHC 2034(a)(2)].

- For each fiscal year in which RMRA funds are received and expended, cities and counties must submit documentation to the Commission that includes a
description and location of each completed project, the amount of funds expended on the project, the completion date, and the estimated useful life of the improvement [SHC 2034(b)].

- A city or county receiving an apportionment of RMRA funds is required to sustain a maintenance of effort (MOE) by spending at least the annual average of its general fund expenditures during the 2009–10, 2010–11, and 2011–12 fiscal years for street, road, and highway purposes from the city’s or county’s general fund [SHC 2036]. Monitoring and enforcement of the maintenance of effort requirement for RMRA funds will be carried out by the Controller.

- A city or county may spend its apportionment of RMRA funds on transportation priorities other than priorities outlined in SHC 2030(b) if the city or county’s average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) meets or exceeds 80 [SHC 2037].

- By July 1, 2023, cities and counties receiving RMRA funds must follow guidelines developed by the California Workforce Development Board (Board) that address participation and investment in, or partnership with, new or existing pre-apprenticeship training programs [SHC 2038].

- Project types that are eligible to receive and use RMRA funding include road maintenance/rehabilitation, safety projects, complete streets components and traffic control devices.

In order to comply with the requirements of SB 1, Staff is proposing to include the RMRA funding in the annual street repair project that repairs and resurfaces streets throughout the City. Since the project is already in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017/18 Adopted Budget, a new project does not need to be included. In order to be totally transparent, Staff is recommending that the City Council consider the attached resolution so there is clear documentation as to how the specific project received funding from the new program.

**CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:**

The annual street repair project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The FY 2018/19 Adopted Budget appropriated $550,000 for the 2018 Annual Pavement Management Program to repair and resurface City streets. The funding was divided between Gas Tax ($400,000) and TransNet ($150,000). This project will be constructed in calendar year 2018 as part of the FY 2018/19 Budget.
Tentatively, the City is projected to receive $77,816 in FY 2017/18 as part of the RMRA program and $231,802 in FY 2018/19. The reason for the major change is that the FY 2017/18 payment would be a partial year funding from the new program. The first full year of funding will be FY 2018/19. These amounts will be appropriated at a later date once the exact amounts have been determined and the State has notified the City.

**WORK PLAN:**

This item is consistent with Unprioritized Community Character Issues identified in the 2017-2018 Work Plan.

**OPTIONS:**

- Approve Staff recommendation.
- Approve Staff recommendation with alternative amendments or modifications.
- Deny Staff recommendation and provide direction.

**DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt Resolution 2017-141:

1. Authorizing the City Engineer to establish a project list for the 2017 Local Streets and Roads Funding Program using funds from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account and designating the 2018 Annual Pavement Management Program, as identified in the City’s 2018/19 Capital Improvement Program list, to receive the funding from this new program.

2. Authorizing the City Engineer to submit the project list to the California Transportation Commission for the 2017 Local Streets and Roads Funding Program using funds from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account.

**CITY MANAGER’S RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve Department Recommendation.

[Signature]

Gregory Wade, City Manager

Attachments:

1. Resolution No. 2017-141
RESOLUTION NO. 2017-141

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLANA BEACH, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING A LIST OF PROJECTS TO RECEIVE ROAD MAINTENANCE REHABILITATION ACCOUNT FUNDING AS REQUIRED BY SENATE BILL 1

WHEREAS, on April 28, 2017, the Governor signed Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Beall, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), which is known as the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017. To address basic road maintenance, rehabilitation and critical safety needs on both the state highway and local streets and road system, SB 1: increases per gallon fuel excise taxes; increases diesel fuel sales taxes and vehicle registration fees; and provides for inflationary adjustments to tax rates in future years; and

WHEREAS, Beginning November 1, 2017, the State Controller (Controller) will deposit various portions of this new funding into the newly created Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA). A percentage of this new RMRA funding will be apportioned by formula to eligible cities and counties pursuant to Streets and Highways Code (SHC) Section 2032(h) for basic road maintenance, rehabilitation, and critical safety projects on the local streets and roads system; and

WHEREAS, SB 1 emphasizes the importance of accountability and transparency in the delivery of California’s transportation programs. Therefore, in order to be eligible for RMRA funding, statute requires cities and counties to provide basic annual RMRA project reporting to the California Transportation Commission (Commission). One of the reporting requirements is that all projects proposed to receive funding must be included in a city/county budget that is adopted by the applicable city council or county board of supervisors at a regular public meeting; and

WHEREAS, in order to comply with the requirements of SB 1, Staff is proposing to include the RMRA funding in the annual street repair project that repairs and resurfaces streets throughout the City. Since the project is already in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017/18 Adopted Budget, a new project does not need to be included. In order to be totally transparent, Staff is recommending that the City Council consider this resolution so there is a clear paper trail as to how the specific project received funding from the new program.

NOW THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, does resolve as follows:

1. That the foregoing recitations are true and correct.

2. That the City Council authorizes the City Engineer to establish a project list for the 2017 Local Streets and Roads Funding Program using funds from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account and designating the 2018 Annual
Pavement Management Program to receive the funding from this new program.

3. That the City Council authorizes the City Engineer to submit the project list to the California Transportation Commission for the 2017 Local Streets and Roads Funding Program using funds from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 27th day of September, 2017, at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers –
NOES: Councilmembers –
ABSENT: Councilmembers –
ABSTAIN: Councilmembers –

__________________________________________
MIKE NICHOLS, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM: ATTEST:

______________________________
JOHANNA N. CANLAS, City Attorney

______________________________
ANGELA IVEY, City Clerk
STAFF REPORT
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council members
FROM: Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT: City Manager’s
SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution 2017-147 Authorizing the FY 2017-18 Community Grant Program

BACKGROUND:

On May 4, 2004, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2004-68 approving Council Policy No. 14, establishing the Community Grant Program (“Grant Program”) and Application Guidelines for the Grant Program. On September 27, 2006, the City Council amended the policy to specify grant monies are only intended to be provided to non-governmental organizations.

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18 Adopted Budget has $25,000 allocated for the Grant Program. Included in the $25,000 allocation is $5,000 in funding from EDCO and $5,000 in funding from Waste Management, as part of their Solid Waste Franchise Agreements with the City, specifically for the Grant Program.

This item is before City Council is to consider approving Resolution 2017-147 (Attachment 1) authorizing the FY 2017-18 Community Grant Program for the City of Solana Beach.

DISCUSSION:

The following is a list of key points for the implementation of the Grant Program for FY 2017-18:

Application Criteria

Applications will be judged and selected based upon the following criteria:

1. The applicant is a non-profit 501(c)(3) or a recognized community-based organization serving the Solana Beach community.
2. Fair and justifiable program costs (budget required).
3. Collaboration/Partnerships.
4. Leveraging of matching funds/resources.

CITY COUNCIL ACTION:


AGENDA ITEM A.4.
5. Originality and creativity. Priority will be given to projects or programs which are new and unique to the community or which provide a new or unique twist on an existing program.
6. Applicants must submit a financial conditions statement (Balance Sheet) as well as the applicant(s) revenue/expenditure statements and tax return statements for the prior operating year.
7. Completion of project between the grant award and December 31, 2018 (an exception to the December 31, 2018 completion date can be made with proof of good cause).

Grant Award Expenditures

Grants will be funded upon approval by the City Council. Expenses must be directly related to services or materials of the proposed activity during the grant award period (Date of Grant Approval through December 31, 2018). Grantees will be required to maintain records to support claimed expenditures and project accomplishments. Funds for the proposed project must not be used to replace or offset funding sources normally available for any portion of the project, nor be used by the applicant(s) to fund/supplement its own monetary contributions.

Grant Award Amounts

The City Council, at its own discretion, may modify the grant awards to qualified recipients based on qualifying criteria, number of qualified applications received, and purpose of request to meet policy areas as enumerated in the City Council’s Work Plan to benefit the Solana Beach community.

Final Report and Receipts

Recipients will submit copies of paid receipts/invoices and a written report to the City Manager’s Office to review the documents to ensure that funds were spent in compliance with the application. Applicant(s) will be required to reimburse the City of Solana Beach for any inappropriately expended funds.

Prior Financial Assistance

Information provided on the application will be used to review prior grant management and performance history. Significant non-compliance issues will be taken into consideration and may affect future funding decisions by the City Council.

Community Grant Program FY 2017-18 Key Dates:

October 2, 2017 Distribute Request for Proposals and issue press notification.

October 31, 2017 Deadline for Request for Financial Assistance Applications. City Manager will review each application and make recommendations based upon:

1) Completed application;
2) Clear indication of the grant amount requested;
3) Timely receipt of grant applications and attachments; and
4) Benefit to Solana Beach and conformity with threshold criteria.

November 15, 2017  **First Council Review:** All eligible grant applications will be considered by the City Council. Review and public comment/presentations will be accepted.

December 13, 2017  **Final Council Review:** Council approves grant recipients. Following Council award, the City Manager will be directed to issue awards to recipients. Announcement of recipients will be made to the community via public notification.

December 1, 2018  Letter will be sent to FY 2017-18 recipients reminding them to submit their reports and copies of receipts by December 31, 2018.

December 31, 2018  All FY 2017-18 recipients must submit copies of paid receipts/invoices and a written report that includes the number of citizens served and outcome of grant funded activity. If no report and/or paid receipts/invoices are received, recipient will be required to immediately reimburse City of Solana Beach grant funds.

January, 2019  At the second City Council Meeting in January 2019, the City Manager provides the Final Report for FY 2017-18 Grant Recipients to the City Council.

If a determination is made that funds were expended inappropriately, City Council will direct recipients to reimburse the City of Solana Beach for the designated amount of award.

**Proposed Community Grant Modification**

The City’s Community Grant Program has been operating successfully for many years. However, Staff is proposing a revision to the program that will help correct some minor issues that have arisen in recent years. Staff’s recommendation is to change the grant cycle period to allow a more efficient administration of the program. Currently, the grant period is annually from January 1st through October 31st which leaves out the months of November and December for grantees to expend the funds. This has caused some inconsistencies with grantees that may use the funding for programs over the winter holidays. In addition, the current grant cycle has the grant applicants presenting their proposed programs/projects in November with the Council allocations happening in December. During election years, this can cause timing issues as the current Council analyzes the grant applications and hears the presentations in November while the potential new Council allocates the funding in December.

Therefore, Staff is recommending that for this grant cycle, the award period be changed from “January 1st through October 31st” to from “Date of Grant Approval through December 31st”. Then, starting with next year’s Community Grant Program (FY 18/19), the grant cycle will coincide with the fiscal year and the grant applications will be due in June 2018 with the Council allocations occurring in July 2018. The change to this year’s grant cycle has been tentatively placed in the timeline above as well as in the attached Community Grant Guidelines for Council consideration (Attachment 2).
CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

Not a project as defined by CEQA.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The approved FY 2017-18 Budget contains fiscal appropriations in the amount of $25,000 to be used to fund community grants. All fiscal appropriations are budgeted under the Mayor/City Council Fund 001-5000-5100-6532 – Contribution to Other Agencies.

WORK PLAN: N/A

OPTIONS:

- Approve Staff recommendation
- Approve Staff recommendation with modifications
- Deny Staff recommendation

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council approve Resolution No. 2017-147 authorizing the FY 2017-18 Community Grant Program.

CITY MANAGER RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Department Recommendation

________________________
Gregory Wade, City Manager

Attachments:

1. Resolution No. 2017-147
2. FY 2017-18 Application Guidelines
3. FY 2017-18 Grant Application
RESOLUTION NO. 2017-147

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLANA BEACH, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE COMMUNITY GRANT PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017-18

WHEREAS, the Community Grant Program procedures and guidelines for funding consideration by the City Council was established and approved by Council Policy No. 14 on May 4, 2004; and

WHEREAS, Council Policy No. 14 specifies that funds are intended only for non-governmental agencies/community service organizations that seek financial assistance; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has approved the allocation of $25,000 for the purpose of funding the Community Grant Program in the FY 2017-18 City of Solana Beach Budget; and

WHEREAS, the City Council approves the solicitation and request for proposals for grant applications to be initiated on October 2, 2017 and the application period to close on October 31, 2017, at 5:00 p.m.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, does resolves as follows:

1. That the above recitations are true and correct.

2. That the annual solicitation of grant proposals from community service organizations who meet the grant program guidelines for the Community Grant Program and Council Policy No. 14 for the FY 2017-18 funds of $25,000 are approved and authorized.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, held on the 27th day of September 2017, by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers –
NOES: Councilmembers –
ABSTAIN: Councilmembers –
ABSENT: Councilmembers –

MIKE NICHOLS, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM: ATTEST:

JOHANNA N. CANLAS, City Attorney ANGELA IVEY, City Clerk

ATTACHMENT 1
City of Solana Beach  
Community Grant Program  
Request for Financial Assistance  
FY 2017-18

APPLICATION GUIDELINES

The City of Solana Beach is soliciting grant applications until 5:00 p.m., Tuesday, October 31, 2017. The City Council has a total of $25,000 available for community organizations. A maximum of two grant applications may be submitted per community organization. Grants will be awarded with a maximum award of $5,000.

Request for Grants are limited to non-governmental, nonprofit organizations serving the Solana Beach community. Excluded entities include the following: County of San Diego, Municipal Organizations, Special or Water Districts, school districts or schools (but not their supporting organizations), and private individuals.

Grant Application & Documents Required
Applicants must complete the attached application form and provide the following documents:
- Summary of organization’s (overall) budget
- Proposed program budget detailing costs which are fair and reasonable.
- Financial Statements including the Balance Sheet and Revenue/Expenditure Statement, and the Tax Statements filed for the prior year.
- W-9 Form
- Calif. Nonprofit Corp. certificate or California Certification Number
  - Non-Profit Organizations
    Nonprofit organizations which have officially filed as a nonprofit with the State of California must attach a copy of its current year 501 (c) 3 nonprofit certification form. For organizations that are “recognized” nonprofits within the community but have never formally filed with the State, the City Council at its discretion may consider their application. Note, any decision made by City Council is final in regards to the community grants process.

Program Requirements:
- Must serve the residents of Solana Beach.
- Preferred to be a new program or one that provides a new or unique aspect to an existing program. Funds are available as one-time seed-money to augment a community program.

Application Submittal and Deadline: NO LATER THAN 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, October 31, 2017
Completed forms should be received at City of Solana Beach, Office of the City Manager, 635 South Highway 101, Solana Beach, CA. 92075, Attn: Community Grants Program. The City will
accept applications via e-mail as well.

Email applications should be sent to dking@cosb.org and copied to plett@cosb.org.

Please contact Dan King, Assistant City Manager, at (858) 720-2477 if you need additional information.

Applications will be judged and selected on the following criteria:

1. Preferences will be given towards non-profits that provide services/goods to Solana Beach groups or individuals with special economic needs that are not being met in the economic environment. These can be non-profits whose funding has been reduced or eliminated and are unable to serve these populations in need.
2. Program costs that are fair and justifiable.
3. Program originality (new and unique).
4. Consideration may be given to applications that collaborate or partner with other organizations.
5. Consideration may be given to applications which receive matching funds from other organizations.
6. Consideration may be given to applications as decided by the City Council.
7. Information provided on application will be used to review prior grant management and performance history. Significant non-compliance issues will be taken into consideration and may affect future funding decisions by the City Council.

Grant Award and Expenditures:
The City Council, at its discretion, may modify the grant award to qualified recipients based on qualifying criteria, number of qualified applicants received, and purpose of request to meet areas as enumerated by the City Council that benefit the Solana Beach community. The total of all grant awards may not exceed $25,000.

Grants will be funded after the approval of the awards by the City Council. Expenses must be directly related to services or materials of proposed activity during the grant award period (Date of Grant Approval through December 31, 2018). Grantees will be required to maintain records to support claimed expenditures and project accomplishments. Funds for the proposed project must not be used to replace or offset funding sources normally available for any portion of the project, nor be used by the applicant to fund/supplement its own monetary giving.

Final Report and Receipts:
The City Manager’s Office will review submitted copies of paid receipts/invoices and a written report to ensure that funds were spent in compliance with the approved application. Applicant(s) will be required to reimburse the City of Solana Beach all inappropriately spent funds.
PROGRAM FY 2017-18 KEY DATES:

October 2, 2017  Distribute Grant Program Application, have it available and solicit for applications.

October 31, 2017  **DEADLINE for Request for Financial Assistance Applications (5:00pm).** The City Manager’s Office will review each application and make recommendations based upon:
1) Completed application;
2) Clear indication of the grant amount requested;
3) Receipt of grant application before the deadline WITH attachments;
4) Benefit to Solana Beach community and conformity with threshold criteria.

November 15, 2017  **First Council Review:** All eligible grant applications for Fiscal Year 2017-18 will be considered by City Council. Review and public comment/presentations will be accepted.

December 13, 2017  **Final Council Review:** Council makes decision and approves grant recipients. The City Manager will be directed to issue awards to recipients. Announcement of grant award recipients is made to community via public notification.

December 1, 2018  Letter will be sent to FY 2017-18 grant recipients reminding them to submit their reports and copies of receipts by October 31, 2018. (Exception to the 10/31/18 completion date can be made with proof of good cause.)

December 31, 2018  All FY 2017-18 grant recipients must submit copies of paid receipts/invoices and written report, that includes the number of citizens served and outcome of grant funded activity. If no paid receipts/invoices are received, recipient will be required to immediately reimburse City of Solana Beach grant funds.

All grant recipients’ final reports will be submitted before the City Council for approval of expenditures. If determination is made that funds were expended inappropriately, Council will direct Grant recipients to reimburse the City of Solana Beach for the designated amount of award.
City of Solana Beach
Community Grant Program
Request for Financial Assistance
FY 2017-18 APPLICATION

All Applications MUST BE RECEIVED by 5:00 p.m. Tuesday, October 31, 2017.
Please Print Clearly or Type
All requests will be determined by the following criteria:

Name of Organization:_________________________________________________________________________
Mailing Address:_______________________________________________________________________________
City_______________________________________ State ________ Zip__________
Contact Person:_________________________________________________________________________________
Daytime Phone:_________________________________________________________________________________
Evening Phone:_________________________________________________________________________________
Email address:_________________________________________________________________________________

1. W-9 must be attached
   Summary of organization's budget must be attached
   Proposed program budget must be attached
   Financial Statements (see Application Guidelines) must be attached

2. A copy of the certificate of California Nonprofit Corporation must be attached
   Or, Calif. Non-profit 501 (c) 3 Corporation Certification Number: ________________________________

3. Has your organization received financial assistance from the City before?
   Yes • No •
   If yes, what activities and which fiscal year?____________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

4. Amount requested for FY 2017-18 $__________________________________________________________

5. Proposed Total Program Costs: $_____________________________________________________________
   (Includes all estimated costs to conduct proposed activity/program.)

6. Title of Proposed Program/Service: __________________________________________________________

7. Grant funds must be used for services or materials directly associated to proposed activity. Please describe how grant funds will be used:
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

(Attach extra sheet, if necessary.)

ATTACHMENT 3
8. Estimated number of S.B. residents to be served by proposed program:__________

9. Program Dates/Location:

________________________________________________________________________

10. Anticipated Program Objectives or Accomplishments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

11. How will the organization acknowledge the City’s financial contribution to the community/ beneficiaries of the proposed activity?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

12. Will there be any matching funds or other grants that would be applied to this program or service? If awarded this grant, will that enable other funding sources?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

13. Will volunteers be used for the proposed program or service and, if so, will they reduce expenses?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

14. If the proposed program or service is only awarded partial funding, will it still move forward? Will the program or service be scaled back and/or is there a threshold at which it will not move forward?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Acknowledgment of Responsibility:
Authorized Signature assumes all responsibility for developing and implementing proposed activities or events in this application, including public acknowledgment of the City's financial contribution. Authorized signature will comply with all accounting and budget procedures outlined by the City. Authorized signature and accompanying group will hold harmless the City of Solana Beach from all losses, claims, accidents and problems associated, directly or indirectly with the development and implementation of proposed activities or events.

______________________________  ________________________
Authorized Signature of Organization  Date

ALL INFORMATION REQUESTED ON THIS APPLICATION MUST BE COMPLETED AS A CONDITION FOR BEING CONSIDERED FOR PUBLIC FUNDS BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF SOLANA BEACH.
Minutes of the City Council

May 24, 2017  Closed Session
May 24, 2017  Regular Meeting
June 14, 2017  Closed Session
June 14, 2017  Regular Meeting

AGENDA ITEM A.5.
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH
SOLANA BEACH CITY COUNCIL, SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY,
PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY, & HOUSING AUTHORITY

MINUTES
Joint Meeting - Closed Session
Wednesday, May 24, 2017 * 5:00 p.m.
City Hall / Council Chambers, 635 S. Highway 101, Solana Beach, California
Minutes contain a summary of significant discussions and formal actions taken at a City Council meeting.

CITY COUNCILMEMBERS
Mike Nichols, Mayor
Ginger Marshall, Deputy Mayor
Jewel Edson, Councilmember
David A. Zito, Councilmember
Judy Hegenauer, Councilmember
Gregory Wade
City Manager
Johanna Canlas
City Attorney
Angela Ivey
City Clerk

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:
Mayor Nichols called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.
Present: Mike Nichols, Ginger Marshall, David A. Zito, Jewel Edson, Judy Hegenauer
Absent: None
Also Present: Gregory Wade, City Manager
Johanna Canlas, City Attorney

PUBLIC COMMENT ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS (ONLY):
Report to Council Chambers and submit speaker slips to the City Clerk before the meeting recesses to closed session.

CLOSED SESSION:

1. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS
Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6
Agency designated representative: Gregory Wade
Employee organizations: Miscellaneous Employees, Marine Safety Unit

2. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION
Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)
- Beach & Bluff Conservancy v. City of Solana Beach, California Coastal Commission,
  Surfrider (Case No. 37-2013-00046561-CU-WM-NC)
- Homeowners Associations: Solana Beach & Tennis Club, Del Mar Beach Club,
  Surfsonq, Seascape Shores, Seascape Chateau, Seascape Surf, Del Mar Shores
  Terrace v. City of Solana Beach (Case 37-2013-00046245-CU-WM-NC)
- Hamilton v. City of Solana Beach, et al. (Case 37-2014-00034514-CU-WM-NC)
- Joseph S. Steinberg v. City of Solana Beach (Case No. 37-2013-00044897-CU-WM-NC)
3. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
   Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2)
   Two (2) Potential case(s).

ACTION: No reportable action.

ADJOURN:
Mayor Nichols adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Angela Ivey, City Clerk                     Approved:
CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:
Mayor Nichols called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

Present: Mike Nichols, Ginger Marshall, David A. Zito, Jewel Edson, Judy Hegenauer
Absent: None
Also Present: Greg Wade, City Manager
Johanna Canlas, City Attorney
Angela Ivey, City Clerk,
Mo Sammak, City Engineer/Public Works Dir.
Marie Berkuti, Finance Manager
Bill Chopyk, Community Development Dir.
Danny King, Assistant City Manager

CLOSED SESSION REPORT: (when applicable)
Johanna Canlas, City Attorney, stated that there was no reportable action.

FLAG SALUTE:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:
Motion: Moved by Deputy Mayor Marshall and second by Councilmember Edson to approve.
Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

PROCLAMATIONS/CERTIFICATES: Ceremonial
- Public Works’ Week

PRESENTATIONS: Ceremonial items that do not contain in-depth discussion and no action/direction.
- Encinitas Half Marathon Recap
- San Diego County Water Authority

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:
This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the City Council on items relating to City business and not appearing on today's agenda by submitting a speaker slip (located on the back table) to the City Clerk. Comments relating to items on this evening's
agenda are taken at the time the items are heard. Pursuant to the Brown Act, no action shall be taken by the City Council on public comment items. Council may refer items to the City Manager for placement on a future agenda. The maximum time allotted for each presentation is THREE MINUTES (SBMC 2.04.190). Please be aware of the timer light on the Council Dais.

Peggy Walker asked if Council would write a letter to the Fairground’s Board asking them to cancel the cannabis fair that was scheduled to be held September 23rd, to attend a meeting on Tuesday, May 30th at the Fairground’s Board offices as 4:00 p.m., submitted three letters that outlined reasons for the opposition, and stated that Prop 64 allowed private adult use of marijuana but it did not command that public venues could put on events.

Judy Strang, San Dieguito Alliance for Drug Free Youth, said that the cannabis festival agenda item was removed over the weekend and moved to a new meeting next Tuesday, and that the Farm Bureau would be speaking which was a large and aggressive pro-pot organization.

COUNCIL COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMENTARY:
An opportunity for City Council to make brief announcements or report on their activities. These items are not agendized for official City business with no action or substantive discussion.

Council reported community announcements and events.

A. CONSENT CALENDAR: (Action Items) (A.1. - A.15.)
Items listed on the Consent Calendar are to be acted in a single action of the City Council unless pulled for discussion. Any member of the public may address the City Council on an item of concern by submitting to the City Clerk a speaker slip (located on the back table) before the Consent Calendar is addressed. Those items removed from the Consent Calendar by a member of the Council will be trailed to the end of the agenda, while Consent Calendar items removed by the public will be discussed immediately after approval of the Consent Calendar.

A.1. Minutes of the City Council.
Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Approve the Minutes of the City Council Meetings held March 22, 2017 and March 29, 2017.
See Approved Minutes http://www.ci.solana-beach.ca.us/index.asp?SEC=FOF1200D-21C6-4A86-9AE1-0B/C07C1A81A7&Type=6_BASIC
Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.2. Register Of Demands. (File 0300-30)
Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Ratify the list of demands for April 22, 2017 through May 5, 2017.
Item A.2. Report (click here)
Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoint, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office
Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Receive the report listing changes made to the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 General Fund Adopted Budget.

Item A.3. Report (click here)

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.4. This Item was left blank.

A.6. Coastal Rail Trail Maintenance District Annual Assessment. (File 0495-20)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-075, initiating the proceedings for the annual levy of assessments within the Coastal Rail Trail Maintenance District.

2. Adopt Resolution 2017-076, approving the Engineer’s Report for proceedings of the annual levy of assessments within Coastal Rail Trail Maintenance District.

3. Adopt Resolution 2017-077, declaring intention to provide for the annual levy and collection of assessments in the Coastal Rail Trail Maintenance District and setting a time and date for a public hearing for June 28, 2017.

Item A.6. Report (click here)

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.7. Fire Benefit Fee. (File 0390-23)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-072:
   a. Setting the FY 2017-18 Fire Benefit Fee at $10.00 per unit, and
   b. Approving the Fee for levying on the tax roll.

Item A.7. Report (click here)

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.8. Municipal Improvement Districts Benefit (MID) Fees. (File 0495-20)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Approve Resolution 2017-080, setting the Benefit Charges for MID No. 9C, Santa Fe Hills at $232.10 per unit for FY 2017-18.

2. Approve Resolution 2017-081, setting the Benefit Charges for MID No. 9E, Isla
Verde at $68.74 per unit for FY 2017-18.

3. Approve Resolution 2017-082, setting the Benefit Charges for MID No. 9H, San Elijo Hills # 2 at $289.58 per unit for FY 2017-18.


Item A.8. Report (click here)

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.9. Appropriations Limit. (File 0390-60)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-073, establishing the FY 2017-18 Appropriations Limit in accordance with Article XIIIIB of the California Constitution and Government Code Section 7910 and choosing the County of San Diego’s change in population growth to calculate the Appropriations Limit.

Item A.9. Report (click here)

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.10. Genevieve Street Assisted Living Facility Project Agreement. (File 0600-40)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-067 authorizing the City Manager to execute a professional services agreement between the City and Summit in the amount of $45,000 plus a 15% administrative fee ($6,750) for a total of $51,750 to support the continued application processing and management of the CEQA process for the Genevieve Street Assisted Living Facility Project and authorizing ongoing authority for the City Manager to modify the contract as needed.

Item A.10. Report (click here)

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.11. Community Development Block Grant and Home Investment Partnerships Programs. (File 0400-10)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-074 authorizing the automatic renewal of the Community Development Block Grant Cooperation Agreement for the qualification periods of July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019; July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020; and July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021.

Item A.11. Report (click here)
Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.12. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Pedestrian Ramps Project, Bid 2016-10. (File 0820-20)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-084:
   a. Authorizing the City Council to accept as complete the ADA Pedestrian Ramps Project, Bid No. 2016-10, constructed by Miramar General Engineering.
   b. Authorizing the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion.

Item A.12. Report (click here)

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.13. Palmitas Street Storm Drain Project, Bid 2016-11. (File 0850-40)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-085:
   a. Authorizing the City Council to accept as complete the Palmitas Street Storm Drain Project, Bid 2016-11, constructed by Miramar General Engineering.
   b. Authorizing the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion.

Item A.13. Report (click here)

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.


Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Resolution SA-013 authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Professional Services Agreement with Del Rio Advisors, LLC for Municipal Advisors services in connection with the possible refinancing of the TA Bonds.

2. Resolution SA-014 authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Professional Services Agreement with Brandis Tallman, LLC for Placement Agent services in connection with the possible refinancing of the TA Bonds.

3. Resolution SA-015 authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Professional Services Agreement with Quint & Thimmig, LLP for Bond Counsel services in connection with the possible refinancing of the TA Bonds.
4. **Resolution SA-016** authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Professional Services Agreement with Fraser & Associates for Fiscal Consultant services in connection with the possible refinancing of the TA Bonds.

5. **Resolution SA-017** requesting the Oversight Board to direct the Successor Agency to refund the TA Bonds, including approval of refunding costs.

**Item A.14. Report (click here)**

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk's Office.

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.

**A.15. Residential Solid Waste Rate Review.** (File 1030-15)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Approve **Resolution 2017-087** authorizing the City to proceed with the proper Proposition 218 noticing and majority protest voting procedures and setting the residential Solid Waste Rate Review Public Hearing protest vote for July 12, 2017.

**Item A.15. Report (click here)**

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk's Office.

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.

**This item pulled by the public for discussion**

**A.5. Street Lighting District Annual Assessment.** (File 0495-20)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt **Resolution 2017-078** approving the Engineer's Report for proceedings for the annual levy of assessments within a special maintenance district.

2. Adopt **Resolution 2017-079** declaring intention to provide for an annual levy and collection of assessment in a special maintenance district and setting a time and date for a public hearing; and scheduling the public hearing for June 28, 2017.

**Item A.5. Report (click here)**

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk's Office.

Greg Wade, City Manager introduced the item.

David Beeman said that he was in favor of the assessment.

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Councilmember Edson to approve. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.
B. PUBLIC HEARINGS: (B.1. – B.2.)
This portion of the agenda provides citizens an opportunity to express their views on a specific issue as required by law after proper noticing by submitting a speaker slip (located on the back table) to the City Clerk. After considering all of the evidence, including written materials and oral testimony, the City Council must make a decision supported by findings and the findings must be supported by substantial evidence in the record. An applicant or designees for a private development/business project, for which the public hearing is being held, is allotted a total of fifteen minutes to speak, as per SBMC 2.04.210. A portion of the fifteen minutes may be saved to respond to those who speak in opposition. All other speakers have three minutes each. Please be aware of the timer light on the Council Dais.


The proposed project meets the minimum objective requirements under the SBMC, is consistent with the General Plan and may be found, as conditioned, to meet the discretionary findings required as discussed in this report to approve a DRP and issue a SDP. Therefore, Staff recommends that the City Council:


2. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and

3. If the City Council makes the requisite findings and approves the project, adopt Resolution 2017-062 conditionally approving a SDP and a DRP to demolish an existing single family residence, construct a new two-story, single-family residence with a subterranean basement and an attached two-car garage, and perform associated site improvements at 216 Ocean Street, Solana Beach.

Item B.1. Report (click here)
B.1. Updated Report #1
B.1. Supplemental Documents (updated 5-24-17, 215pm) - R

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Corey Andrews, Principal Planner, said this was a returning item, that it had been continued from the May 10th meeting to address some potential view impairment to the claimants’ home, and was returning with a redesign, and she presented a PowerPoint (on file) reviewing the proposed project.

Mayor Nichols stated that this was currently an open public hearing.

Council disclosures.

Larry Jackel, applicant, reviewed his meetings with Frank Stribling and the preservation of their ocean view, that chairs on the roof deck would be below the height of the deck railing and an umbrella would not work in that confined space, that they had lowered all of the ceilings on the ground floor by a foot, that they submitted a draft deed restriction document to the Striblings who asked to include a sunset clause if they did not live there any longer or built onto their house.
Steve Dalton, architect, presented pictures (on file) of the heights of houses in the surrounding area, said that their surveyor reviewed and confirmed the distances of each of the 2nd floors of the adjacent house, and that they had minimized the view impact and maintained 98-100% of the Stribling's view depending on where they were standing on their property.

Frank Stribling stated that his request was to approve the project subject to conditions based on story poles posted after the May 10th Council meeting, 1) Only allow 2nd floor deck to extend to south of the 2nd floor building façade and limit the corresponding roof overhang to two feet beyond the building façade 2) Do not change height of the roof above one-story part of the house, the maximum height of the one-story part of the house would remain at 95 msl as story poled 3) Set a condition of approval to prohibit the roof for use as a deck, prohibit the conversion of any part of the flat roof over the southerly one-story portion of the house to become or to be used as a desk or to be used to place personal property such as potted plants.

Tracy Richmond said the process was only about view and property issues and should not be personal, that the issue was whether they were being allowed to develop their property reasonably, and to give him an approval with or without conditions.

Council, Staff and Applicant discussed that the initial hand sketch was 4 ft. of deck space but was actually 4'6" ft. with the curb, and that it was story poled at 4'6".

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Edson and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to close the public hearing. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.

Council discussed the request to restrict the roof deck from being used, that most aspects of the view were preserved, that the 1st floor height maximum was already in the current plans, and that any proposed use of the 2nd floor flat roof would have to come to Council for review.

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Edson and second by Councilmember Zito to approve with additional conditions 1) the roof of the one-story portion of the house shall not be modified or converted for use or otherwise used as a deck, outdoor useable space, storage, or for any other use or purpose other than as a roof and 2) the first floor roof shall be constructed to the height shown on the project plans as presented to the Council during the May 24, 2017 Council Hearing. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.

**B.2. Introduce (1st Reading) Ordinance 478 to Prohibit the Establishment and Operation of all Commercial Marijuana Activities, Including Marijuana Cultivation, Processing, Delivery, and Dispensary Activities, in the City of Solana Beach. (File 0230-10)**

Recommendation: That the City Council


2. Introduce Ordinance 478 prohibiting the delivery, cultivation and dispensing of all marijuana.

Item B.2. Report (click here)
Johanna Canlas, City Attorney, stated that the current municipal code banned all marijuana activities, that recent changes to the state regulatory agencies and the governor’s trailer bill suggest that a City needed to establish an ordinance to call out its regulations, that nothing was changing other than the title and clarification to not make a distinction, and eliminating the reference to medical and commercial or recreational marijuana.

Council and Staff discussed that personal use at home was preempted by state law, that this ordinance would only address what could be restricted, and everything else defaulted to state law.

Judy Strang said that she was in support of the ban.

Peggy Walker urged Council’s support of the ordinance.

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to close the public hearing. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Councilmember Edson to approve. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.

*Mayor Nichols recessed the meeting for a break 7:35 p.m. and reconvened at 7:41 p.m.*

**C. STAFF REPORTS:** (C.1. - C.2.)
*Submit speaker slips to the City Clerk.*

**C.1. Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) Consultant Services.** (File 0480-70)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt **Resolution 2017-043** and **Resolution 2017-044** authorizing the City Manager to execute all contracts with TEA and Calpine to provide CCA services to the City.

Item C.1. Report (click here)
B.1. Updated Report #1
C.1. Supplemental Documents (updated 5-24-17, 425pm) - R

**Greg Wade**, City Manager, introduced the item.

Dan King, Assistant City Manager, presented a PowerPoint (on file).

Council, Staff, and consultants discussion included when the City still has time to cancel the process, to consider whether Council wants to have the power to approve each new Phase before it commences. Council and staff discussed two categories of renewable energy 1)
imported energy from elsewhere and 2) RECs (Renewable Energy Credits) and their measurable impact on Solana Beach and its ability to track megawatt hours or energy, RECs, and that the program would be flexible to allow other cities to participate.

Discussion continued regarding how the CCA would meet the state mandated climate action goal, PCIA (Power Charge Indifference Adjustment) charges or exit fees, rooftop solar impacts and net energy metering charges.

Public Speakers

Alan Barnebey said that homeowners would find out about rates and rate structure and what the impacts of solar panels and net metering would be in about a year from now, that it would be difficult to take part in a CCA if the basic question about net metering were not addressed in the first six months, and that he wondered when he would be required to sign up and whether he would be signed up in the CCA as well as SDG&E.

Council and Staff stated that rate information would come out about six months from now during the 1st and 2nd phases of the program, that the net metering issue was a programmatic operational question, the 2nd phase would provide rate structures as they would compare to SDG&E, that the net metering would come later during the operation, that a net metering customer would continue to get the same rate that SDG&E provided but that in time the CCA could improve on that rate, that after phase 1 and the Council decides to launch each customer will be given four separate notices with the option to opt out, that a CCA customer would have a 60-day grace period to opt out, and that customers would know more information before they had to make a decision.

Frank Stribling said that he was in favor of a CCA since he did not use much electricity any longer, and that his investigation showed that it no longer made sense to get solar panels because the CCA would allow him to get clean renewable energy without installing solar roofs.

Jim Wang said he hoped it would be easier for neighboring cities to follow the lead.

Ty Tosdall said that he had seen CCA programs up close and had a lot of confidence in them because of competitive lower utility costs, and that a letter from Sempra said not enough dialogue had been exchanged and they would like an expensive research agenda which was not practical for a local government.

Bob Wilcox said that he researched fusion energy, he supported a CCA and thought it was an important step in reducing the City's carbon emissions, and that he encouraged the City to move forward with a CCA.

Patti Larchet said she just put a solar roof up and her data showed that she saved 3 tons of CO2 emissions just by her house since December, that 95% of her energy came from her roof, and encouraged community choice with an option to choose energy.

Nicole Capretz said that community choice would be a win for everyone, that it would be first time in in 134 years to have an option of an electricity provider, that it was designed by the state as a program public private partnership so all stakeholders benefit, that SDG&E would
continue to get benefits of the revenue they would generate by delivering the power, that it was a win for all levels, and that she was in support.

Donald Moser said he was a former City Councilmember of Del Mar, and was currently their climate action plan facilitator, that Del Mar adopted a climate action plan about a year ago and one big goal was 100% clean energy by 2035 but could not get there without a CCA, that he urged Council to move forward, and that maybe Del Mar would join if it was successful.

Dave Clemons (time donated by Cindi Clemons) stated that he supported a CCA, that the City should move towards clean and renewable energy and a CCA allowed these options, and that it would help California reach its greenhouse gas emission reduction goal.

Peter Zahn (time donated by Sandy Mills) stated that this would be the first CCA in the area. He said that Mary Yang, Chair of the Climate Action Commission, was not able to make it and had a few comments that he would share which included that a CCA was a proven mechanism for reducing cost and increasing renewables in the areas they serve, it was innovative and effective and proven, it would offer different levels of 100% renewable energy, that SDG&E was essentially a fossil fuel company that favored fossil fuel so they would never provide a 100% renewables, that CCA's could undercut the utilities because it was a nonprofit with lower overhead and not bound by expensive energy contracts, that SDG&E's assumptions in their recent letter would need to be reviewed carefully, and urged Council to approve the resolutions to move forward to a CCA.

Daniel Beeman said that he noticed increased rates in his SDG&E bill, that it was something that did not give one a choice and was a dual monopoly, that even solar customers were forced to go on the grid, and there would still be options to make changes as necessary.

Beverly Martinez said that she wanted choice and more access to renewable energy, that CCA was a proven model, 63 cities and 9 counties in California had adopted it and were showing the benefits, and that she highly encouraged Council to continue in this step forward.

Lane Sharman (time donated by Michael Hetz) said that ways could be found to cooperate with SDG&E and develop a partnership of innovation devoted to unbundling energy, and that this was a step in the right direction, and urged everyone to vote yes.

Tracy Richmond said she strongly favored a CCA, urged Council to provide Solana Beach with an energy alternative that helped fight climate change as well as provide other benefits.

Kelly Harless said that it was many years of discussion, that she wanted more info and understood that it would be provided as it moved forward, and that she would see an opportunity as an individual to make a choice.

Shawna McGarry said that she echoed everything she had heard and that as a mother and a member of the Climate Action Commission that she fully supported a CCA.

Council and Staff discussion included that community outreach and communication was part of Phase 1, that there would be an opportunity to opt-out before and after the program
launched, and that rates would be known before the first notice going out to opt-out which would be about two months prior to the launch date.

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Hegenauer and second by Councilmember Zito to approve. **Approved 4/1** (Noes: Marshall). Motion carried.

**C.2. Repayment of Funds Borrowed from the San Elijo Joint Powers Authority for the Water Reclamation Facility, Approving Sale of Bonds and Official Statement, and Authorizing Official Actions.** (File 0150-80)

Recommendation: That the City Council


**Item C.2. Report (click here)**

**C.2. Updated Report #1**

*Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.*

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Mike Thorton, General Manager, presented a PowerPoint (on file).

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.

**COMPENSATION & REIMBURSEMENT DISCLOSURE:** None

GC: Article 2.3. Compensation: 53232.3. (a) Reimbursable expenses shall include, but not be limited to, meals, lodging, and travel. 53232.3 (d) Members of a legislative body shall provide brief reports on meetings attended at the expense of the local agency at the next regular meeting of the legislative body.

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS:**
Councilmembers reported Committee activities.

**Regional Committees: (outside agencies, appointed by this Council)**

a. City Selection Committee (meets twice a year) – Nichols (Edson, alternate).
b. County Service Area 17 – Marshall (Nichols, alternate).
c. Escondido Creek Watershed Authority – Marshall/Staff (no alternate).
d. League of Ca. Cities’ San Diego County Executive Committee – Nichols (Edson, alternate) and any subcommittees.
e. League of Ca. Cities’ Local Legislative Committee – Nichols (Edson, alternate)
f. League of Ca. Cities’ Coastal Cities Issues Group (CCIG) – Nichols (Edson, alternate)
g. North County Dispatch JPA – Marshall (Edson, alternate).
h. North County Transit District – Edson (Nichols, alternate)
i. Regional Solid Waste Association (RSWA) – Nichols (Hegenauer, alternate).
j. SANDAG – Zito (Primary), Edson (1st alternate), Nichols (2nd alternate) and any subcommittees.
k. SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Committee – Zito (Hegenauer, alternate).
l. San Dieguito River Valley JPA – Hegenauer (Nichols, alternate).
m. San Eilio JPA – Marshall, Zito (City Manager, alternate).
n. 22nd Agricultural District Association Community Relations Committee – Marshall, Edson.

**Standing Committees: (All Primary Members) (Permanent Committees)**

c. Fire Dept. Management Governance & Organizational Evaluation – Edson, Hegenauer
e. Parks and Recreation Committee – Nichols, Zito
g. School Relations Committee – Nichols, Hegenauer.

**ADJOURN:**
Mayor Nichols adjourned the meeting at 9:47 p.m.

Angela Ivey, City Clerk

Approved: ______________
CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:
Mayor Nichols called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Present: Mike Nichols, Ginger Marshall, David A. Zito, Jewel Edson, Judy Hegenauer
Absent: None
Also Present: Gregory Wade, City Manager
Johanna Canlas, City Attorney

PUBLIC COMMENT ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS (ONLY):
Report to Council Chambers and submit speaker slips to the City Clerk before the meeting recesses to closed session.

CLOSED SESSION:

1. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – INITIATION OF LITIGATION
   Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(4)
   Two (2) Potential case(s).

2. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
   Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2)
   Two (2) Potential case(s).

3. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION
   Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)
   - Beach & Bluff Conservancy v. City of Solana Beach, California Coastal Commission, Surfrider (Case No. 37-2013-00046561-CU-WM-NC)
   - Homeowners Associations: Solana Beach & Tennis Club, Del Mar Beach Club, Surfsong, Seascapes Shores, Seascapes Chateau, Seascapes Surf, Del Mar Shores Terrace v. City of Solana Beach (Case 37-2013-00046245-CU-WM-NC)
   - Hamilton v. City of Solana Beach, et al. (Case 37-2014-00034514-CU-WM-NC)
   - Joseph S. Steinberg v. City of Solana Beach (Case No. 37-2013-00044897-CU-WM-NC)
- Wakefield, T v. City of Solana Beach, City of Del Mar, PAL General Engineering, et al.  
  (Case 37-2017-00010259-CU-PO-CTL)

4. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS
   Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6
   Agency designated representative: Gregory Wade
   Employee organizations: Miscellaneous Employees and Marine Safety Unit

   ACTION: No reportable action.

   ADJOURN:
   Mayor Nichols adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

   Angela Ivey, City Clerk  
   Approved:
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David A. Zito, Councilmember
Judy Hegenauer, Councilmember
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Johanna Canlas
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Angela Ivey
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CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:
Mayor Nichols called the meeting to order at 6:25 p.m.

Present: Mike Nichols, Ginger Marshall, David A. Zito, Jewel Edson, Judy Hegenauer
Absent: None
Also Present: Greg Wade, City Manager
Johanna Canlas, City Attorney
Angela Ivey, City Clerk,
Mo Sammak, City Engineer/Public Works Dir.
Marie Berkuti, Finance Manager
Bill Chopyk, Community Development Dir.
Danny King, Assistant City Manager

CLOSED SESSION REPORT: (when applicable)
Johanna Canlas, City Attorney, stated that there was no reportable action.

FLAG SALUTE:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:
Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Councilmember Edson to approve.
Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: Ceremonial
Veterans Memorial Courtyard – Award from APWA (American Public Works Association)
PRESENTATIONS: Ceremonial items that do not contain in-depth discussion and no action/direction. Stevens Project Update
Mo Sammak, Public Works/Engineering Dir., presented a PowerPoint (on file).

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:
This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the City Council on items relating to City business and not appearing on today’s agenda by submitting a speaker slip (located on the back table) to the City Clerk. Comments relating to items on this evening’s agenda are taken at the time the items are heard. Pursuant to the Brown Act, no action shall be taken by the City Council on public comment items. Council may refer items to the City Manager for placement on a future agenda. The maximum time allotted for each presentation is THREE MINUTES (SBMC 2.04.190). Please be aware of the timer light on the Council Dais.

Pat Tirona and Renee Hanson, Solana Beach Library, said that their remodeling should be finished in August, and spoke about their summer reading program.

Dave Roland, Tony Atkin’s office, reviewed a few items of the State Budget Fiscal Year 2017-18 and some Senate Bills regarding human traffickers, single payer health care, and affordable housing.

Heather Klickman spoke about an update on the North County Transit District development.

COUNCIL COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMENTARY:
An opportunity for City Council to make brief announcements or report on their activities. These items are not agendized for official City business with no action or substantive discussion.

A. CONSENT CALENDAR: (Action Items) (A.1. - A.7.)
Items listed on the Consent Calendar are to be acted in a single action of the City Council unless pulled for discussion. Any member of the public may address the City Council on an item of concern by submitting to the City Clerk a speaker slip (located on the back table) before the Consent Calendar is addressed. Those items removed from the Consent Calendar by a member of the Council will be trailed to the end of the agenda, while Consent Calendar items removed by the public will be discussed immediately after approval of the Consent Calendar.

A.1. Minutes of the City Council.

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Approve the Minutes of the City Council Meetings held April 26, 2017.

See Approved Minutes http://www.ci.solana-beach.ca.us/index.jsp?SEC=f0f1200d-21c6-4498-8a41-0b07c1a81a7&Type=B_BASIC Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.2. Register Of Demands. (File 0300-30)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Ratify the list of demands for May 6, 2017 through May 26, 2017.
Item A.2. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.


Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Receive the report listing changes made to the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 General Fund Adopted Budget.

Item A.3. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.4. Work Plan Fiscal Year 2017-2018. (File 0410-08)

Recommendation: That the City Council


Item A.4. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.6. Pedestrian Pathway Improvements, Notice of Completion. (File 0820-20)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-090:
   a. Authorizing the City Council to accept as complete the Pedestrian Pathway Improvements, Bid 2016-03, constructed by PAL General Engineering.
   b. Authorizing the City Clerk to file a Notice of Completion.

Item A.6. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.7. General Fund for the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Appropriation of Funds for Transfer to the City CIP Fund and Related Revenue Adjustments. (File 0340-45)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-094 revising appropriations in the Fiscal Year 2016-17
Budget.

Item A.7. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk's Office.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

A.5. Investment Policy. (File 0350-30)

Recommendation: That the City Council


Item A.5. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk's Office.

This item was pulled by the public.

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Peter Zahn said that he voted for the policy when he was on the Council, that more agencies were concerned about divesting public funds from fossil fuel companies, and he presented a PowerPoint (on file) showing the list of agencies that had adopted divestment policies.

Council and Mr. Zahn discussed that it could be considered at the quarterly update, to consider maintaining one share of fossil fuel investments, that shareholders were making some companies take a more environmental stance, and to have Chandler provide a list of fossil fuel investments for review.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Councilmember Edson to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

C.2. TRAkIT Land Management and Permit Streamlining Software and MyCommunity Mobile App Implementation and Purchase of Annual Subscription. (File 0600-05)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-086 authorizing the City Manager to enter into an agreement with Superion, LLC to implement and purchase a subscription to TRAkIT land management and permit streamlining software and MyCommunity mobile app.

Item C.2. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk's Office.

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Bill Chopyk, Community Development Dir., reviewed the current permit management process, other vendors considered, implementation process, compatibility with the City's finance software, and MyCommunity mobile application.
Justin Parnell, TRAKiT representative, presented a PowerPoint (on file) and discussed TRAKiT’s web-based integrated systems/modules, citizens and contractors access portal, and MyCommunity App features.

Council and Staff discussed GIS implementation and current vendor, the need for a GIS server, software upgrades and staffing needs. Discussion continued regarding the integration with the California Licensing Board, options for parties incurring credit card fees, credit card information storage, the system’s PCI compliance, the mobile app customization, that it would reduce staff time, that Esgil was already familiar with the TRAKiT system, the data owned by the City was transferable to a different software system, and that the system had e-check capability.

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Councilmember Edson to approve. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.

**B. PUBLIC HEARINGS:** (B.1. – B.2.)
This portion of the agenda provides citizens an opportunity to express their views on a specific issue as required by law after proper noticing by submitting a speaker slip (located on the back table) to the City Clerk. After considering all of the evidence, including written materials and oral testimony, the City Council must make a decision supported by findings and the findings must be supported by substantial evidence in the record. An applicant or designee for a private development/business project, for which the public hearing is being held, is allotted a total of fifteen minutes to speak, as per SBMC 2.04.210. A portion of the fifteen minutes may be saved to respond to those who speak in opposition. All other speakers have three minutes each. Please be aware of the timer light on the Council Dais.


Recommendation: That the City Council


Item B.1. Report (click here)

B.1. Updated Report # 1

*Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.*

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Marie Berkuti, Finance Mgr, presented a PowerPoint (on file).

Mayor Nichols opened the public hearing.

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to close the public hearing. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.

**Motion:** Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. **Approved 5/0.** Motion carried unanimously.

Recommendation: That the City Council
The proposed project meets the minimum zoning requirements under the SBMC, may be found to be consistent with the General Plan and may be found, as conditioned, to meet the discretionary findings required as discussed in this report to approve a Development Review Permit (DRP) and administratively issue a Structure Development Permit (SDP). Therefore, Staff recommends that the City Council:


2. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and

3. If the City Council makes the requisite findings and approves the project, adopt Resolution 2017-091 conditionally approving a DRP and an SDP to construct a 1,605 square-foot, garage-level and main-level addition and construct a new 909 square-foot upper-level addition to an existing split-level, single-family residence with an attached, two-car garage and perform associated site improvements at 223 Ocean Street, Solana Beach.

Item B.2. Report (click here)

B.2. Updated Report # 1
Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Katie Benson, Associate Planner, presented a PowerPoint (on file).

Applicant:
Matt and Erin McBriar said they aimed to keep the house as close to the footprint as possible and they had worked with their neighbors and all had agreed with their plans.

Council, Applicant, Architect, discussed that the property was designed for future solar on the roof, that the mechanical unit would be placed on the roof and Solana Beach required screening to block the view of the unit, handrails or guardrails, and fence height.

Council disclosures.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to close the public hearing. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion: Moved by Deputy Mayor Marshall and second by Councilmember Zito to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

Mayor Nichols recessed the meeting for a break at 8:10 p.m. and reconvened at 8:15 p.m.
C. STAFF REPORTS: (C.1. - C.5.)
Submit speaker slips to the City Clerk.


Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Receive the Fletcher Cove Marine Safety Center Feasibility/Needs Assessment Study prepared by Stephen Dalton Architects and provide direction to Staff as may be needed.

Item C.1. Report (click here)
C.1. Supplemental Documents

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk's Office.

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Mo Sammak, Public Works/Engineering Dir., presented a PowerPoint (on file).

Stephen Dalton, Consultant, continued the PowerPoint (on file).

Council, Staff, and Consultant, discussed that the costs in the report were based on expenses from the project at Moonlight Beach, that the report was a high level needs assessment, and the square footage and estimated costs in the assessment were designed to show the magnitude of the project.

Kristin Brinner stated that she supported the City's mission to provide a safe environment for the beach going public, that demolishing the existing facility and constructing a new one would likely be the most cost effective and appropriate option, there were questions and concerns regarding the beach access stairway and the seawall along the coastal bluff, that she encouraged minimizing damage to the bluff and further evaluating options to ensure the least environmentally damaging option was selected, that there should be a deeper conversation concerning the justification for preemptive construction of a seawall.

David Voorhies stated he supported a replacement building, and spoke about design alternatives including deferring a full schematic design and entitlements permits phase and doing a specific concept study phase instead, a setback of the main building footprint further from the slope, that the existing beach bluff at the building site be manmade, long-term stabilization with some re-sloping strategies as an alternative to all structures, a reduction of building footprint would be helpful, and to explore more options at the conceptual and programing level.

Jason Shook, Marine Safety Lieutenant, stated that the Needs Study was based on the department's needs, that the marine safety staff was very involved in the study, and that all needs were met in the planning of the structure.

Council discussed demolishing the current building and constructing a new one, that they would like to see some of the style and feel of the existing structure maintained in the new design, that they wanted the new building to be functional for the lifeguards, they would like to
reduce the square footage of the building and tuck it into the hillside for improved visibility, to explore options for the stairs so they do not dig into the hillside, that they would prefer to do the project without constructing a seawall, they would like to consider phasing options if needed, and energy efficiency for future use.

Discussion continued regarding that the project was not a funded item and that one source of funding could be TOT (Transient Occupancy Tax) funding as a visitors serving component.

Greg Wade, City Manager, stated that Staff would take the input and come back with a proposed budget item showing funding options, sources and amounts.

C.3. This item was left blank.

C.4. Introduce (1st Reading) Ordinance 477 – Consideration of Subjecting the City of Solana Beach to the California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act (UPCCCAA). (File 0370-28)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Consider the alternative bidding procedure in accordance with provisions of the California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act (UPCCCAA). If so desired by the City Council to participate in UPCCCAA, Staff recommends
   a. Introduction of Ordinance 477 adding Chapter 3.10 to the Municipal Code of the City of Solana Beach to provide information bidding procedures under the Uniform Public Construction Costs Account Act (Section 22000 Et Seq. of the Public Contract Code).
   b. Adoption of Resolution 2017-092 that details the formation of the Solana Beach Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Policies and Procedures.

Item C.4. Report (click here)

Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Council and Staff discussed a prequalified list of contractors that would be required for transparency, that audit would be regular as well as annual reports, and that internal protocol could be created to create fair and diverse use of the contractors.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Councilmember Edson to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

C.5. Adopt (2nd Reading) Ordinance 478 to Prohibit the Establishment and Operation of all Commercial Marijuana Activities, Including Marijuana Cultivation, Processing, Delivery, and Dispensary Activities, in the City of Solana Beach. (File 0230-10)

Recommendation: That the City Council
1. Adopt (2nd reading) Ordinance 478 prohibiting the delivery, cultivation and dispensing of all marijuana.

Item C.5. Report (click here)
Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time, prior to the start of the meeting, for processing new submittals. The final official record containing handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a Records Request to the City Clerk’s Office.

Johanna Canlas, City Attorney, read the title of the ordinance.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Edson and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0. Motion carried unanimously.

COMPENSATION & REIMBURSEMENT DISCLOSURE: None
GC: Article 2.3. Compensation: 53232.3. (a) Reimbursable expenses shall include, but not be limited to, meals, lodging, and travel. 53232.3 (d) Members of a legislative body shall provide brief reports on meetings attended at the expense of the local agency at the next regular meeting of the legislative body.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS:
Regional Committees: (outside agencies, appointed by this Council)
   a. City Selection Committee (meets twice a year) – Nichols (Edson, alternate).
   b. County Service Area 17 – Marshall (Nichols, alternate).
   c. Escondido Creek Watershed Authority – Marshall/Staff (no alternate).
   d. League of Ca. Cities’ San Diego County Executive Committee – Nichols (Edson, alternate) and any subcommittees.
   e. League of Ca. Cities’ Local Legislative Committee – Nichols (Edson, alternate).
   g. North County Dispatch JPA – Marshall (Edson, alternate).
   h. North County Transit District – Edson (Nichols, alternate).
   i. Regional Solid Waste Association (RSWA) – Nichols (Hegenauer, alternate).
   j. SANDAG – Zito (Primary), Edson (1st alternate), Nichols (2nd alternate) and any subcommittees.
   k. SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Committee – Zito (Hegenauer, alternate).
   l. San Dieguito River Valley JPA – Hegenauer (Nichols, alternate).
   m. San Eilo JPA – Marshall, Zito (City Manager, alternate).
   n. 22nd Agricultural District Association Community Relations Committee – Marshall, Edson.

Standing Committees: (All Primary Members) (Permanent Committees)
   c. Fire Dept. Management Governance & Organizational Evaluation – Edson, Hegenauer
   e. Parks and Recreation Committee – Nichols, Zito
   g. School Relations Committee – Nichols, Hegenauer.

ADJOURN:
Mayor Nichols adjourned the meeting at 9:21 p.m.

Angela Ivey, City Clerk

Approved: ___________________________
STAFF REPORT
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT: Community Development Department
SUBJECT: Public Hearing: Request for DRP to Construct a Two-Story, Single-Family Residence with an Attached Carport and Perform Associated Site Improvements at 246 Barbara Avenue (Case # 17-16-07 Applicants: Kristin Brinner and Chris Novak; APN: 263-372-17; Resolution No. 2017-069)

BACKGROUND:

The Applicants, Kristin Brinner and Chris Novak, are requesting City Council approval of a Development Review Permit (DRP) to construct a two-story residence with a carport that will tuck under the second story, and perform associated site improvements. The 4,449 square-foot lot is located at 246 Barbara Avenue and within the boundaries of the Medium High Residential (MHR) Zone.

The project proposes approximately 440 cubic yards of soil to be excavated and exported off-site. The project meets three thresholds for the requirement of a DRP, including: 1. construction in excess of 60 percent of the allowable floor area; 2. the square footage of the second story exceeds 40 percent of the first story floor area on a residential lot of 6,000 square feet or less; and 3. an aggregate grading quantity in excess of 100 cubic yards.

The maximum building height would be 18 feet 2 inches above the proposed (finished) grade and 16 feet above the existing grade. The maximum building height would be 117.5 feet above Mean Sea Level (MSL). The project is exempt from the requirement of a Structure Development Permit (SDP) because the proposed residence would not exceed 16 feet in height above the existing grade.

The issue before the Council is whether to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the Applicants' request as contained in Resolution 2017-069 (Attachment 1).

CITY COUNCIL ACTION:


AGENDA ITEM B.1.
DISCUSSION:

The rectangular shaped lot is located on the east side of Barbara Avenue. The site topography slopes upward approximately four feet as you move east from the frontage on Barbara Avenue toward the rear property line. The lot is currently developed with a one-story, 1,343 square foot, single-family residence. The Applicants propose to demolish the existing residence and construct a new two-story residence with a carport that would tuck under the second floor. Other improvements include grading to lower the building pad so that the residence would not exceed 16 feet in height from the existing grade. The project plans are provided in Attachment 2.

Table 1 (below) provides a comparison of the Solana Beach Municipal Code (SBMC) applicable zoning regulations with the Applicants’ proposed design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOT INFORMATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Allowable Floor Area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Floor Area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Max. Floor Area by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Allowable Height:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Proposed Height:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Point/Ridge:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay Zone(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Designation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of Units Allowed:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of Units Requested:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROPOSED PROJECT INFORMATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Square Footage:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Floor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Permits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Grading:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Parking:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Fences and Walls:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Accessory Structure:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Development:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff has prepared draft findings for approval of the project in the attached Resolution 2017-069 for Council’s consideration based upon the information in this report. The applicable SBMC sections are provided in italicized text and conditions from the Community Development, Engineering, and Fire Departments are incorporated in the Resolution of Approval. The Council may direct Staff to modify the Resolution to reflect the findings and conditions it deems appropriate as a result of the Public Hearing.
process. If the Council determines the project is to be denied, Staff will prepare a Resolution of Denial for adoption at a subsequent Council meeting.

The following is a discussion of the findings for a DRP as they apply to the proposed project as well as references to recommended conditions of approval contained in Resolution 2017-069.

Development Review Permit Compliance (SBMC Section 17.68.40):

A DRP is required because the total proposed square footage would exceed 60 percent of the maximum allowable floor area for the property. The total floor area proposed is 2,857 square feet, which would be 86% of the maximum allowable floor area for the property. A DRP is also required because the 1,347 square foot second floor exceeds 40% of the 1,510 square foot first story floor area and because the proposal includes an aggregate grading quantity that exceeds 100 cubic yards of grading. As designed, the project would include 440 cubic yards of excavated soil to be exported off-site.

In addition to meeting zoning requirements, the project must also be found in compliance with development review criteria. The following is a list of the development review criteria topics:

1. Relationship with Adjacent Land Uses
2. Building and Structure Placement
3. Landscaping
4. Roads, Pedestrian Walkways, Parking, and Storage Areas
5. Grading
6. Lighting
7. Usable Open Space

The Council may approve, or conditionally approve, a DRP only if all of the findings listed below can be made. Resolution 2017-069 provides the full discussion of the findings.

1. The proposed development is consistent with the general plan and all applicable requirements of the zoning ordinance including special regulations, overlay zones, and specific plans.

2. The proposed development complies with the development review criteria.

3. All required permits and approvals issued by the city, including variances, conditional use permits, comprehensive sign plans, and coastal development permits have been obtained prior to or concurrently with the development review permit.

4. If the development project also requires a permit or approval to be issued by a state or federal agency, the city council may conditionally
approve the development review permit upon the Applicants obtaining the required permit or approval from the other agency.

If the above findings cannot be made, the Council shall deny the DRP. The following is a discussion of the applicable development review criteria as they relate to the proposed project.

Relationship with Adjacent Land Uses:

The property is located within the MHR Zone. Surrounding properties are also located within the MHR Zone and are developed with a mix of one and two-story single and multi-family residences. The project site is currently developed with a single-story, single-family residence.

The project, as designed, is consistent with the permitted uses for the MHR Zone as described in SBMC Sections 17.20.010 and 17.12.020. The property is designated Medium High Density Residential in the General Plan and intended for multi-family residential development with a density of 8-12 dwelling units per acre. The proposed development could be found to be consistent with the objectives of the General Plan as it encourages the development and maintenance of healthy residential neighborhoods, the stability of transitional neighborhoods, and the rehabilitation of deteriorated neighborhoods.

The property is not located within any of the City’s Specific Plan areas or overlay zones; however, it is located within the boundaries of the Coastal Zone. As a condition of project approval, the Applicants would be required to obtain a Coastal Development Permit, Waiver or Exemption from the California Coastal Commission prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

Building and Structure Placement:

The Applicants propose to demolish the existing residence and construct a new two-story, single family residence with a carport that would tuck under the northwest corner of the proposed second floor. The Applicants propose 440 yd$^3$ of excavation to place a portion of the first floor below grade and to lower the proposed building pad so that the two-story residence would not exceed 16 feet in height as measured from the existing grade. Associated site improvements include fences and walls and landscaping.

The Engineering Department is requiring a 4 foot dedication along Barbara Avenue. With this dedication, the lot depth would be less than 100 feet. According to SBMC Section 17.20.030(D)(1)(b), when a lot abuts a right-of-way of 55 feet or greater or when a lot is less than 100 feet in depth, the front yard setback can be reduced to 20 feet. As designed, the proposed residence proposes an architectural feature around the windows on the southwest and southeast corners of the proposed first floor. The proposed architectural features are supported at or behind the required setback lines and would not encroach further than two feet as permitted by SBMC Section 17.20.030(D)(4). On the second floor on each corner of the proposed residence, the
proposed balconies project into the required setback no further than two feet. The Applicants are proposing a staircase that leads to the rear yard from the covered deck proposed on the southeast corner of the second floor. The proposed staircase projects into the required setback a maximum of two feet and is cantilevered over a proposed on-grade concrete landing. SBMC Section 17.20.030(D)(5) indicates:

Fireplace chimneys, fire escapes, exterior stairs and landings, and similar architectural features requiring ground contact may project into required yards a maximum distance of two feet; provided such feature shall be three feet from a property line.

As designed, the proposed residence would maintain a 20-foot front yard setback, 5-foot side yard setbacks and a 25-foot rear yard setback.

The proposed residence includes a carport that would tuck under the northwest corner of the proposed second floor. The carport would be within the buildable area and be accessed from the driveway at the northwest corner of the lot. The first floor would consist of the front entry, two bedrooms, two bathrooms, storage and the master suite. The second floor would consist of the kitchen, living room, dining room, office, bathroom and two decks.

The maximum floor area allowable for properties within the MHR zone is .75 of the lot area. The proposed design includes a total proposed floor area of 2,857 square feet, which is 480 square feet below the maximum allowable Floor Area for the 4,449 square-foot lot. The maximum floor area calculation for this project is as follows:

\[
4,449 \text{ SF} \times 0.75 \text{ SF} = 3,337 \text{ SF}
\]

The proposed project, as designed, would meet the minimum required setbacks and be below the maximum allowable floor area for the property.

Neighborhood Comparison:

Staff compared the proposed project to 43 other properties within the surrounding area. This area includes properties along both sides of Barbara Avenue, the east side of N. Rios Avenue and the west side of N. Granados Avenue as shown on the following Map:
The properties evaluated in this comparison are located in the MHR Zone. The existing homes range in size from 408 square feet to 3,777 square feet, according to the County Assessor records. It should be noted that the County Assessor does not include the garage, covered porch area, unfinished basement or accessory building area in the total square footage. None of those have been included in the floor area for the proposed residence, therefore, the entire proposed building area would be used for comparison purposes.

Table 2 is based upon the County Assessor’s data and SanGIS data. It contains neighboring lot sizes, the square footage of existing development and the maximum allowable square footage for potential development on each lot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Lot Size in ft² (GIS)</th>
<th>Existing ft² Onsite (Assessor's)</th>
<th>Proposed / Recently Approved ft²</th>
<th>Max. Allowable ft² .75</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>241 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>5,709</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td></td>
<td>MHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>237 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td></td>
<td>MHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>231 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td></td>
<td>MHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>258 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td></td>
<td>MHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>262 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,566</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td></td>
<td>MHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>270 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,521</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>4,141</td>
<td></td>
<td>MHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>267 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>MHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>300 N. Rios Ave.</td>
<td>5,514</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>4,136</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>265 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,828</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>4,371</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>255 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>238 N. Rios Ave.</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>3,914</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>262 N. Rios Ave.</td>
<td>5,777</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>232 N. Rios Ave.</td>
<td>6,187</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>235 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>4,979</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>229 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,007</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>3,755</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>225 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>8,849</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>6,637</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>202 N. Rios Ave.</td>
<td>9,318</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>6,989</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>212 N. Rios Ave.</td>
<td>4,687</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>214 N. Rios Ave.</td>
<td>7,145</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>5,359</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>228 N. Rios Ave.</td>
<td>6,806</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>5,105</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>225 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,547</td>
<td>1,796</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>251 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>245 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,256</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>3,942</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>256 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>229 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>5,147</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>221 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>3,814</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>215 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>211 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>4,909</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>3,682</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>207 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>4,403</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>151 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>212 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>12,222</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>208 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,320</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>202 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,293</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>222 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>9,502</td>
<td>3,777</td>
<td>7,127</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>228 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>4,514</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td>3,386</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>232 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>4,888</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>238 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,153</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td><strong>246 Barbara Ave.</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,449</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,343</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,857</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,337</strong></td>
<td>MHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>248 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,114</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>3,836</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>259 Barbara Ave.</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>143 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>3,811</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>137 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>3,926</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>129 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>7,799</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>5,849</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>127 N. Granados Ave.</td>
<td>7,401</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>5,551</td>
<td>MHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fences, Walls and Retaining Walls:**

Within the front yard setback area, the SBMC Section 17.20.040(O) allows fences and walls, or any combination thereof, to be no higher than 42 inches in height as measured from existing grade, except for an additional two feet of fence that is at least 80% open to light. Fences, walls and retaining walls located within the rear and interior side yards are allowed to be up to six feet in height with an additional 24 inches that is 50% open.
to light and air. However, the SBMC also permits fences or walls to be 5 feet high in the front-yard setback to comply with pool fencing requirements. It should also be noted that fences and walls are measured from the pre-existing grade.

A combination retaining wall/cedar fence is proposed along the entire perimeter of the property except at the northwest corner of the lot where the existing driveway access will remain. At the driveway access, the Applicants are proposing a six foot high sliding gate at the front yard setback line in order to screen the required parking from the street and adjacent properties.

Portions of the proposed retaining wall along the northern and southern property lines would be below the existing grade because the building pad would be lowered by approximately 2.5 feet. The fence proposed on top of the perimeter retaining walls would range in height depending on whether it is located within the required front yard setback or the side and rear yard setbacks. Fences and walls are measured from existing grade, therefore, the portion of the retaining wall proposed below the existing grade would not be counted in the maximum height of the proposed fence/wall combination. In no case would the proposed fence/wall combination exceed the maximum permitted fence and wall heights as measured from the existing grade.

The retaining wall proposed at the east property line would be approximately four feet above the existing grade to support the higher grades on the property to the east. Retaining walls are also proposed between the proposed front entry and the driveway access and between the northeast corner of the residence and the rear yard area.

Currently, the plans show fences and walls that comply with the requirements of SBMC 17.20.040(O) and 17.60.070(C). If the Applicants decide to modify any of the proposed fences and walls or construct additional fences and walls on the project site, a condition of project approval indicates that they would be required to be in compliance with the Municipal Code.

Landscape:

The project is subject to the current water efficient landscaping regulations of SBMC Chapter 17.56. A Landscape Documentation Package is required for new development projects with an aggregate landscape equal to or greater than 500 square feet requiring a building permit, plan check or development review. The Applicants provided a conceptual landscape plan that has been reviewed by the City’s third-party landscape architect, who has recommended approval. The Applicants will be required to submit detailed construction landscape drawings that will be reviewed by the City’s third-party landscape architect for conformance with the conceptual plan. In addition, the City’s third-party landscape architect will perform inspections during the construction phase of the project. A separate condition has been added to require that native or drought-tolerant and non-invasive plant materials and water-conserving irrigation systems are required to be incorporated into the landscaping to the extent feasible.
Parking:

SBMC Section 17.52.040 and the Off-Street Parking Design Manual (OSPDM) require two (2) parking spaces for a single-family residence. The Applicants are proposing to construct a carport in the northwest corner of the buildable area of the property that would that would be accessed from a driveway off of Barbara Avenue. The carport would tuck under the proposed second floor of the structure. One parking space would be located in the carport and one parking space would be located partially under the proposed carport and partially within the required side yard setback along the northern property line. The Off-Street Parking Design Manual (OSPDM) indicates that required parking can be located within the required interior side yard setback if it is screened by a 6 foot high solid fence or wall. The OSPDM also indicates that when a required parking space is located next to a fence or a wall in the side yard setback the width of the parking space shall be increased to 10.5 ft. X 19 ft. feet. As designed, the carport will provide space for one 9 ft. X 19 ft. parking space. An additional 10.5 ft. X 19 ft. parking space is proposed next to covered space that would be partially covered by the proposed carport and would encroach into the required side yard setback. A combination retaining wall/cedar fence will provide the required 6 ft. tall screening for the parking within the side yard setback.

Grading:

The project includes approximately 440 cubic yards of excavated soil to be exported off-site in order to lower the grade of the site and place the building pad below grade so that the height of the proposed residence would not exceed 16 feet in height from the existing grade. The grading would occur below the proposed building footprint, in the existing driveway location, and in the rear and side yards to provide exterior access around the building. Retaining walls are proposed around the areas that would be graded in order to support the higher adjacent grades.

Lighting:

A condition of project approval is that all new exterior lighting fixtures comply with the City-Wide Lighting Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance (SBMC 17.60.060). All light fixtures shall be shielded so that no light or glare is transmitted or reflected in such concentrated quantities or intensities as to be detrimental to the surrounding area.

Usable Open Space:

The project consists of the construction of a new two-story, single family residence with a tuck under carport; therefore, usable open space and recreational facilities are neither proposed nor required according to SBMC Section 17.20.040.

Structure Development Permit Compliance:

When the project was initially submitted the design included the request for a Structure Development Permit as the proposed residence was originally designed to exceed 16
feet in height from the existing grade. The project was story poled and a height
certification was submitted on May 19, 2016 certifying the maximum building height at
24.67 feet above the proposed finished grade with the highest pole at 126 feet above
Mean Sea Level (MSL). Notices were mailed to all properties owners and residents
within 300 feet of the project site which established a 30-day deadline to file for view
assessment on July 21, 2016. By that date, the City received four applications for view
assessment.

The project was heard at the September 20, 2016 View Assessment Commission (VAC)
meeting. After hearing testimony from the Applicants and the View Assessment
Claimants and discussing the project, the VAC voted to continue the project to a future
meeting to give the Applicants additional time to redesign the project and work with the
neighbors to resolve view impairment.

The Applicants submitted revised project plans to the City in October of 2016. The
revised design was located entirely within the three-dimensional envelope illustrated by
the story poles certified for the original project design; therefore, a new 30-day public
notice period was not required. The Applicants revised the story poles to illustrate the
revised project envelope and submitted a revised height certification on November 7,
2016. The height certification indicated that the maximum height of the revised design
would be 22.40 feet above the proposed finished grade with the highest story pole
elevation at 123.40 MSL. After reviewing the revised project design, none of the four
original applications for View Assessment were withdrawn. The project went back
before the VAC on November 15, 2016. After reviewing the revised project design and
hearing testimony from the Applicants and the View Assessment Claimants, the VAC
voted to continue the project for a redesign.

The Applicants revised the project design again to include a two-story structure that did
not exceed 16 feet in height from the existing grade and would no longer require a SDP.
The construction of the proposed residence would exceed 15 feet in height from the
existing grade. As a condition of approval, the Applicants will be required to submit a
height certification prior to requesting a framing inspection. The height certificate shall
be prepared by a licensed land surveyor and will certify that the framing members and
the proposed roofing materials will not exceed 16 feet above the existing grade or 117.5
feet above the MSL, which is the maximum proposed structure height reflected on the
project plans.

Public Hearing Notice:

Notice of the City Council Public Hearing for the project was published in the Union
Tribune more than 10 days prior to the public hearing. The same public notice was
mailed to property owners and occupants within 300 feet of the proposed project site on
September 15, 2017. Staff received one letter in opposition to the original project design
after the SDP notice was mailed which is attached for your reference (Attachment 3). As
of the date of preparation of this Staff Report, Staff has not received any additional
correspondence from neighbors or interested parties in support of, or in opposition to,
the proposed project.
Conditions from the Planning, Engineering, and Fire Departments have been incorporated into the Resolution of Approval.

In conclusion, the proposed project, as conditioned, could be found to be consistent with the Zoning regulations and the General Plan.

**CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:**

The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Class 3 consists of construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures. Examples of this exemption include one single-family residence or second dwelling unit in a residential zone. In urbanized areas, up to three single-family residences may be constructed or converted under this exemption.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** N/A

**WORK PLAN:** N/A

**OPTIONS:**

- Approve Staff recommendation adopting the attached Resolution 2017-069.
- Approve Staff recommendation subject to additional specific conditions necessary for the City Council to make all required findings for the approval of a DRP.
- Deny the project if all required findings for the DRP cannot be made.

**DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:**

The proposed project meets the minimum zoning requirements under the SBMC, may be found to be consistent with the General Plan and may be found, as conditioned, to meet the discretionary findings required as discussed in this report to approve a DRP. Therefore, Staff recommends that the City Council:


2. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and

3. If the City Council makes the requisite findings and approves the project, adopt Resolution 2017-069 conditionally approving a DRP to demolish the existing residence and construct a new 2,857 square foot, two-story, single-family residence with an attached carport and associated site improvements at 246 Barbara Avenue, Solana Beach.
CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Department Recommendation.

[Signature]

Gregory Wade, City Manager

Attachments:

1. Resolution 2017-069
2. Project Plans
3. Letter in Opposition
RESOLUTION NO. 2017-069

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLANA BEACH, CALIFORNIA, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PERMIT TO DEMOLISH AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AND CONSTRUCT A NEW TWO-STORY, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH AN ATTACHED CARPORT AND PERFORM ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 246 BARBARA AVENUE, SOLANA BEACH

APPLICANTS: CHRIS NOVAK AND KRISTIN BRINNER
CASE NO.: 17-16-07 DRP

WHEREAS, Chris Novak and Kristin Brinner (hereinafter referred to as "Applicants"), have submitted an application for a Development Review Permit (DRP) pursuant to Title 17 (Zoning) of the Solana Beach Municipal Code (SBMC); and

WHEREAS, the public hearing was conducted pursuant to the provisions of Solana Beach Municipal Code Section 17.72.030; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing on September 27, 2017, the City Council received and considered evidence concerning the proposed application; and

WHEREAS, the City Council found the application request exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, this decision is based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, and any information the City Council gathered by viewing the site and the area as disclosed at the hearing.

NOW THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, does resolves as follows:

1. That the foregoing recitations are true and correct.

2. That the request for a DRP to demolish the existing residence and construct a new two-story, 2,857 square foot, single-family residence with a tuck under carport and perform associated site improvements at 246 Barbara Avenue, is conditionally approved based upon the following Findings and subject to the following Conditions:
3. FINDINGS

A. In accordance with Section 17.68.040 (Development Review Permit) of the City of Solana Beach Municipal Code, the City Council finds the following:

I. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and all applicable requirements of SBMC Title 17 (Zoning Ordinance), including special regulations, overlay zones and specific plans.

General Plan Consistency: The project, as conditioned, is consistent with the City’s General Plan designation of Medium High Density Residential, which allows for multi-family residential development with a maximum density of eight to twelve dwelling units per acre. The development is also consistent with the objectives of the General Plan as it encourages the development and maintenance of healthy residential neighborhoods, the stability of transitional neighborhoods, and the rehabilitation of deteriorated neighborhoods.

Zoning Ordinance Consistency: The project is consistent with all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance (Title 17) (SBMC 17.20.030 and 17.48.040), which delineates maximum allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR), Permitted Uses and Structures (SBMC Section 17.20.020) which provides for uses of the property. Further, the project adheres to all property development regulations established for the MHR Zone and cited by SBMC Section 17.020.030.

The project is consistent with the provisions for minimum yard dimensions (i.e., setbacks) and the maximum allowable Floor Area (FAR), maximum building height, and parking requirements.

II. The proposed development complies with the following development review criteria set forth in Solana Beach Municipal Code Section 17.68.040.F:

a. Relationship with Adjacent Land Uses: The development shall be designed in a manner compatible with and where feasible, complimentary to existing and potential development in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Site planning on the perimeter of the development shall give consideration to the protection of surrounding areas from potential adverse effects, as well as protection of the property from adverse surrounding influences.

The property is located within the MHR Zone. Surrounding properties are also located within the MHR Zone and are developed with a mix of one and two-story single and multi-family residences. The project site is currently developed with a single-story, single-family residence.
The project, as designed, is consistent with the permitted uses for the MHR Zone as described in SBMC Sections 17.20.010 and 17.12.020. The property is designated Medium High Density Residential in the General Plan and intended for multi-family residential development with a density of 8-12 dwelling units per acre. The proposed development is found to be consistent with the objectives of the General Plan as it encourages the development and maintenance of healthy residential neighborhoods, the stability of transitional neighborhoods, and the rehabilitation of deteriorated neighborhoods.

The property is not located within any of the City's Specific Plan areas or overlay zones; however, it is located within the boundaries of the Coastal Zone. As a condition of project approval, the Applicants would be required to obtain a Coastal Development Permit, Waiver or Exemption from the California Coastal Commission prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

b. Building and Structure Placement: Buildings and structures shall be sited and designed in a manner which visually and functionally enhances their intended use.

The Applicants propose to demolish the existing residence and construct a new two-story, single family residence with a carport that would tuck under the northwest corner of the proposed second floor. The Applicants propose 440 yd³ of excavation to place a portion of the first floor below grade and to lower the proposed building pad so that the two story residence would not exceed 16 feet in height as measured from the existing grade. Associated site improvements including fences and walls and landscaping are proposed.

The Engineering Department is requiring a four foot dedication along Barbara Avenue. With this dedication, the lot depth would be less than 100 feet. According to SBMC Section 17.20.030(D)(1)(b), when a lot abuts a right-of-way of 55 feet or greater or when a lot is less than 100 feet in depth, the front yard setback can be reduced to 20 feet. As designed, the proposed residence proposes an architectural feature around the windows on the southwest and southeast corners of the proposed first floor. The proposed architectural features are supported at or behind the required setback lines and would not encroach further than two feet as permitted by SBMC Section 17.20.030(D)(4). On the second floor on each corner of the proposed residence, the proposed balconies project into the required setback no further than two feet. The Applicants
are proposing a staircase that leads to the rear yard from the covered deck proposed on the southeast corner of the second floor. The proposed staircase projects into the required setback a maximum of two feet and is cantilevered over a proposed on-grade concrete landing. SBMC Section 17.20.030(D)(5) indicates:

Fireplace chimneys, fire escapes, exterior stairs and landings, and similar architectural features requiring ground contact may project into required yards a maximum distance of two feet; provided such feature shall be three feet from a property line.

As designed, the proposed residence would maintain a 20 foot front yard setback, five foot side yard setbacks and a 25 foot rear yard setback.

The proposed residence includes a carport that would tuck under the northwest corner of the proposed second floor. The carport would be within the buildable area and be accessed from the driveway at the northwest corner of the lot. The first floor would consist of the front entry, two bedrooms, two bathrooms, storage and the master suite. The second floor would consist of the kitchen, living room, dining room, office, bathroom and two decks.

The maximum floor area allowable for properties within the MHR zone is .75 of the lot area. The proposed design includes a total proposed floor area of 2,857 square feet, which is 480 square feet below the maximum allowable Floor Area for the 4,449 square-foot lot. The maximum floor area calculation for this project is as follows:

\[
4,449 \text{ SF} \times 0.75 \text{ SF} = 3,337 \text{ SF}
\]

The proposed project, as designed, would meet the minimum required setbacks and be below the maximum allowable floor area for the property.

c. Landscaping: The removal of significant native vegetation shall be minimized. Replacement vegetation and landscaping shall be compatible with the vegetation of the surrounding area. Trees and other large plantings shall not obstruct significant views when installed or at maturity.

The project is subject to the current water efficient landscaping regulations of SBMC Chapter 17.56. A Landscape Documentation Package is required for new development projects with an aggregate landscape equal to or greater than
500 square feet requiring a building permit, plan check or development review. The Applicants provided a conceptual landscape plan that has been reviewed by the City’s third-party landscape architect, who has recommended approval. The Applicants would be required to submit detailed construction landscape drawings that will be reviewed by the City’s third-party landscape architect for conformance with the conceptual plan. In addition, the City’s third-party landscape architect will perform inspections during the construction phase of the project. A separate condition has been added to require that native or drought-tolerant and non-invasive plant materials and water-conserving irrigation systems are required to be incorporated into the landscaping to the extent feasible.

d. Roads, Pedestrian Walkways, Parking and Storage Areas: Any development involving more than one building or structure shall provide common access roads and pedestrian walkways. Parking and outside storage areas, where permitted, shall be screened from view, to the extent feasible, by existing topography, by the placement of buildings and structures, or by landscaping and plantings.

SBMC Section 17.52.040 and the Off-Street Parking Design Manual (OSPDM) require two (2) parking spaces for a single-family residence. The Applicants are proposing to construct a carport in the northwest corner of the buildable area of the property that would that would be accessed from a driveway off of Barbara Avenue. The carport would tuck under the proposed second floor of the structure. One parking space would be located in the carport and one parking space would be located partially under the proposed carport and partially within the required side yard setback along the northern property line. The OSPDM indicates that required parking can be located within the required interior side yard setback if it is screened by a 6 foot high solid fence or wall. The OSPDM also indicates that when a required parking space is located next to a fence or a wall in the side yard setback, the width of the parking space shall be increased to 10.5 ft. X 19 ft. feet. As designed, the carport will provide space for one 9 ft. X 19 ft. parking space. An additional 10.5 ft. X 19 ft. parking space is proposed next to covered space that would be partially covered by the proposed carport and would encroach into the required side yard setback. A combination retaining wall/cedar fence will provide the required 6 ft. tall screening for the parking within the side yard setback.

e. Grading: To the extent feasible, natural topography and scenic features of the site shall be retained and incorporated into the
proposed development. Any grading or earth-moving operations in connection with the proposed development shall be planned and executed so as to blend with the existing terrain both on and adjacent to the site. Existing exposed or disturbed slopes shall be landscaped with native or naturalized non-native vegetation and existing erosion problems shall be corrected.

The project includes approximately 440 cubic yards of excavated soil to be exported off-site in order to lower the grade of the site and place the building pad below grade so that the height of the proposed residence would not exceed 16 feet in height from the existing grade. The grading would occur below the proposed building footprint, in the existing driveway location, and in the rear and side yards to provide exterior access around the building. Retaining walls are proposed around the areas that would be graded in order to support the higher adjacent grades.

f. Lighting: Light fixtures for walkways, parking areas, driveways, and other facilities shall be provided in sufficient number and at proper locations to assure safe and convenient nighttime use. All light fixtures shall be appropriately shielded so that no light or glare is transmitted or reflected in such concentrated quantities or intensities as to be detrimental to the surrounding areas per SBMC 17.60.060 (Exterior Lighting Regulations).

All new exterior lighting fixtures shall comply with the City-Wide Lighting Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance (SBMC 17.60.060). All light fixtures shall be shielded so that no light or glare is transmitted or reflected in such concentrated quantities or intensities as to be detrimental to the surrounding area.

g. Usable Open Space: Recreational facilities proposed within required usable open space shall be located and designed to maintain essential open space values.

The project consists of the construction of a new two-story, single family residence with a tuck under carport; therefore, usable open space and recreational facilities are neither proposed nor required according to SBMC Section 17.20.040.

III. All required permits and approvals including variances, conditional use permits, comprehensive sign plans, and coastal development permits have been obtained prior to or concurrently with the development review permit.
All required permits are being processed concurrently with the Development Review Permit.

IV. If the development project also requires a permit or approval to be issued by a state or federal agency, the city council may conditionally approve the development review permit upon the Applicants obtaining the required permit or approval from the other agency.

The Applicants shall obtain approval from the California Coastal Commission prior to issuance of Building Permits.

4. CONDITIONS

Prior to use or development of the property in reliance on this permit, the Applicants shall provide for and adhere to the following conditions:

A. Community Development Department Conditions:

I. The Applicants shall pay required Public Facilities Fees, as established by SBMC Section 17.72.020 and Resolution 1987-36.

II. Building Permit plans must be in substantial conformance with the architectural plans presented to the City Council on September 27, 2017, and located in the project file with a submittal date of September 7, 2017.

III. Prior to requesting a framing inspection, the Applicants shall be required to submit a height certification, signed by a licensed land surveyor, certifying that the building envelope is in conformance with the plans as approved by the City Council on September 27, 2017 and will not exceed 16 feet in height from the pre-existing or 117.5 feet above MSL.

IV. Any proposed onsite fences, walls and retaining walls and any proposed railing located on top, or any combination thereof, shall comply with applicable regulations of SBMC Section 17.20.040 and 17.60.070 (Fences and Walls).

V. The Applicants shall obtain required California Coastal Commission (CCC) approval of a Coastal Development Permit, Waiver or Exemption as determined necessary by the CCC, prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit.

VI. The Applicants shall submit detailed construction landscape drawings that will be reviewed by the City’s third-party landscape architect and shall be in substantial conformance with the conceptual plan presented to the City Council on September 27, 2017. In addition, the City’s third-party landscape architect will perform a final inspection to
verify substantial conformance onsite prior to final occupancy.

VII. Native or drought tolerant and non-invasive plant materials and water conserving irrigation systems shall be incorporated into any proposed landscaping and compatible with the surrounding area to the extent feasible.

VIII. Any new exterior lighting fixtures shall be in conformance with the City-Wide Lighting Regulations of SBMC 17.60.060.

IX. All light fixtures shall be appropriately shielded so that no light or glare is transmitted or reflected in such concentrated quantities or intensities that render them detrimental to the surrounding area.

B. Fire Department Conditions:

I. OBSTRUCTION OF ROADWAYS DURING CONSTRUCTION: All roadways shall be a minimum of 24 feet in width during construction and maintained free and clear, including the parking of vehicles, in accordance with the California Fire Code and the Fire Department.

II. ADDRESS NUMBERS / STREET NUMBERS: Approved numbers and/or addresses shall be placed on all new and existing buildings and at appropriate additional locations as to be plainly visible and legible from the street or roadway fronting the property from either direction of approach. Said numbers shall contrast with their background, and shall meet the following minimum standards as to size: 4” high with a ½” inch stroke width for residential buildings, 8” high with a ½” stroke for commercial and multi-family residential buildings, 12” high with a 1” stroke for industrial buildings. Additional numbers shall be required where deemed necessary by the Fire Marshal, such as rear access doors, building corners, and entrances to commercial centers.

III. AUTOMATIC FIRE SPRINKLERS SYSTEM: ONE AND TWO FAMILY DWELLINGS: Structures shall be protected by an automatic fire sprinkler system designed and installed to the satisfaction of the Fire Department. Plans for the automatic fire sprinkler system shall be approved by the Fire Department prior to installation.

IV. SMOKE DETECTORS/CARBON MONOXIDE ALARMS/FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEMS: Smoke detectors/carbon monoxide alarms/fire sprinklers shall be inspected by the Solana Beach Fire Department.

V. CLASS "A" ROOF: All structures shall be provided with a Class “A” Roof covering to the satisfaction of the Solana Beach Fire Department.
C. Engineering Department Conditions:

I. Obtain an Encroachment permit in accordance with Chapter 11.20 of the Solana Beach Municipal Code, prior to the construction of any improvements within the public right-of-way including, but not limited to, demolition and construction of surface improvements. All proposed improvements within the public right-of-way shall comply with City standards including, but not limited to, the Off-Street Parking Design Manual. Improvements shall include the construction of a 36" AC swale supported by 8"X8"X10" zero concrete curb and Compacted Stabilized Decomposed Granite (D.G.) from the edge of the swale to the new property line. The swale shall transition to the existing flow line and connect to the proposed driveway to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

II. All construction demolition materials shall be recycled according to the City’s Construction and Demolition recycling program and an approved Waste Management Plan shall be submitted.

III. Construction fencing shall be located on the subject property unless the Applicants have obtained an Encroachment Permit in accordance with Chapter 11.20 of the Solana Beach Municipal Code, which allows otherwise.

IV. All new utility services shall be installed underground.

V. The Applicants shall record an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement (EMRA) for private improvements in the public right-of-way such as the swale from the property line wall to the 19" swale.

VI. A 4' dedication of right-of-way is required along Barbara Avenue as shown on the Preliminary Grading Plan prepared by Coastal Land Solutions, Inc.

VII. Obtain a Grading Permit in accordance with Chapter 15.40 of the Solana Beach Municipal Code. Conditions prior to the issuance of a Grading Permit shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. The Grading Plan shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and approved by the City Engineer. On-site grading design and construction shall be in accordance with Chapter 15.40 of the SBMC.

b. A Soils Report shall be prepared by a Registered Soils Engineer and approved by the City Engineer. All necessary measures shall be taken and implemented to assure slope stability, erosion control, and soil integrity. The Grading Plan shall incorporate all recommendations contained in the Soils Report.
c. The Hydrology Report prepared by Coastal Land Solutions, Inc. includes a portion of the driveway to be paved with pervious pavers. Prior to the issuance of the occupancy for this project, the Engineer of Record is required to certify the coefficient of runoff and adequacy of the permeability of these surfaces to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Additionally, the project Applicants shall record a document on this property that would require maintenance of these surfaces in perpetuity to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

d. The Hydrology Report includes a Detention Basin at the west end of the property. An Easement shall be recorded for maintenance of the Detention Basin by the property owner(s) in perpetuity, prior to the occupancy of this project.

e. All retaining walls and drainage structures shall be shown. Retaining walls shown on the Grading Plan shall conform to the San Diego Regional Standards or be designed by a licensed Civil Engineer. Engineering calculations for all designed walls with a surcharge and nonstandard walls shall be submitted at grading plan check. Retaining walls may not exceed the allowable height within the property line setback as determined by the City of Solana Beach Municipal Code. Contact the Community Development Department for further information.

f. The Applicants are responsible to protect the adjacent properties during construction. If any grading or other types of construction are anticipated beyond the property lines, the Applicants shall obtain a written permission from the adjoining property owners for incidental grading or construction that may occur and submit the letter to the City Engineer prior to the anticipated work.

g. Pay Grading Plan Check fee in accordance with the current Engineering Fee Schedule at initial Grading Plan Submittal. Inspection fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of the Grading Permit.

h. Obtain and submit grading security in a form prescribed by the City Engineer.

i. Obtain haul permit for import/export of soil. The Applicants shall transport all excavated material to legal disposal site.

j. Submit certification from the Engineer of Record and the Soils Engineer that all public or private drainage facilities and finished grades are functioning and are installed in accordance with the approved plans. This shall be accomplished by the Engineer of Record incorporating as-built conditions on the
Mylar Grading Plans and obtaining signatures of the Engineer of Record and the Soils Engineer certifying the as-built conditions.

k. An Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan shall be prepared. Best Management Practices (BMP's) shall be developed and implemented to manage storm water and non-storm water discharges from the site at all times during excavation and grading activities. Erosion prevention shall be emphasized as the most important measure for keeping sediment on site during excavation and grading activities. Sediment controls shall be used as a supplement to erosion prevention for keeping sediment on-site.

l. Show all proposed on-site private drainage facilities intended to discharge water run-off. Elements of this design shall include a hydrologic and hydraulic analysis verifying the adequacy of the facilities and identify any easements or structures required to convey the drainage. The construction of drainage structures shall comply with the standards set forth in the San Diego Regional Standard Drawings.

m. Post construction BMP’s meeting City and RWQCB Order No. R9-2013-001 requirements shall be implemented in the drainage design.

n. No increased cross lot drainage shall be allowed.

5. ENFORCEMENT

Pursuant to SBMC 17.72.120(B) failure to satisfy any and all of the above-mentioned conditions of approval is subject to the imposition of penalties as set forth in SBMC Chapters 1.1.6 and 1.18 in addition to any applicable revocation proceedings.

6. EXPIRATION

The Development Review Permit for the project shall expire 24 months from the date of this Resolution, unless the Applicants have obtained building permits and have commenced construction prior to that date, and diligently pursued construction to completion. An extension of the application may be granted by the City Council according to SBMC 17.72.110.

7. INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT

The Applicants shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City, its agents, officers, and employees from any and all claims, actions, proceedings, damages, judgments, or costs, including attorney’s fees, against the City or its agents,
officers, or employees, relating to the issuance of this permit including, but not limited to, any action to attack, set aside, void, challenge, or annul this development approval and any environmental document or decision. The City will promptly notify the Applicants of any claim, action, or proceeding. The City may elect to conduct its own defense, participate in its own defense, or obtain independent legal counsel in defense of any claim related to this indemnification. In the event of such election, the Applicants shall pay all of the costs related thereto, including without limitation reasonable attorney’s fees and costs. In the event of a disagreement between the City and Applicants regarding litigation issues, the City shall have the authority to control the litigation and make litigation related decisions, including, but not limited to, settlement or other disposition of the matter. However, the Applicants shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement unless such settlement is approved by the Applicants.

NOTICE TO APPLICANTS: Pursuant to Government Code Section 66020, you are hereby notified that the 90-day period to protest the imposition of the fees, dedications, reservations or other exactions described in this resolution commences on the effective date of this resolution. To protest the imposition of any fee, dedications, reservations or other exactions described in this resolution you must comply with the provisions of Government Code Section 66020. Generally the resolution is effective upon expiration of the tenth day following the date of adoption of this resolution, unless the resolution is appealed or called for review as provided in the Solana Beach Zoning Ordinance.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a special meeting of the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, held on the 27th day of September, 2017, by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers –

NOES: Councilmembers –

ABSENT: Councilmembers –

ABSTAIN: Councilmembers –

MIKE NICHOLS, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM: ATTEST:

JOHANNA N. CANLAS, City Attorney ANGELA IVEY, City Clerk
ANYTHING IN EXCESS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED
ONLY IMPROVEMENTS OR CHANGES SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED!

THANKS
RON GRIGGS
355 N. GRANADOS AVE 505-984-1758
TO: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT: Community Development Department
SUBJECT: Public Hearing: Request for DRP and SDP to Construct a New, Single-Family Residence with an Attached Two-Car Garage, a Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit and Perform Associated Site Improvements at 960 Avocado Place. (Case # 17-17-02 Applicant: Clipper NSPP FA, LLC; APN: 298-292-26; Resolution No. 2017-143)

BACKGROUND:

The Applicant, Clipper NSPP FA, LLC, is requesting City Council approval of a Development Review Permit (DRP) and a Structure Development Permit (SDP) to construct a new single-story, single-family residence with an attached two-car garage, a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) which includes an attached single-car garage and perform associated site improvements on a vacant lot. The 20,386 square-foot lot is located at 960 Avocado Place which was approved as Lot 7 of the Feather Acres Subdivision by the City Council in May of 2016. The lot is located within the Estate Residential (ER-2) Zone.

The project proposes grading in the amounts of 200 cubic yards of cut, 1,300 cubic yards of fill and 1,100 cubic yards of import. The maximum building height would be 23.10 feet above the pad height approved for Lot 7 under the Feather Acres Subdivision and 256.20 feet above Mean Sea Level (MSL) as reflected in the approving resolution2016-044. The project meets two thresholds for the requirement of a DRP, including: 1) construction in excess of 60 percent of the allowable floor area; and 2) an aggregate grading quantity in excess of 100 cubic yards. The project requires a SDP because the proposed development exceeds 16 feet in height above the existing grade as established by the Feather Acres Subdivision approval.

The issue before the Council is whether to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the Applicant’s request as contained in Resolution 2017-143 (Attachment 1).

CITY COUNCIL ACTION:


AGENDA ITEM B.2.
DISCUSSION:

The lot was created with the approval of the Feather Acres seven lot subdivision. The lot was originally identified as Lot 7 of the subdivision, however, since then addresses have been assigned to each of the lots and Lot 7 has been assigned 960 Avocado Place.

The property is rectangular in shape with 89 foot long east and west (front and rear) property lines and 229 foot long north and south (side) property lines. The property is located in the southeast corner of the subdivision on the west side of Avocado Place. Grading approved as part of the subdivision established specific pad elevations for each of the individual lots. The subject lot was graded to have two flat pads. The first flat pad was graded to an elevation of 235 feet above MSL which is approximately five feet below the street elevation. At the center of the lot, the property slopes downward five feet to the second flat pad at 230 MSL. The southwest corner of the lot slopes downward eleven feet to the existing topography on the adjacent property to the south.

The property abuts other vacant lots created by the subdivision to the north and west, a developed lot to the south and developed properties located across Avocado Place to the east within the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego. The Applicant proposes to construct a 5,351 square-foot, single-story residence which includes 623 square feet of the proposed residence that has a ceiling height greater than 15 feet and is counted twice towards the calculation of floor area and a 353 square foot covered and enclosed porch that is also included as floor area. The Applicant is also proposing an attached 738 square foot two-car garage and a detached ADU with an attached single-car garage as well as associated site improvements including cut and fill grading, a pool, hardscape, fencing and retaining walls, and landscaping. The project plans are provided in Attachment 2.

Table 1 (below) provides a comparison of the Solana Beach Municipal Code (SBMC) applicable zoning regulations with the Applicant’s proposed design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>LOT INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Address:</td>
<td>960 Avocado Pl,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size (Net):</td>
<td>22,386 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Allowable Floor Area:</td>
<td>7,558 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Floor Area:</td>
<td>6,139 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Max. Floor Area by:</td>
<td>1,419 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Allowable Height:</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Proposed Height:</td>
<td>23.10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Point/Ridge:</td>
<td>256.20 MSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Designation:</td>
<td>ER-2 (1-2 du/ac)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Units Allowed:</td>
<td>1 Dwelling Unit, 1 ADU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Units Requested:</td>
<td>1 Dwelling Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks:</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (E)</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side (N)</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side (S)</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear (W)</td>
<td>40 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROPOSED PROJECT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Residence:</th>
<th>Required Permits:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence Main Level: 4,375 ft²</td>
<td>DRP: A DRP is required for a structure that exceeds 60% of the maximum allowable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Covered Porch: 353 ft²</td>
<td>floor area and for grading in excess of 100 cubic yards (aggregate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Ceiling over 15 ft.: 623 ft²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached Garage: 738 ft²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: 6,089 ft²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached ADU:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADU: 210 ft²</td>
<td>SDP: A SDP is required for a new structure that exceeds 16 feet in height from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached Garage: 240 ft²</td>
<td>the existing grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal: 6,539 ft²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Parking Exemption: -400 ft²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Floor Area: 6,139 ft²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Grading:** Cut: 200 yd³ Fill: 1,300 yd³ Import: 1,100 yd³

**Proposed Parking:** Attached 2-Car Garage

**Proposed Fences and Walls:** Yes

**Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit:** Yes

**Proposed Accessory Structure:** No

**Existing Development:** Vacant Lot

Staff has prepared draft findings for approval of the project in the attached Resolution 2017-143 for Council's consideration based upon the information in this report. The applicable SBMC sections are provided in italicized text and conditions from the Community Development, Engineering, and Fire Departments are incorporated in the Resolution of Approval. The Council may direct Staff to modify the Resolution to reflect the findings and conditions it deems appropriate as a result of the public hearing process. If the Council determines the project is to be denied, Staff will prepare a Resolution of Denial for adoption at a subsequent Council meeting.

The following is a discussion of the findings for a DRP and an administrative SDP as each applies to the proposed project as well as references to recommended conditions of approval contained in Resolution 2017-143.

**Development Review Permit Compliance (SBMC Section 17.68.40):**

A DRP is required for the following reasons: 1) the total proposed square footage would exceed 60 percent of the maximum allowable floor area in a residential zone; and 2) the proposal includes an aggregate grading quantity that exceeds 100 cubic yards of grading. The total floor area proposed is 6,139 square feet, which is 81 percent of the maximum allowable floor area for the subject lot. There would be 200 cubic yards of cut, 1,300 cubic yards of fill, and 1,100 cubic yards of import or an aggregate grading quantity of 900 cubic yards.

In addition to meeting zoning requirements, the project must also be found in compliance with development review criteria. The following is a list of the development review criteria topics:
1. Relationship with Adjacent Land Uses
2. Building and Structure Placement
3. Landscaping
4. Roads, Pedestrian Walkways, Parking, and Storage Areas
5. Grading
6. Lighting
7. Usable Open Space

The Council may approve, or conditionally approve, a DRP only if all of the findings listed below can be made. Resolution 2017-143 provides the full discussion of the findings.

1. The proposed development is consistent with the general plan and all applicable requirements of the zoning ordinance including special regulations, overlay zones, and specific plans.

2. The proposed development complies with the development review criteria.

3. All required permits and approvals issued by the city, including variances, conditional use permits, comprehensive sign plans, and coastal development permits have been obtained prior to or concurrently with the development review permit.

4. If the development project also requires a permit or approval to be issued by a state or federal agency, the city council may conditionally approve the development review permit upon the Applicant obtaining the required permit or approval from the other agency.

If the above findings cannot be made, the Council shall deny the DRP. The following is a discussion of the applicable development review criteria as they relate to the proposed project.

Relationship with Adjacent Land Uses:

The property is located within the ER-2 Zone. Surrounding properties to the north, south, and west are also located within the ER-2 Zone. Properties to the south are developed. Lots to the north and west are vacant residential lots created with the Feather Acres Subdivision. Lots directly across Avocado Place to the east are developed and located within the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego.

The project, as designed, is consistent with the permitted uses for the ER-2 Zone as described in SBMC Sections 17.20.010 and 17.12.020. The property is designated Estate Residential in the General Plan and intended for single-family residences developed at a maximum density of one to two dwelling units per acre. The proposed development could be found to be consistent with the objectives of the General Plan as it encourages the development and maintenance of healthy residential neighborhoods,
the stability of transitional neighborhoods, and the rehabilitation of deteriorated neighborhoods.

The property is not located within any of the City’s Specific Plan or Overlay Zone areas; however, it is located within the Coastal Zone. As a condition of project approval, the Applicant would be required to obtain a Coastal Development Permit, Waiver or Exemption from the California Coastal Commission prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

Building and Structure Placement:

The Applicant proposes to construct a new single-story, single-family residence with an attached two-car garage and a detached ADU which includes an attached one-car garage.

As mentioned previously in this report, grading was approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision to create specific building pads for each of the seven lots. A two-tier building pad was created for the subject property. The grading has been completed onsite for the subject property and a pad certification has been submitted to the Engineering Department in order to certify that the existing condition of the lot matches the grading and pad elevations approved under the subdivision.

The Applicant is requesting the approval of a DRP in order to perform additional grading onsite which is described in more detail later in this report. In order to measure the maximum building height for the proposed development, Staff is using the pad elevations approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision as the pre-existing grade. Proposed grade as shown on the plans is the proposed grade elevation if the grading proposed with this development application is approved by the City Council.

Driveway access would be taken from Avocado Place at the center of the street frontage along the eastern property line. The driveway would slope down from Avocado Place. The residence, attached garage and detached ADU with the attached single-car garage would create a “U” shape around a proposed auto courtyard area accessed by the proposed driveway. Instead of orienting the garage doors towards the street, the attached two-car garage and the detached single-car garage would be accessed from the sides adjacent to the auto courtyard along the south and north elevations. The covered entry to the residence would be located at the west side of the courtyard. The covered porch along the front entry is included in the calculation of floor area because it is surrounded on three sides by full sized walls and covered. At the southwest corner of the buildable area of the lot, the Applicant is proposing to construct a hardscape patio area and a swimming pool. A covered patio is proposed on the west elevation of the residence between the residence and the pool which is not included in the calculation of floor area because it is open on two sides.

The 5,351 square-foot principal residence would include the following features: a pool bathroom that can be accessed from the southern elevation, a pantry, kitchen, great room, entry area, craft room, three bedrooms, four bathrooms, laundry room and the
master suite. The 210 square foot living area of the ADU would consist of a bedroom and bathroom and would have an attached 240 square foot, single-car garage. In October of 2016, the City adopted Ordinance 470 to implement the States regulations for Accessory Dwelling Units. In order to construct an ADU, there must be an attached or dethatched principal residence onsite. The ADU must be at least 350 square feet in size and comply with the development regulations of the Zone in which it is located for height, setbacks and FAR. In addition, the ADU must be constructed with a separate utility connection. ADU’s are not required to provide an additional parking space depending on their distance from public transit stops and car share pick up locations. The Applicant has, however, included an attached one-car garage in the proposed detached ADU. As proposed, the detached ADU complies with the regulations for an ADU.

A single-family residence requires two off-street parking spaces per single family residence. The Code indicates that when required spaces are provided in a garage, 200 square feet of floor area is exempted for each required space. The ADU regulations do not require an additional parking space for the proposed ADU but as designed, one would be included in the detached ADU. The site is required to provide two parking spaces, therefore, the project is afforded a 400 square-foot exemption, and the total proposed floor area would be 6,139 square feet, which is 1,419 square feet below the maximum allowable floor area for the 20,386 square-foot lot. The maximum floor area calculation for this project is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor Area</th>
<th>Required Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.60 for first 5,000 ft²</td>
<td>3,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30 for 5,000 to 20,000 ft²</td>
<td>4,500 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15 for anything over 20,000 ft²</td>
<td>58 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Allowable Floor Area:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,558 ft²</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project, as designed, meets the minimum required setbacks and is 1,419 square-feet below the maximum allowable floor area for the property.

**Neighborhood Comparison:**

Staff compared the proposed project to 49 other properties within the surrounding area. This area includes properties along both sides of Avocado Place as shown on the following map:
The properties evaluated in this comparison are located in the ER-2 Zone. The existing homes range in size from 1,806 square feet to 5,550 square feet, according to the County Assessor records. It should be noted that the County Assessor does not include the garage, covered porch area, unfinished basement or accessory building area in the total square footage. Accordingly, the building area of the proposed project has been calculated for comparison purposes by deleting the area of the proposed garages, the covered porch, the ceiling height over 15 feet, and the detached ADU as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Gross Building Area:</td>
<td>6,539 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete Ceiling Height Over 15 ft:</td>
<td>- 623 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete Covered Porch Area:</td>
<td>- 353 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete Attached Garage:</td>
<td>- 738 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete ADU:</td>
<td>- 210 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete ADU Garage:</td>
<td>- 240 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Area for Comparison to Assessor's Data:</td>
<td>4,375 ft²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 is based upon the County Assessor's data and SanGIS data. It contains neighboring lot sizes, the square footage of existing development and the maximum allowable square footage for potential development on each lot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Lot Size in ft² (GIS)</th>
<th>Existing ft² Onsite (Assessor’s)</th>
<th>Proposed / Recently Approved ft²</th>
<th>Max. Allowable ft²</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>935 Jeffery Road</td>
<td>25,265</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,290</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>945 Jeffery Road</td>
<td>28,750</td>
<td>4,275</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,813</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 Jeffery Road</td>
<td>22,216</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,832</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>911 Avocado Place</td>
<td>23,958</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,094</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>985 Avocado Place</td>
<td>26,136</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>981 Jeffery Road</td>
<td>26,572</td>
<td>5,486</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,486</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>905 Avocado Place</td>
<td>30,492</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,074</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>955 Jeffery Road</td>
<td>30,492</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,074</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>973 Jeffery Road</td>
<td>27,878</td>
<td>4,408</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,682</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>930 Avocado Place</td>
<td>22,216</td>
<td>4,827</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,832</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>920 Avocado Place</td>
<td>28,750</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,813</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>956 Avocado Place</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,67</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>873 Avocado Place</td>
<td>47,480</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,622</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>869 Avocado Place</td>
<td>24,829</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,224</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>859 Avocado Place</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>849 Avocado Place</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>839 Avocado Place</td>
<td>23,958</td>
<td>3,523</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,094</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>986 Avocado Place</td>
<td>31,799</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>708 Avocado Place</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>716 Avocado Place</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>726 Avocado Place</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>736 Avocado Place</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>744 Avocado Place</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>995 Avocado Place</td>
<td>28,750</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,813</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>731 Avocado Place</td>
<td>39,204</td>
<td>2,408</td>
<td>5,112</td>
<td>10,381</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>737 Avocado Place</td>
<td>27,878</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,682</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>747 Avocado Place</td>
<td>30,056</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,008</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>787 Avocado Pace</td>
<td>29,185</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,878</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>782 Avocado Place</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,355</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>723 Avocado Place</td>
<td>33,541</td>
<td>4,143</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,531</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>715 Avocado Place</td>
<td>22,651</td>
<td>3,948</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,898</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>*2920 Avocado Place</td>
<td>22,651</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>*2945 Avocado Place</td>
<td>23,958</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>*941 Avocado Place</td>
<td>34,412</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>*2930 Avocado Place</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>*2940 Avocado Place</td>
<td>30,492</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>*2935 Avocado Place</td>
<td>27,007</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>*2925 Avocado Place</td>
<td>22,651</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>*957 Avocado Place</td>
<td>31,363</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>*933 Avocado Place</td>
<td>33,541</td>
<td>4,463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>984 Avocado Place</td>
<td>25,892</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Site Size</td>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>982 Avocado Place</td>
<td>28,690</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>8,804</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>980 Avocado Place</td>
<td>32,714</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>9,407</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>970 Avocado Place</td>
<td>22,074</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>7,811</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><strong>960 Avocado Place</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,386</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td><strong>4,375</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,558</strong></td>
<td>ER-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>840 Avocado Place</td>
<td>22,207</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>7,831</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>850 Avocado Place</td>
<td>21,965</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>7,805</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>862 Avocado Place</td>
<td>60,984</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>13,648</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>934 Avocado Place</td>
<td>37,897</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>10,185</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>877 Avocado Place</td>
<td>23,841</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>8,076</td>
<td>ER-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These properties are located within the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego.

**Fences, Walls and Retaining Walls:**

Within the front yard setback area, the SBMC Section 17.20.040(O) allows fences and walls, or any combination thereof, to be no higher than 42 inches in height as measured from existing grade, except for an additional two feet of fence that is at least 80% open to light. Fences, walls and retaining walls located within the rear and interior side yards are allowed to be up to six feet in height with an additional 24 inches that is 50% open to light and air. However, the SBMC also permits fences or walls to be 5 feet high in the front-yard setback to comply with pool fencing requirements.

The Applicant proposes to construct retaining walls along the southern property line, a portion of the western property line and a portion of the northern property line in order to support the proposed change in topography to create one level pad onsite. The Applicant is also proposing a five foot high fence to surround the flat pad around the proposed pool and usable yard area at the southwestern corner of the buildable area and within the rear yard setback area along the western property line. The fences and walls onsite have been measured from the existing grade or the grade approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision for the lot. The retaining wall proposed along the southern elevation will not exceed 6 feet in height as measured from the existing grade on the adjacent property.

Currently, the plans show fences and walls that comply with the requirements of SBMC 17.20.040(O) and 17.60.070(C). If the Applicant decides to modify any of the proposed fences and walls or construct additional fences and walls on the project site, a condition of project approval indicates that they would be required to be in compliance with the Municipal Code.

**Landscape:**

The project is subject to the current water efficient landscaping regulations of SBMC Chapter 17.56. A Landscape Documentation Package is required for new development projects with an aggregate landscape equal to or greater than 500 square feet requiring a building permit, plan check or development review. The Applicant provided a
conceptual landscape plan that has been reviewed by the City's third-party landscape architect, who has recommended approval. The Applicant will be required to submit detailed construction landscape drawings that will be reviewed by the City's third-party landscape architect for conformance with the conceptual plan. In addition, the City's third-party landscape architect will perform inspections during the construction phase of the project. A separate condition has been added to require that native or drought-tolerant and non-invasive plant materials and water-conserving irrigation systems are required to be incorporated into the landscaping to the extent feasible.

Parking:

SBMC Section 17.52.040 and the Off-Street Parking Design Manual (OSPDM) require two (2) parking spaces for a single-family residence. The Applicant is proposing to construct an attached, two-car garage in the southeastern corner of the buildable area of the lot as well as a detached single-car garage space included in the proposed ADU in the northeastern corner of the buildable area. The property would be accessed by a new driveway at the center of the street frontage along the eastern property line along Avocado Place. SBMC Section 17.08.030 indicates that required parking up to 200 square feet per parking space provided in a garage is exempt from the floor area calculation. The proposed garage will provide two parking spaces. Two spaces are required, therefore, 400 square feet of garage area is exempt from the project's floor area calculation.

The SBMC regulations do not require an additional parking space for the proposed ADU but as designed, one would be included in the detached ADU. The additional space is not considered a required off-street parking space, therefore, an additional 200 square foot exemption is not applied to the project.

Grading:

The project includes grading in the amount of 200 cubic yards of cut, 1,300 cubic yards of fill, and 1,100 cubic yards of import. As mentioned before, with the approval of the Feather Acres Subdivision the subject lot was graded to have two level building pads. The pad at the western half of the lot was approved at 230 feet above MSL and the pad on the eastern half of the lot was approved at 235 feet above MSL. With the proposed project, the Applicant is proposing to import soil to provide one level pad across the center of the lot at 234.3 feet above MSL. This means that the western half of the lot would be raised approximately 4.3 feet and the eastern half of the lot would be lowered by approximately 0.7 feet. Grading is also proposed to provide for a stormwater detention area along the western elevation, the proposed driveway at the center of the eastern elevation and to provide exterior access around the proposed residence. The proposed topography will slope downward approximately four feet from the finished surface of Avocado Place as you move west towards the front yard setback. Retaining walls are proposed along a portion of the western elevation, the southern elevation and a portion of the northern elevation to support the proposed change in topography. The grade along the southern property line would be lower than the proposed grade onsite; however, at no point would the proposed retaining wall on the Applicant's property
exceed 6 feet in height as measured from the existing grade on the adjacent property. The proposed grading will blend with the grades for the lots to the north and west as approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision.

Lighting:

The project site is located within the City’s Dark Sky Area which has specific lighting regulations to preserve the traditional semirural character of the area which includes low levels of nighttime illumination. These regulations prohibit the outside illumination for aesthetic or dramatic purposes of any building and/or surrounding landscape, including environmentally sensitive habitat areas (public or private). Conditions of project approval include that all new exterior lighting fixtures comply with the City-Wide Lighting Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance (SBMC 17.60.060); that all light fixtures shall be shielded so that no light or glare is transmitted or reflected in such concentrated quantities or intensities as to be detrimental to the surrounding area; and that aesthetic illumination of the proposed residence or landscaping is prohibited.

Usable Open Space:

The project consists of the construction of a new single-story, single-family residence with an attached garage and a detached ADU which includes an attached single-car garage on a vacant residential lot, therefore, usable open space and recreational facilities are neither proposed nor required according to SBMC Section 17.20.040. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will be required to pay the City’s Park Fee for developing a vacant lot.

Structure Development Permit Compliance:

The proposed structure exceeds 16 feet in height above the existing grade as approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision, therefore, the project must comply with all of the View Assessment requirements of SBMC Chapter 17.63 and the Applicant was required to complete the SDP process. Once the pad elevations approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision were certified for the lot, the Applicant had story poles erected onsite. A final Story Pole Height Certification was issued by a licensed land surveyor on June 26, 2017, which showed a maximum building height of 23.10 feet and the tallest story poles (SP #3, SP #12 and #33) certified at 256.20 MSL as measured above the proposed finished grade after the grading proposed with this DRP has been completed. Notices to apply for View Assessment were mailed to property owners and occupants within 300 feet of the project site which established a deadline to file for View Assessment on August 7, 2017. No applications for View Assessment were received. Therefore, if the Council is able to make the required findings to approve the DRP, the SDP would be approved administratively.

It should be noted that the proposed chimney would exceed the 25-foot maximum height limit for the property, which is permissible pursuant to SMBC Section 17.08 (Building Height). The chimney is depicted by a "T" at the top of story pole #33 which was certified at 261.3 MSL or 26.4 feet above the proposed grade.
As a condition of approval, a height certificate prepared by a licensed land surveyor will be required prior to the framing inspection certifying that the maximum height of the proposed addition will not exceed 23.10 feet above the proposed grade or 256.20 feet above the Mean Sea Level (MSL), which is the maximum proposed structure height reflected on the project plans.

Public Hearing Notice:

Notice of the City Council Public Hearing for the project was published in the Union Tribune more than 10 days prior to the public hearing. The same public notice was mailed to property owners and occupants within 300 feet of the proposed project site on September 15, 2017. As of the date of preparation of this Staff Report, Staff has not received written correspondence regarding this project.

Conditions from the Planning, Engineering, and Fire Departments have been incorporated into the Resolution of Approval.

In conclusion, the proposed project, as conditioned, could be found to be consistent with the Zoning regulations and the General Plan. Should the Council determine that the findings can be made to approve the project; the SDP will be issued administratively with the DRP.

**CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:**

The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Class 3 consists of construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures. Examples of this exemption include one single-family residence or second dwelling unit in a residential zone. In urbanized areas, up to three-single-family residences may be constructed or converted under this exemption.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** N/A

**WORK PLAN:** N/A

**OPTIONS:**

- Approve Staff recommendation adopting the attached Resolution 2017-143.
- Approve Staff recommendation subject to additional specific conditions necessary for the City Council to make all required findings for the approval of a SDP and DRP.
- Deny the project if all required findings for the DRP cannot be made.
DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed project meets the minimum zoning requirements under the SBMC, may be found to be consistent with the General Plan and may be found, as conditioned, to meet the discretionary findings required as discussed in this report to approve a DRP and administratively issue a SDP. Therefore, Staff recommends that the City Council:


2. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and

3. If the City Council makes the requisite findings and approves the project, adopt Resolution 2017-143 conditionally approving a DRP and an administrative SDP to construct a new single-level, single-family residence with an attached two-car garage, a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit with an attached single-car garage and perform associated site improvements on a vacant lot at 960 Avocado Place, Solana Beach.

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Department Recommendation.

/Gregory Wade, City Manager

Attachments:

1. Resolution 2017-143
2. Project Plans
RESOLUTION NO. 2017-143

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLANA BEACH, CALIFORNIA, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PERMIT AND AN ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SINGLE-STORY, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH AN ATTACHED TWO-CAR GARAGE, A DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT WHICH INCLUDES AN ATTACHED SINGLE-CAR GARAGE AND ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS ON A PROPERTY LOCATED AT 960 AVOCADO PLACE, SOLANA BEACH

APPLICANTS: Clipper NSPP FA, LLC
CASE NO.: 17-17-02 DRP/SDP

WHEREAS, Clipper NSPP FA, LLC (hereinafter referred to as the “Applicant”), has submitted an application for a Development Review Permit (DRP) and Structure Development Permit (SDP) pursuant to Title 17 (Zoning) of the Solana Beach Municipal Code (SBMC); and

WHEREAS, the public hearing was conducted pursuant to the provisions of Solana Beach Municipal Code Section 17.72.030; and

WHEREAS, at the public hearing on September 27, 2017, the City Council received and considered evidence concerning the proposed application; and

WHEREAS, the public hearing was conducted pursuant to the provisions of Solana Beach Municipal Code Section 17.72.030; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Solana Beach found the application request exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, this decision is based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, and any information the City Council gathered by viewing the site and the area as disclosed at the hearing.

NOW THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, does resolves as follows:

I. That the foregoing recitations are true and correct.

II. That the request for a DRP and an administrative SDP to construct a new two-story, 5,351 square foot single-family residence with an attached 738 square foot two-car garage, a detached 450 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) that includes an attached single-car garage and to perform associated site improvements on a vacant lot at 960 Avocado Place, Lot 7 of the Feather Acres Subdivision, is conditionally approved based upon the following Findings and subject to the following Conditions:
III. FINDINGS

A. In accordance with Section 17.68.040 (Development Review Permit) of the City of Solana Beach Municipal Code, the City Council finds the following:

I. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and all applicable requirements of SBMC Title 17 (Zoning Ordinance), including special regulations, overlay zones and specific plans.

General Plan Consistency: The project, as conditioned, is consistent with the City's General Plan designation of Estate Residential (ER-2) which allows for single-family residential development with a maximum density of 1-2 dwelling units per acre. The development is also consistent with the objectives of the General Plan as it encourages the development and maintenance of healthy residential neighborhoods, the stability of transitional neighborhoods, and the rehabilitation of deteriorated neighborhoods.

Zoning Ordinance Consistency: The project is consistent with all applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance (Title 17) (SBMC 17.20.030 and 17.48.040), which delineates maximum allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR), Permitted Uses and Structures (SBMC Section 17.20.020) which provides for uses of the property for a single-family residence. Further, the project adheres to all property development regulations established for the ER-2 Zone and cited by SBMC Section 17.020.030.

The project is consistent with the provisions for minimum yard dimensions (i.e., setbacks) and the maximum allowable Floor Area (FAR), maximum building height, and parking requirements.

II. The proposed development complies with the following development review criteria set forth in Solana Beach Municipal Code Section 17.68.040.F:

a. Relationship with Adjacent Land Uses: The development shall be designed in a manner compatible with and where feasible, complimentary to existing and potential development in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Site planning on the perimeter of the development shall give consideration to the protection of surrounding areas from potential adverse effects, as well as protection of the property from adverse surrounding influences.

The property is located within the ER-2 Zone. Surrounding properties to the north, south, and west are also located within the ER-2 Zone. Properties to the south are developed. Lots to the north and west are vacant residential lots created with the
Feather Acres Subdivision. Lots directly across Avocado Place to the east are developed and located within the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego.

The project, as designed, is consistent with the permitted uses for the ER-2 Zone as described in SBMC Sections 17.20.010 and 17.12.020. The property is designated Estate Residential in the General Plan and intended for single-family residences developed at a maximum density of one to two dwelling units per acre. The proposed development is found to be consistent with the objectives of the General Plan as it encourages the development and maintenance of healthy residential neighborhoods, the stability of transitional neighborhoods, and the rehabilitation of deteriorated neighborhoods.

The property is not located within any of the City's Specific Plan or Overlay Zone areas; however, it is located within the Coastal Zone. As a condition of project approval, the Applicant shall obtain a Coastal Development Permit, Waiver or Exemption from the California Coastal Commission prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

b. Building and Structure Placement: Buildings and structures shall be sited and designed in a manner which visually and functionally enhances their intended use.

The Applicant proposes to construct a new single-story, single-family residence with an attached two-car garage and a detached ADU which includes an attached one-car garage.

As mentioned previously in this report, grading was approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision to create specific building pads for each of the seven lots. A two-tier building pad was created for the subject property. The grading has been completed onsite for the subject property and a pad certification has been submitted to the Engineering Department in order to certify that the existing condition of the lot matches the grading and pad elevations approved under the subdivision.

The Applicant is requesting the approval of a DRP in order to perform additional grading onsite which is described in more detail later in this report. In order to measure the maximum building height for the proposed development, Staff is using the pad elevations approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision as the pre-existing grade. Proposed grade as shown on the plans is the proposed grade elevation if the grading proposed
with this development application is approved by the City Council.
Driveway access would be taken from Avocado Place at the center of the street frontage along the eastern property line. The driveway would slope down from Avocado Place. The residence, attached garage and detached ADU with the attached single-car garage would create a "U" shape around a proposed auto courtyard area accessed by the proposed driveway. Instead of orienting the garage doors towards the street, the attached two-car garage and the detached single-car garage would be accessed from the sides adjacent to the auto courtyard along the south and north elevations. The covered entry to the residence would be located at the west side of the courtyard. The covered porch along the front entry is included in the calculation of floor area because it is surrounded on three sides by full sized walls and covered. At the southwest corner of the buildable area of the lot, the Applicant is proposing to construct a hardscape patio area and a swimming pool. A covered patio is proposed on the west elevation of the residence between the residence and the pool which is not included in the calculation of floor area because it is open on two sides.

The 5,351 square-foot principal residence would include the following features: a pool bathroom that can be accessed from the southern elevation, a pantry, kitchen, great room, entry area, craft room, three bedrooms, four bathrooms, laundry room and the master suite. The 210 square foot living area of the ADU would consist of a bedroom and bathroom and would have an attached 240 square foot, single-car garage. In October of 2016, the City adopted Ordinance 470 to implement the States regulations for Accessory Dwelling Units. In order to construct an ADU, there must be an attached or detached principal residence onsite. The ADU must be at least 350 square feet in size and comply with the development regulations of the Zone in which it is located for height, setbacks and FAR. In addition, the ADU must be constructed with a separate utility connection. ADU’s are not required to provide an additional parking space depending on their distance from public transit stops and car share pick up locations. The Applicant has, however, included an attached one-car garage in the proposed detached ADU. As proposed, the detached ADU complies with the regulations for an ADU.

A single-family residence requires two off-street parking spaces per single family residence. The SBMC indicates that when required spaces are provided in a garage, 200 square feet of floor area is exempted for each required space. The ADU
regulations do not require an additional parking space for the proposed ADU but as designed, one would be included in the detached ADU. The site is required to provide two parking spaces, therefore, the project is afforded a 400 square-foot exemption, and the total proposed floor area would be 6,139 square feet, which is 1,419 square feet below the maximum allowable floor area for the 20,386 square-foot lot. The maximum floor area calculation for this project is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Description</th>
<th>Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.60 for first 5,000 ft²</td>
<td>3,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30 for 5,000 to 20,000 ft²</td>
<td>4,500 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15 for anything over 20,000 ft²</td>
<td>58 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Allowable Floor Area:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,558 ft²</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project, as designed, meets the minimum required setbacks and is 1,419 square-feet below the maximum allowable floor area for the property.

c. **Landscaping:** The removal of significant native vegetation shall be minimized. Replacement vegetation and landscaping shall be compatible with the vegetation of the surrounding area. Trees and other large plantings shall not obstruct significant views when installed or at maturity.

The project is subject to the current water efficient landscaping regulations of SBMC Chapter 17.56. A Landscape Documentation Package is required for new development projects with an aggregate landscape equal to or greater than 500 square feet requiring a building permit, plan check or development review. The Applicant provided a conceptual landscape plan that has been reviewed by the City’s third-party landscape architect, who has recommended approval. The Applicant will be required to submit detailed construction landscape drawings that will be reviewed by the City’s third-party landscape architect for conformance with the conceptual plan. In addition, the City’s third-party landscape architect will perform inspections during the construction phase of the project. A separate condition has been added to require that native or drought-tolerant and non-invasive plant materials and water-conserving irrigation systems are required to be incorporated into the landscaping to the extent feasible.

d. **Roads, Pedestrian Walkways, Parking and Storage Areas:** Any development involving more than one building or structure shall provide common access roads and pedestrian walkways. Parking and outside storage areas, where permitted, shall be screened from view, to the extent feasible, by existing
topography, by the placement of buildings and structures, or by landscaping and plantings.

SBMC Section 17.52.040 and the Off-Street Parking Design Manual (OSPDM) require two (2) parking spaces for a single-family residence. The Applicant is proposing to construct an attached, two-car garage in the southeastern corner of the buildable area of the lot as well as a detached single-car garage space included in the proposed ADU in the northeastern corner of the buildable area. The property would be accessed by a new driveway at the center of the street frontage along the eastern property line along Avocado Place. SBMC Section 17.08.030 indicates that required parking up to 200 square feet per parking space provided in a garage is exempt from the floor area calculation. The proposed garage will provide two parking spaces. Two spaces are required, therefore, 400 square feet of garage area is exempt from the project's floor area calculation.

The SBMC regulations do not require an additional parking space for the proposed ADU but as designed, one would be included in the detached ADU. The additional space is not considered a required off-street parking space, therefore, an additional 200 square foot exemption is not applied to the project.

e. Grading: To the extent feasible, natural topography and scenic features of the site shall be retained and incorporated into the proposed development. Any grading or earth-moving operations in connection with the proposed development shall be planned and executed so as to blend with the existing terrain both on and adjacent to the site. Existing exposed or disturbed slopes shall be landscaped with native or naturalized non-native vegetation and existing erosion problems shall be corrected.

The project includes grading in the amount of 200 cubic yards of cut, 1,300 cubic yards of fill, and 1,100 cubic yards of import. As mentioned before, with the approval of the Feather Acres Subdivision the subject lot was graded to have two level building pads. The pad at the western half of the lot was approved at 230 feet above MSL and the pad on the eastern half of the lot was approved at 235 feet above MSL. With the proposed project, the Applicant is proposing to import soil to provide one level pad across the center of the lot at 234.3 feet above MSL. This means that the western half of the lot would be raised approximately 4.3 feet and the eastern half of the lot would be lowered by approximately 0.7 feet. Grading is also
proposed to provide for a stormwater detention area along the western elevation, the proposed driveway at the center of the eastern elevation and to provide exterior access around the proposed residence. The proposed topography will slope downward approximately four feet from the finished surface of Avocado Place as you move west towards the front yard setback. Retaining walls are proposed along a portion of the western elevation, the southern elevation and a portion of the northern elevation to support the proposed change in topography. The grade along the southern property line would be lower than the proposed grade onsite; however, at no point would the proposed retaining wall on the Applicant’s property exceed 6 feet in height as measured from the existing grade on the adjacent property. The proposed grading will blend with the grades for the lots to the north and west as approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision.

f. **Lighting:** Light fixtures for walkways, parking areas, driveways, and other facilities shall be provided in sufficient number and at proper locations to assure safe and convenient nighttime use. All light fixtures shall be appropriately shielded so that no light or glare is transmitted or reflected in such concentrated quantities or intensities as to be detrimental to the surrounding areas per SBMC 17.60.060 (Exterior Lighting Regulations).

The project site is located within the City’s Dark Sky Area which has specific lighting regulations to preserve the traditional semirural character of the area which includes low levels of nighttime illumination. These regulations prohibit the outside illumination for aesthetic or dramatic purposes of any building and/or surrounding landscape, including environmentally sensitive habitat areas (public or private). Conditions of project approval include that all new exterior lighting fixtures comply with the City-Wide Lighting Regulations of the Zoning Ordinance (SBMC 17.60.060); that all light fixtures shall be shielded so that no light or glare is transmitted or reflected in such concentrated quantities or intensities as to be detrimental to the surrounding area; and that aesthetic illumination of the proposed residence or landscaping is prohibited.

g. **Usable Open Space:** Recreational facilities proposed within required usable open space shall be located and designed to maintain essential open space values.

The project consists of the construction of a new single-story, single-family residence with an attached garage and a detached ADU which includes an attached single-car garage on a vacant residential lot, therefore, usable open space and
recreational facilities are neither proposed nor required according to SBMC Section 17.20.040. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will be required to pay the City's Park Fee for developing a vacant lot.

III. All required permits and approvals including variances, conditional use permits, comprehensive sign plans, and coastal development permits have been obtained prior to or concurrently with the development review permit.

All required permits, including a Structure Development Permit, are being processed concurrently with the Development Review Permit.

IV. If the development project also requires a permit or approval to be issued by a state or federal agency, the city council may conditionally approve the development review permit upon the Applicant obtaining the required permit or approval from the other agency.

The Applicant is required to obtain approval from the California Coastal Commission prior to issuance of Building Permits.

B. In accordance with Section 17.63.040 (Structure Development Permit) of the Solana Beach Municipal Code, the City Council finds the following:

The proposed structure exceeds 16 feet in height above the existing grade as approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision, therefore, the project must comply with all of the View Assessment requirements of SBMC Chapter 17.63 and the Applicant was required to complete the SDP process. Once the pad elevations approved under the Feather Acres Subdivision were certified for the lot, the Applicant had story poles erected onsite. A final Story Pole Height Certification was issued by a licensed land surveyor on June 26, 2017, which showed a maximum building height of 23.10 feet and the tallest story poles (SP #3, SP #12 and #33) certified at 256.20 MSL as measured above the proposed grade. Notices to apply for View Assessment were mailed to property owners and occupants within 300 feet of the project site which established a deadline to file for View Assessment on August 7, 2017. No applications for View Assessment were received. Therefore, if the Council is able to make the required findings to approve the DRP, the SDP would be approved administratively.

It should be noted that the proposed chimney would exceed the 25-foot maximum height limit for the property, which is permissible pursuant to SMBC Section 17.08 (Building Height). The chimney is depicted by a "T" at the top of story pole #33 which was certified at 261.3 MSL or 26.4 feet above the proposed grade.

As a condition of approval, a height certificate prepared by a licensed land surveyor will be required prior to the framing inspection certifying that the
maximum height of the proposed addition will not exceed 23.10 feet above the proposed grade or 256.20 feet above the Mean Sea Level (MSL), which is the maximum proposed structure height reflected on the project plans.

IV. CONDITIONS

Prior to use or development of the property in reliance on this permit, the Applicant shall provide for and adhere to the following conditions:

A. Community Development Department Conditions:

I. The Applicant shall pay required Public Facilities Fees, as established by SBMC Section 17.72.020 and Resolution 1987-36.

II. The Applicant shall pay the required Park Fee, Regional Transportation Congestion Impact Fee (RTCIP) and Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) for the development of a vacant lot prior to building permit issuance.

III. Building Permit plans must be in substantial conformance with the architectural plans presented to the City Council on September 27, 2017, and located in the project file with a submittal date of September 19, 2017.

IV. Prior to requesting a framing inspection, the Applicant shall submit a height certification, signed by a licensed land surveyor, certifying that the building envelope (which is represented by the story poles) is in conformance with the plans as approved by the City Council on September 27, 2017 and the certified story pole plot plan, and will not exceed 23.10 feet in height from the proposed finished grade or 256.20 feet above MSL.

V. Any proposed onsite fences, walls and retaining walls and any proposed railing located on top, or any combination thereof, shall comply with applicable regulations of SBMC Section 17.20.040 and 17.60.070 (Fences and Walls).

VI. The Applicant shall obtain required California Coastal Commission (CCC) approval of a Coastal Development Permit, Waiver or Exemption as determined necessary by the CCC, prior to the issuance of a grading or building permit.

VII. The Applicant shall provide a full Landscape Documentation Package in compliance with SBMC Chapter 17.56 prior to building permit issuance, which will be reviewed and inspected by the City's third party landscape professional.
VIII. Native or drought tolerant and non-invasive plant materials and water conserving irrigation systems shall be incorporated into any proposed landscaping and compatible with the surrounding area to the extent feasible.

IX. All new exterior lighting fixtures shall be in conformance with the City-wide lighting regulations of the Zoning Ordinance (SBMC 17.60.060). All light fixtures shall be appropriately shielded so that no light or glare is transmitted or reflected in such concentrated quantities or intensities as to be detrimental to the surrounding area.

X. Due to the property's location within the Dark Sky Area, the outside illumination for aesthetic or dramatic purposes of any building or surrounding landscape, including environmentally sensitive habitat areas (public or private) is prohibited.

B. Fire Department Conditions:

I. ACCESS ROAD MINIMUM DIMENSIONS: Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed improved width of not less than 20 feet; curb line to curb line, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches. Exception: Single-Family residential driveways; serving no more than two single-family dwellings, shall have minimum of 16 feet, curb line to curb line, of unobstructed improved width. Access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of not less than 75,000 pounds and shall be provided with an approved paved surface to provide all-weather driving capabilities.

a. Lot frontage (Avocado Place) shall comply with condition providing 20 feet in width minimum.

b. The fire apparatus access road shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building.

II. GRADE: The gradient for a fire apparatus access roadway shall not exceed 20.0%. Grades exceeding 15.0% (incline or decline) shall not be permitted without mitigation. Minimal mitigation shall be a surface of Portland cement concrete, with a deep broom finish perpendicular to the entire direction of travel. Additional mitigation measures may be required where deemed appropriate. The angle of departure and angle of approach of a fire access roadway shall not exceed seven degrees (12 percent).

III. POSTING OR STRIPING ROADWAYS "NO PARKING FIRE LANE":
Fire Department access roadways, when required, shall be properly identified as per Solana Beach Fire Department standards. The means by which fire lanes are designated shall be maintained in a clean and legible condition at all times and be replaced or repaired when necessary to provide adequate visibility.

IV. GATES: All gates or other structures or devices, which could obstruct fire access roadways or otherwise hinder emergency operations, are prohibited unless they meet standards approved by the Fire Department. An approved emergency key-operated switch and/or an approved emergency traffic control-activating strobe light sensor shall be installed per Solana Beach Fire Department standards.

V. OBSTRUCTION OF ROADWAYS DURING CONSTRUCTION: All roadways shall be a minimum of 20 feet in width during construction and maintained free and clear, including the parking of vehicles, in accordance with the California Fire Code and the Solana Beach Fire Department.

VI. FIRE HYDRANTS AND FIRE FLOWS: The Applicant shall provide fire hydrants of a type, number, and location satisfactory to the Solana Beach Fire Department. A letter from the water agency serving the area shall be provided that states the required fire flow is available. Fire hydrants shall be of a bronze type. Multi-family residential or industrial fire hydrants shall have two (2) 4" inch and two (2) 2 ½" inch NST outlets. Residential fire hydrants shall have one (1) 4" inch NST outlet, and one (1) 2 ½" inch NST outlets.

VII. ADDRESS NUMBERS: STREET NUMBERS: Approved numbers and/or addresses shall be placed on all new and existing buildings and at appropriate additional locations as to be plainly visible and legible from the street or roadway fronting the property from either direction of approach. Said numbers shall contrast with their background, and shall meet the following minimum standards as to size: 4" high with a ½" inch stroke width for residential buildings, 8" high with a ½" stroke for commercial and multi-family residential buildings, 12" high with a 1" stroke for industrial buildings. Additional numbers shall be required where deemed necessary by the Fire Marshal, such as rear access doors, building corners, and entrances to commercial centers.

VIII. AUTOMATIC FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM-ONE AND TWO FAMILY DWELLINGS: Structures shall be protected by an automatic fire sprinkler system designed and installed to the satisfaction of the Fire Department. Plans for the automatic fire sprinkler system shall be approved by the Fire Department prior to installation.
IX. CLASS "A" ROOF: All structures shall be provided with a Class "A" Roof covering to the satisfaction of the Solana Beach Fire Department.

C. Engineering Department Conditions:

I. Obtain an Encroachment Permit in accordance with Chapter 11.20 of the SBMC, prior to the construction of any improvements within the public right-of-way including, but not limited to, the demolition and construction of surface improvements. All proposed improvements within the public right-of-way shall comply with City standards including but not limited to the Off-Street Parking Design Manual.

II. All construction demolition materials shall be recycled according to the City’s Construction and Demolition recycling program and an approved Waste Management Plan shall be submitted.

III. Construction fencing shall be located on the subject property unless the Applicant has obtained an Encroachment Permit in accordance with Chapter 11.20 of the SBMC which allows otherwise.

IV. Obtain a Grading Permit in accordance with Chapter 15.40 of the SBMC. Conditions prior to the issuance of a Grading Permit shall include, but not be limited, to the following:

a. The Grading Plan shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and approved by the City Engineer. On-site grading design and construction shall be in accordance with Chapter 15.40 of the SBMC.

b. A Soils Report shall be prepared by a Registered Soils Engineer and approved by the City Engineer. All necessary measures shall be taken and implemented to assure slope stability, erosion control and soil integrity. The Grading Plan shall incorporate all recommendations contained in the soils report.

c. Provide a Drainage Report prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer. This report shall address the design for a detention basin and corresponding outflow system to ensure the rate of runoff for the proposed development is at or below that of existing condition. A detention basin easement will be required over the proposed basin site. All recommendations of this report shall be incorporated into the Preliminary Grading Plan.

d. An easement shall be recorded for maintenance of the detention basins by the property owner(s) in perpetuity, prior
to the occupancy of this project.

e. All retaining walls and drainage structures shall be shown. Retaining walls shown on the Grading Plan shall conform to the San Diego Regional Standards or be designed by a licensed civil engineer. Engineering calculations for all designed walls with a surcharge and nonstandard walls shall be submitted at grading plan check. Retaining walls may not exceed the allowable height within the property line setback as determined by the City of Solana Beach Municipal Code. Contact the Community Development department for further information.

f. The Applicant is responsible to protect the adjacent properties during construction. If any grading or other types of construction are anticipated beyond the property lines, the Applicant shall obtain a written permission from the adjoining property owners for incidental grading or construction that may occur and submit the letter to the City Engineer prior to the anticipated work.

g. Pay grading plan check fee in accordance with the current Engineering Fee Schedule at initial grading plan submittal. Inspection fees shall be paid prior to issuance of the grading permit.

h. Obtain and submit grading security in a form prescribed by the City Engineer.

i. Obtain haul permit for import/export of soil. The Applicant shall transport all excavated material to a legal disposal site.

j. Submit certification from the Engineer of Record and the Soils Engineer that all public or private drainage facilities and finished grades are functioning and are installed in accordance with the approved plans. This shall be accomplished by the Engineer of Record incorporating as-built conditions on the Mylar grading plans and obtaining signatures of the Engineer of Record and the Soils Engineer certifying the as-built conditions.

k. An Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control Plan shall be prepared. Best management practices shall be developed and implemented to manage storm water and non-storm water discharges from the site at all times during excavation and grading activities. Erosion prevention shall be emphasized as the most important measure for keeping sediment on site during excavation and grading activities. Sediment controls
shall be used as a supplement to erosion prevention for keeping sediment on site.

l. Show all proposed on-site private drainage facilities intended to discharge water run-off. Elements of this design shall include a hydrologic and hydraulic analysis verifying the adequacy of the facilities and identify any easements or structures required to properly convey the drainage. The construction of drainage structures shall comply with the standards set forth by the San Diego Regional Standard Drawings.

m. Post Construction Best Management Practices meeting City and RWQCB Order No. R9-2013-001 requirements shall be implemented in the drainage design.

n. No increased cross lot drainage shall be allowed.

V. The Applicant shall pay in full the one-time sewer capacity/connection fees of $4500.00 per Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU). The EDU assignment is determined by SBMC 14.08.060.

a. Pay in full the prorated portion of the current annual sewer charge for the remainder of the fiscal year.

b. The Applicant shall record a document holding the City of Solana Beach harmless in case of a sanitary sewer backup due to a blockage in the public sewer main; a backflow prevention device shall be installed on private property.

X. ENFORCEMENT

Pursuant to SBMC 17.72.120(B) failure to satisfy any and all of the above-mentioned conditions of approval is subject to the imposition of penalties as set forth in SBMC Chapters 1.1.6 and 1.18 in addition to any applicable revocation proceedings.

XI. EXPIRATION

The Development Review Permit and Structure Development Permit for the project will expire 24 months from the date of this Resolution, unless the Applicant has obtained building permits and have commenced construction prior to that date, and diligently pursued construction to completion. An extension of the application may be granted by the City Council according to SBMC 17.72.110.

XII. INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT
The Applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City, its agents, officers, and employees from any and all claims, actions, proceedings, damages, judgments, or costs, including attorney's fees, against the City or its agents, officers, or employees, relating to the issuance of this permit including, but not limited to, any action to attack, set aside, void, challenge, or annul this development approval and any environmental document or decision. The City will promptly notify the Applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding. The City may elect to conduct its own defense, participate in its own defense, or obtain independent legal counsel in defense of any claim related to this indemnification. In the event of such election, the Applicant shall pay all of the costs related thereto, including without limitation reasonable attorney’s fees and costs. In the event of a disagreement between the City and Applicant regarding litigation issues, the City shall have the authority to control the litigation and make litigation related decisions, including, but not limited to, settlement or other disposition of the matter. However, the Applicant shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement unless such settlement is approved by the Applicant.

NOTICE TO APPLICANTS: Pursuant to Government Code Section 66020, you are hereby notified that the 90-day period to protest the imposition of the fees, dedications, reservations or other exactions described in this resolution commences on the effective date of this resolution. To protest the imposition of any fee, dedications, reservations or other exactions described in this resolution you must comply with the provisions of Government Code Section 66020. Generally the resolution is effective upon expiration of the tenth day following the date of adoption of this resolution, unless the resolution is appealed or called for review as provided in the Solana Beach Zoning Ordinance.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, held on the 27th day of September, 2017, by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers –

NOES: Councilmembers –

ABSENT: Councilmembers –

ABSTAIN: Councilmembers –

________________________________________
MIKE NICHOLS, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________________________
JOHANNA N. CANLAS, City Attorney

ATTEST:

________________________________________
ANGELA IVEY, City Clerk
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LANDSCAPE NOTES

At the time of completion of the installation a certification of completion, using the City's form and signed by the licensed professional who prepared the landscape plans, will be required.

The following items shall be completed prior to the City's inspection:

A. All landscape work has been installed and completed per the plans approved by the City of Solana Beach
B. A hydro-zone diagram shall be provided adjacent to the irrigation controller
C. The person operating the system shall receive all required maintenance and irrigation plans.
D. All required soil amendments shall be incorporated and verified by the licensed professional
E. The following shall be submitted with the certification of completion form:
   1) A copy of the soil's management report
   2) A maintenance schedule for planting and irrigation
   3) An irrigation schedule that deferses irrigation times and water usage consistent with the approved plan's estimated total water use (ETWU) and current Santa Fe Irrigation District Requirements

LOT SQUARE FOOTAGE BREAKDOWN

TOTAL LOT SIZE: 20,389 SQFT
BUILDING FOOTPRINT: 5,405 SQFT
HARDSCAPE (INCLUDING DRIVEWAY): 4,110 SQFT
TOTAL IRRIGATED LANDSCAPE AREA: 7,232 SQFT
(INCLUDING SURFACE OF POOL)
NON-IRRIGATED LANDSCAPE AREA: 2,648 SQFT

WATER USE CALCULATIONS

TOTAL LOT SIZE: 20,389 SQFT
TOTAL IRRIGATED LANDSCAPE AREA: 7,232 SQFT
MARR = 29,143,972 * 115.747 = 109,304 L/gallon per year
ETWU = 29,143,972 * 0.8 = 23,315 gallons per year

*Reference water use calculations worksheet for full calculations

Signature: [Signature]
Date: [Date]

LANDSCAPE PLAN

[Diagram of proposed landscape plan]

[Scale and north orientation indicated]
LANDSCAPE HYDROZONES

Low Water Use Planted Zones 3, 6, 10, 14 = 2,763 SQFT planter
Moderate Water Use Planted Zones 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11 = 2,224 SQFT planter
Mulch = 1,661 SQFT, 6/5 SQFT planting area
Surface Area of Pool = 710 SQFT
Biotenion Area = 710 SQFT

WATER USE CALCULATIONS
TOTAL LOT SIZE = 28,390 SQFT
TOTAL IRRIGATED LANDSCAPE AREA = 7,222 SQFT
MWA = 28 x 143,752 = 4,042 gallons per year
ETWA = 28 x 143,752 = 109,304 gallons per year
*refer to water use calculations worksheet for full calculations
TO: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT: Engineering Department
SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution No. 2017-145 Authorizing the City Engineer to Advertise the La Colonia Skate Park for Construction Bids

BACKGROUND:

At the November 9, 2016 City Council meeting, the City Council approved the establishment of a La Colonia Park Master Plan Reserve (Reserve) in the City CIP Fund by allocating $300,000 of the projected Fiscal Year (FY) 2015/16 General Fund surplus to this Reserve that was specifically designated to be used for the Skate Park element of the Master Plan. The Reserve would then be established and available for funding future Master Plan improvements. The funds were subsequently appropriated to the Reserve at the December 14, 2016 City Council meeting.

At the March 22, 2017 City Council meeting, the City Council approved a Professional Services Agreement with Van Dyke Landscape Architects/Site Design Group (VDLA/SDG) for final design services for a skate park at La Colonia Park.

This item is before the City Council to provide an update on the design of the La Colonia Skate Park and for the consideration of Resolution 2017-145 (Attachment 1) authorizing the City Engineer to advertise for construction bids.

DISCUSSION:

In 2010, Van Dyke Landscape Architects developed preliminary design plans for the redevelopment of La Colonia Park, including the community center and surrounding park. Those plans included a skate park and a courtyard area. The courtyard area was later developed into the Veterans' Honor Courtyard which was constructed following the general guidance of the La Colonia Park Master Plan in a way that still allows for other elements of the Master Plan to be constructed at a later date. Similar to the example

COUNCIL ACTION:


AGENDA ITEM C.1.
established by the Veterans' Honor Courtyard, there is a desire to construct the Skate Park element of the master plan. Since the proposed Skate Park location would be on the northern edge of the La Colonia Park Master Plan, it could easily be constructed to be incorporated into the remainder of the Master Plan when other elements move forward for construction.

Design Concepts

As part of the original Master Plan for La Colonia Park, the preliminary design of the Skate Park was developed by SDG as a sub-consultant to VDLA. VDLA included SDG on their team to design the Skate Park portion of this project which also includes landscaping, site furnishings, grading, electrical and other items ancillary to the Skate Park. During the negotiations for the scope of work for this project, SDG stated that the majority of the original Skate Park design could be incorporated into the new project.

Since approval of the PSA with VDLA, Staff has been working with VDLA/SDG on various design alternatives for the proposed La Colonia Skate Park. In order to start the public input process, the design team (which consists of Staff and VDLA/SDG) held an initial workshop to gather community input on the design of a proposed skate park. At the first workshop that was held in late April 2017, SDG engaged the attendees, many of whom were youth skaters, to determine what features they would like to be included as part of the Skate Park. The attendees were broken up into several working groups and each group used scaled down cutouts to provide a possible skate park layout.

After the first community workshop, VDLA/SDG took the feedback obtained and developed two concept design plans for a proposed skate park layout. These two concept plans were presented at a second community workshop that was held in early June 2017. During the discussions that followed the presentation of the two concept plans to the workshop attendees, a request was made to combine the various elements of the two concept plans into one hybrid design concept plan. The concept plans are provided in Attachment 2 which includes two concepts, A & B, and the "hybrid" concept.

Since the second workshop, VDLA/SDG has been developing preliminary design plans for the hybrid design concept plan that includes grading, site lighting, the hybrid Skate Park design concept, the adjacent half-court basketball court and surrounding landscaping and hardscaping. It is this hybrid design concept plan that is being presented to the City Council for consideration. As part of the proposed actions, Staff is requesting feedback from the City Council on the various design elements shown in the hybrid design concept plan.

Fund Raising

Since the beginning of this project, there has been a very active fundraising campaign to help fund the construction of the proposed Skate Park. As part of the first community workshop, there was a pancake breakfast held to solicit donations for the Skate Park.
Other fundraising efforts have included an event at the Belly Up Tavern and a booth at Fiesta del Sol where t-shirts were sold and a raffle was held. In addition, the Solana Beach Skate Park Fund has been established by community residents through the Coastal Communities Foundation to accept private donations for the Skate Park.

Another potential way to raise funds would be to sell donation tiles similar to what was done at Fletcher Cove Park. VDLA has designed a donor tile wall along the south-facing wall that leads to the entrance of the Skate Park for Council’s consideration.

Grant Applications

To date, Staff has submitted grant applications for the Skate Park to two separate organizations. The first grant request was submitted to the Solana Beach and Del Mar Chapter of the Lions Clubs International Foundation, but the grant request was denied. A second grant application was recently submitted to the County of San Diego as part of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Program. The City is still awaiting word as to whether we will receive this funding.

CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

Environmental studies are currently underway but are not completed at this time. A completed CEQA compliance statement will be included at the time a construction contract is awarded and before final approval of the project.

FISCAL IMPACT:

To date, including the donations from various special events and the Tony Hawk grant of $5,000, the City Council has allocated a total of $541,000 for the design and construction of the Skate Park and private fundraising efforts and donations have raised an additional $10,000 for a total of $551,000. The most current construction cost estimate projects the total cost of the Skate Park at approximately $821,000. This includes the skate area, lighting, landscaping, hardscape, drainage improvements, the half basketball court and contingency. As noted above, Staff has submitted a grant application to the County. The amount of the grant application is $270,000 which would close the funding gap if the grant is awarded in the full amount.

After construction bids are received, Staff will have a much better idea of the projected construction costs so adjustments to the project funding can be made at that time if necessary.

WORK PLAN:

The Skate Park at La Colonia Park is consistent with Item B.2 (La Colonia Park Improvements) of the Community Character Priorities section of the FY 2017/18 Work Plan.
OPTIONS:

- Approve Staff recommendation.
- Approve Staff recommendation with alternative amendments/modifications.
- Provide direction.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council:

1. Provide feedback on the various design features of the hybrid design concept plan.

2. Adopt Resolution 2017-145 authorizing the City Engineer to complete the design plans and specifications package and advertise for construction bids.

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Department Recommendation.

Gregory Wade, City Manager

Attachments:

1. Resolution 2017-145
2. Concept plans
RESOLUTION 2017-145

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLANA BEACH, CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE CITY ENGINEER TO ADVERTISE THE LA COLONIA SKATE PARK FOR CONSTRUCTION BIDS

WHEREAS, at the November 9, 2016 City Council meeting, the City Council approved the establishment of a La Colonia Park Master Plan Reserve (Reserve) in the City CIP Fund by allocating $300,000 of the projected Fiscal Year (FY) 2015/16 General Fund surplus to this Reserve specifically to be used for the Skate Park element of the Master Plan. The Reserve would then be established and available for funding future Master Plan improvements. The funds were subsequently appropriated to the Reserve at the December 14, 2016 City Council meeting; and

WHEREAS, at the March 22, 2017 City Council meeting, the City Council approved a Professional Services Agreement with Van Dyke Landscape Architects/Site Design Group (VDLA/SDG) for final design services for a skate park at La Colonia Park; and

WHEREAS, since approval of the PSA with VDLA, Staff has been working with VDLA/SDG on various design alternatives for the proposed La Colonia Skate Park; and

WHEREAS, VDLA/SDG has developed preliminary design plans for the hybrid design concept plan that includes grading, site lighting, the hybrid skate park design concept, the adjacent half-court basketball court and surrounding landscaping and hardscaping.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, does resolve as follows:

1. That the above recitations are true and correct.
2. That the City Council authorizes the City Engineer to complete the design plans and specifications package and advertise for construction bids.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 27th day of September, 2017, at a regularly scheduled meeting of the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers –
NOES: Councilmembers –
ABSTAIN: Councilmembers –
ABSENT: Councilmembers –

________________________
MIKE NICHOLS, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM: ATTEST:

________________________
JOHANNA N. CANLAS, City Attorney

________________________
ANGELA IVEY, City Clerk
LA COLONIA - SKATE PARK

715 VALLEY AVE, SOLANA BEACH, CA 92075

6/9/2017
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STAFF REPORT
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT: Engineering Department
SUBJECT: Consideration of Resolution No. 2017-022 – Update on Lomas Santa Fe Corridor Feasibility Study and Amendment of PSA with STC Traffic, Inc.

BACKGROUND:

On June 24, 2015, the City Council approved the City’s Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategies (CATS). The CATS identified several segments along the Lomas Santa Fe Drive corridor as high priority improvements and Council directed Staff to focus on this corridor as part of the City’s Fiscal Year (FY) 2016/17 Work Plan.

To accomplish this task, the City entered into a Professional Services Agreement (PSA) with STC Traffic, Inc. (STC) for the preparation of a corridor feasibility study for Lomas Santa Fe Drive. Work on the initial phase of the feasibility study has been under way since November 2016. This item is before the City Council to provide an update on the LSF Corridor Feasibility Study and for Council consideration of Resolution 2017-022 (Attachment 1) which would authorize the City Manager to amend the PSA with STC to include work on Phase 2 of the Lomas Santa Fe Corridor Feasibility Study (Study).

DISCUSSION:

The first phase of the Study started in November 2016 and was intended to provide an assessment of the existing conditions which consisted of base mapping, data collection, identification of corridor deficiencies and identification of proposed solutions to noted deficiencies. As part of the data collection, the City and STC held a day-long walk audit of the entire corridor to solicit feedback from the community. Other efforts to collect feedback from the community included an open house that showed examples of possible solutions to issues brought up during the walk audit and creation of an on-line survey/feedback forum to continue receiving comments from the community.

COUNCIL ACTION:

______________________________________________________________

AGENDA ITEM C.2.
The first stage of the Study was to identify existing deficiencies along the Lomas Santa Fe corridor. This was accomplished through several steps which began with an Engineering Field Walk at which the project team (City Staff and the consultant team of civil engineers, traffic engineers and landscape architects) walked the entire corridor to better visualize the problem areas, identify physical constraints, and prepare for the upcoming community walk audit. Key issues identified during the Engineering Field Walk included narrow sidewalks, missing ADA curb ramps, deteriorating pavement and wide traffic lanes/medians which can encourage higher traffic speeds.

Following the Engineering Field Walk, a Community Walk Audit was conducted to collect community input on the existing conditions along LSF. The Community Walk Audit was broken into the following four focus areas:

- Highway 101 to Granados Avenue
- Stevens Avenue to Interstate 5 interchange
- Santa Helena to Via Mil Cumbres
- Lomas Santa Fe Drive/Highland Drive intersection

The community was invited to participate in the day long Community Walk Audit, where residents, business owners and interested individuals walked with the project team along each of these four focus areas. Over the course of the four focus area walks and the summary meeting at City Hall at the end of the day, 43 participants were engaged in this interactive event. As part of the walk audit, worksheets were provided to all participants. Project team members facilitated a discussion of the key concerns at a series of stopping points along the route. A summary of the information received from the community is included with this Staff Report as Attachment 2.

Following the Community Walk Audit, the participants were invited back to City Hall for an open discussion regarding their experiences along the corridor. Team members provided a broad overview of the key points and information gathered during the walk audits. Participants then offered additional input, offered suggestions regarding specific ideas and concerns and were provided an opportunity to mark-up maps to illustrate other areas of concern not identified in the walk audit.

The project team compiled the findings of the field walk and walk audit and developed a series of potential improvements for each of the four segments of the corridor, which were presented at a Community Workshop on May 15, 2017. The Community Workshop was noticed via e-blast, and Council's announcements citywide with specific e-mails sent to participants of the Community Walk Audit.

During the Community Workshop, participants were provided an overview presentation, which included a description of the proposed improvements, discussion of the goals of the project and a brief traffic engineering tutorial. Participants were then asked to review large scale maps of the corridor, ask questions of the project team and provide
feedback on their support, or lack thereof, for the potential improvements included for each of the four focus areas. A survey was also distributed for participants to provide feedback on each of the potential improvements.

Recognizing that not all community members were available to attend the Community Workshop or Community Walk Audit, the materials from the workshop were also made available on the City’s website. The availability of the survey was noticed to the community through e-blast. The survey remained open for over five weeks spanning the months of May, June and July 2017. A total of five on-line surveys were collected along with a series of e-mailed and written comments.

In addition to conducting the field assessment and identifying potential improvements for the corridor, an operational assessment of key locations along the corridor was conducted to ensure that the improvements presented to the public would be operationally feasible and viable. The operational analysis focused on locations where the existing traffic signal timing, phasing or geometric conditions would change as a result of the improvements included in the report. These improvements could include:

- Potential multi-use path for pedestrians and bicyclists along Lomas Santa Fe east of I-5
- Restriping Lomas Santa Fe/Highway 101
- Installation of a pedestrian “scramble” phase at Lomas Santa Fe/Cedros (“scramble” phase allows for all-way pedestrian crossing, including diagonally)
- Construction of a median at Granados
- Implementation of protected or split left turn signal phasing on side streets where side streets currently have permitted phasing
- Implementation of “leading pedestrian phase” at all signalized intersections

A field assessment of the existing traffic signal controllers along the corridor was conducted. It was determined that the software in the City’s existing controller cabinets is old and not capable of many of the features identified in some of the bullets listed above. One solution would be to upgrade the traffic signal software in the cabinets. However, the hardware of a few of the older traffic signal controllers would either need to be upgraded or replaced in order to run leading pedestrian phase operations and/or pedestrian scrambles since the current traffic signal controllers and software are not capable of this type of operation. Fortunately this assessment was finalized in time for the preparation of City’s annual budget and CIP program and Staff was able to incorporate a project for upgrading up to four traffic signal controller hardware facilities which was approved by the City Council. Staff is currently in the process of implementing this CIP program and if the City Council decides to move forward with these recommendations, Staff would be able to implement these signal timing proposals with appropriate software modifications.

In general, installation of a pedestrian scramble, which is an intersection where all vehicle traffic is stopped so that pedestrians can cross in all directions including
diagonally, will increase overall delay at the Lomas Santa Fe/Cedros Avenue intersection. Although this would be an overall benefit to pedestrians at the intersection by reducing yield-control pedestrian/vehicle conflicts, the amount of pedestrian green time needed to serve the pedestrian scramble will affect the existing coordination timing plans with Highway 101. Currently, Lomas Santa Fe is coordinated between Highway 101 and Rios Avenue. The coordinated timing allows the southbound left turning vehicles on Highway 101 to pass seamlessly through Cedros and Rios before heading further east along the corridor. Integrating a scramble phase at the Lomas Santa Fe/Cedros intersection would affect the City's ability to continue to provide this coordination.

Changing the signal phasing from permitted to protected for Cedros traffic entering Lomas Santa Fe would also reduce the number of yield-controlled pedestrian conflict points in the intersection. Controlling left turn access would eliminate pedestrians crossing Lomas Santa Fe while drivers are simultaneously trying to make a left turn, which is an overall benefit in terms of pedestrian visibility and accessibility. However, the new protected left turn phasing would increase the intersection cycle length, increase delay and potentially lengthen left-turn pockets on Cedros which would eliminate some on-street parking. In most cases, this condition exists at smaller, non-coordinated intersections such as Nardo Avenue where the increase in delay is nominal and does not affect the level of service.

Restriping and construction of median islands typically have little to no impact on intersection delay. The leading pedestrian phase also has very little impact on the signal timing and corridor operations. However, creating a pleasant driving experience through the integration of well-designed landscaping, installation of artwork, implementation of other streetscape features such as benches, bike racks and decorative lighting has a natural traffic calming effect and may result in slower traffic speeds as we have experienced along Highway 101. This can be further encouraged through the integration of buffered bicycle lanes, narrower lane widths, curb extensions at key intersections and placement of on-street parking. The width of Lomas Santa Fe (curb to curb) can accommodate most, if not all, of these features as illustrated in the recommended improvements presented at the Community Workshop. Although traffic speeds may be reduced along the corridor as a result of the modifications proposed, total through capacity and intersection operations will remain relatively unchanged. Therefore, the improvements create a more pleasant walking and bicycling environment, while maintaining acceptable traffic operating conditions and a better driving experience.

The purpose of Phase 1 of the Lomas Santa Fe Corridor Study was to solicit input from the community, identify potential issues and deficiencies and to identify potential solutions from which concept drawings were prepared for further evaluation, discussion and consideration. Those concept drawings are contained in Attachment 3. As previously stated, however, this is a multiphase phase project, with each phase designed to receive community input. Therefore, the concept drawings are intended to
illustrate potential ideas for the corridor and to promote further discussion, analysis and consideration entering the next phase of the study.

Amendment 1 to the PSA with STC would allow for the preparation of preliminary engineering plans and cost estimates for proposed improvements along the corridor. In support of the 30% preliminary engineering plans and cost estimates, STC would perform traffic modeling to evaluate operating conditions for the proposed improvements as well as preparing additional illustrative sketches of the proposed streetscape, pedestrian and bicycle improvements for the corridor. The sketches and illustrations should help convey the proposed improvements to the community in a clear and concise manner that can be used as the vision of the corridor is implemented over time. The adopted FY 2017/2018 Budget has allocated $65,000 for this phase of the Study.

**CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:**

Providing an update on the Study is not a project as defined by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Proper environmental clearance will be obtained during the design stage of any project that results from the Study.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The FY 2016/17 Adopted Budget appropriated $50,000 for the initial phase of the LSF Corridor Feasibility Study. Since the scope of work for Phase 1 of the Study was written to fit within the allocated budget, no additional funds were needed. Similarly, Phase 2 of the Study would be tailored to meet the available budget. The FY 2017/18 Adopted Budget appropriated $65,000 for the Phase 2 of the Study. Therefore, no additional funds would be necessary at this time to continue on to Phase 2 of the Lomas Santa Fe Corridor Feasibility Study.

**WORK PLAN:**

This project is consistent with Item B.6 of the Community Character Priorities of the FY 2017/18 Work Plan.

**OPTIONS:**

- Approve Staff recommendation.
- Approve Staff recommendation with alternative amendments/modifications.
- Provide direction/feedback.
DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt Resolution 2017-022 authorizing the City Manager to execute an amendment to the Professional Services Agreement with STC Traffic, Inc., in the amount of $65,000, for Phase 2 of the Lomas Santa Fe Corridor Feasibility Study that will allow for technical analysis of the data collected in Phase 1 of the Feasibility Study and preparation of 30% preliminary engineering plans and cost estimates.

CITY MANAGER’S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Department Recommendation.

/Gregory Wade, City Manager

Attachments:

1. Resolution 2017-022
2. Community Walk Audit Summary
3. Corridor Concept Drawings
RESOLUTION NO. 2017-022

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLANA BEACH, CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH STC TRAFFIC, INC. FOR PHASE 2 OF THE LOMAS SANTA FE CORRIDOR FEASIBILITY STUDY

WHEREAS, since the completion of the Interstate 5/Lomas Santa Fe Drive (LSF) freeway interchange, there have not been any substantial operational changes to the LSF corridor; and

WHEREAS, as part of the Comprehensive Active Transportation Strategies (CATS) study that was completed and brought before the City Council at the June 24, 2015 City Council meeting, there were several proposed improvements identified that would improve the LSF corridor for active transportation users such as pedestrians, bicyclists and those who use mass transit; and

WHEREAS, in November 2016, the City entered into a Professional Services Agreement (PSA) with STC Traffic, Inc. (STC) for the preparation of a corridor feasibility study for Lomas Santa Fe Drive; and

WHEREAS, the first phase of the Study started in November 2016 and was intended to provide an assessment of the existing conditions which consisted of base mapping, data collection, identification of deficiencies and identification of proposed solutions to the deficiencies; and

WHEREAS, this is a multiphase project, with each phase designed to receive community input and the next phase of this project would be the preparation of preliminary engineering plans and cost estimates for any proposed improvements.

NOW THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, does resolve as follows:

1. That the foregoing recitations are true and correct.
2. That the City Council authorizes the City Manager to execute an amendment to the Professional Services Agreement with STC Traffic, Inc., in the amount of $65,000, for Phase 2 of the Lomas Santa Fe Corridor Feasibility Study that will allow for technical analysis of the data collected in Phase 1 of the Feasibility Study and preparation of 30% preliminary engineering plans and cost estimates.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 27th day of September, 2017, at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California by the following vote:

**AYES:**
- Councilmembers –

**NOES:**
- Councilmembers –

**ABSENT:**
- Councilmembers –

**ABSTAIN:**
- Councilmembers –

____________________________
MIKE NICHOLS, Mayor

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

Johanna N. Canlas, City Attorney

____________________________
ANGELA IVEY, City Clerk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Concerns from Community</th>
<th>Ideas from Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedros/Lomas Santa Fe</td>
<td>• Noisy</td>
<td>• Big idea needed vs. smaller ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic calming – LSF too wide</td>
<td>• Pedestrian scramble @ Cedros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Left turn lane heading west on LSF very dangerous, light in wrong location</td>
<td>• Pedestrian bump outs / curb extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ped lights sometimes stay on too long</td>
<td>• Widen sidewalks, take space for planted medians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cars just run it up from Cedros thru fire station</td>
<td>• Storm water improvements / Bio swells where possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nowhere for kids to bike</td>
<td>• Rain garden center islands and curbside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Child hit in intersection</td>
<td>• Plant big trees to disguise I-5 interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sidewalks are too narrow</td>
<td>• Sync lights along LSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce # of lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Add buffered bike lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Red paint for 200’ can be used for buffered BL since not used for parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stop cars further back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Possibility of roundabouts @ Cedros &amp; Coast Hwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sculpture in center of intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Graphic design &amp; lots of paint at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Rios/Lomas Santa Fe</td>
<td>• Bulb out for right turns to/from Rios</td>
<td>• Pedestrian scale lighting from Granados to Coast Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very dangerous crosswalk for people heading E/W across LSF, blind night turn for cars</td>
<td>• Narrow lanes on LSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heading west on LSF</td>
<td>• Trees – bus stops &amp; street furniture could be sponsored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Narrow street</td>
<td>(endowment fund for maintenance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slow down traffic</td>
<td>• Wider, buffered bike lanes with green transition zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Delivery at liquor store blocks sign</td>
<td>• Wider sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• High visibility crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bulbout for right turns to/from Rios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Midblock crossing near boys and girls club w/ ped refuge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Liquor store change one way to prevent left turns downhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSF into driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Plant medians, where possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Put parking to the outside of the bike lane, rather than road, bike, parking,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Need wider bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Good street furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construct Roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paint Crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Distance across Lomas: not enough green for ped (compared to Cedro green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Granados/Lomas</td>
<td>• Very steep, hard to see pedestrian</td>
<td>• Median islands to create interest and create visual corridor toward ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>• Granados is too steep, hard to cross</td>
<td>• Integrate community organizations to help find projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No ADA ramp</td>
<td>• Mini islands along Lomas Santa Fe (don’t block driveways)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cedros to fire station speeding problem</td>
<td>• Reconfigure bike lane/parking going east (flipflop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Make Lomas Santa Fe feel less like a highway, make car lanes narrower, put in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bump outs south side at S Granados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Help with right turn curve steepness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Granados north/south traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Concerns from Community</td>
<td>Ideas from Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Skyline Elementary School/Lomas Santa Fe | ● Sweeping right curve an issue  
● Cars swerve into bike lane | ● Add crosswalk on east side of Stevens  
● Ped head starts for signals  
● Add pocket park with ped path idea.  
● Wider/buffered bike lanes everywhere  
● Improve protected bike lanes around school entrances/exits  
● Put bicycle lanes on sidewalk  
● Wider sidewalks everywhere  
● Add a grassy median  
● Kids ride on sidewalk |
| Stevens/Loma Santa Fe      |                                                     | ● Advance times for pedestrian crosswalk lights as much as possible  
● At Glencrest create green bike box going east forward of cars  
● Add pocket park on southwest corner and benches  
● Add bike box eastbound  
● Improve striping and add flashing beacons  
● Fix striping because stop bar is not clear  
● Crosswalk good but need more ped crossing time  
● Add class 4 bicycle facility  
● Activate crosswalk with effective signage |
| Solana Hills/Loma Santa Fe | ● Right lane stacks up                             | ● Roundabouts  
● Widen sidewalks on north & south sides of LSF  
● Add stop bar back from crosswalk and bike sensors  
● Lights too long so bikers ride on opposite side of road  
● Wider sidewalk & traffic control flashing beacon @ driveways  
● Wider bike lane |
| I-5/Loma Santa Fe          | ● Trash cans block sidewalk                        | ● Green transition going east near I-5 on ramp to help bikes;  
best solution for I-5 interchange:  
● Possibly extend to median to intersection  
● Improve continental crosswalks  
● Add paint to refresh & stop cars before crosswalk  
● Sidewalk width in front of First Citizen Bank is good width  
● Widen sidewalk by Presbyterian church  
● Add safety wall to south side of sidewalk  
● Tough for bikers going eastbound, cars going on freeway |
### Table ES-3: Community Walk Audit Summary (Santa Helena to Via Mil Cumbres/Las Banderas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Concerns from Community</th>
<th>Ideas from Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via Mill Cumbres/Loma Santa Fe</td>
<td>• Crossing difficult&lt;br&gt;• Peds need advanced time&lt;br&gt;• Northbound left turn phase is too short (light), cars don't wait for peds&lt;br&gt;• No protected Left Turn Phase&lt;br&gt;• Accidents due to people making u turn&lt;br&gt;• Signal sensors not working right&lt;br&gt;• Northbound may be a split phase opportunity</td>
<td>• Ped load time for crosswalks&lt;br&gt;• Add ped refuge, if/where possible&lt;br&gt;• Repurpose the wide LSF road to better accommodate biker &amp; pads and calm traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway/Loma Santa Fe</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continental crosswalks&lt;br&gt;• More medians please (East on LSF)&lt;br&gt;• One lane trucks &amp; access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Helena/Loma Santa Fe</td>
<td>• Concern about downhill 1 lane concept (want to keep 4 lanes)</td>
<td>• Repaint faded bike lanes and crosswalks (Now)&lt;br&gt;• Drop speed from 40 to 35 or lower to calm traffic&lt;br&gt;• Return to left turn only lane for freeway entrance. Thus right lane will be cars entering Santa Helena&lt;br&gt;• Don't want to share right turn lane with freeway (Caltrans will not change this)&lt;br&gt;• Roundabouts?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table ES-4: Community Walk Audit Summary (Lomas Santa Fe/ Highland Avenue and Walking Path)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Concerns from Community</th>
<th>Ideas from Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highland/Loma Santa Fe</td>
<td>• No path sol vista from villas on south side of LSF&lt;br&gt;• Speeds too high&lt;br&gt;• accident history?</td>
<td>• Roundabout please. Not expensive/fancy version needed&lt;br&gt;• Slow down traffic, fewer lanes&lt;br&gt;• Make wider bike lane and good safe sidewalks&lt;br&gt;• Beautify east corridor to make people want to slow down and enjoy&lt;br&gt;• DG trail on flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path on North side of Loma Santa Fe (West of Highland)</td>
<td>• People won't walk at night, they use golf cart path&lt;br&gt;• Lighting not an issue&lt;br&gt;• High visible crosswalk/REFB&lt;br&gt;• Dark-won't walk along corridor. Internal w/ community&lt;br&gt;• Space and speed of traffic</td>
<td>• Establish and improve DG path on Northside&lt;br&gt;• Add low lighting because more people may walk here at night&lt;br&gt;• Artwork and plantings are wonderfull&lt;br&gt;• Any improvements to each side of Lomas Santa Fe would be fair&lt;br&gt;• I walk with a 3 year old on south side to park to the east&lt;br&gt;• Medians favored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path on North side of Loma Santa Fe (West of Via Mil Cumbres)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mid-block crosswalk possible between Via Mil Cumbres &amp; Via Mil Cumbres/Las Banderas&lt;br&gt;• Clipboards for participants would be helpful next time&lt;br&gt;• Consider grass from the villas for cars&lt;br&gt;• San Andres-put in golf course crossing and median</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED FEATURES

1. High Visibility Crosswalk Striping
2. Bike Buffer
3. Bike Lane
4. Green Bike Lane Striping
5. Shift On-Street Parking
6. Signal for Split Crossing
7. Add Curb Ramp
8. Parking Buffer
9. New Benches at Fire Station

S. NARDO AVENUE
LOMAS SANTA FE DRIVE
PROPOSED FEATURES
1. Landscaped Median
2. Green Bike Lane Striping
3. Bike Buffer
4. Bike Lane
5. On-Street Parking
6. Parking Buffer
7. Replace Curb Ramp
SOLANA BEACH LOMAS SANTA FE CORRIDOR FEASIBILITY STUDY

PROPOSED FEATURES
1. School Zone Crosswalk Striping
2. Pocket Park with Walkways
3. Existing Trees
4. Bike Buffer
5. Green Bike Lane Striping
6. Replace and Install New Curb Ramps
PROPOSED FEATURES
1 Skyline Project Improvement
2 New School Access Left Turn Lane
3 New School Entrance
4 Right Turn Only Exit

SCHOOL DISTRICT PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
LOMAS SANTA FE DRIVE

1 Landscaped Median
2 Bike Lane
PROPOSED FEATURES

1. High Visibility Crosswalk Striping
2. Green Bike Lane Striping
3. Striped Buffer with Flexible Bollards
PROPOSED FEATURES
1. High Visibility Crosswalk Striping
2. Green Bike Lane Striping
SOLANA BEACH LOMAS SANTA FE CORRIDOR FEASIBILITY STUDY

PROPOSED FEATURES
1. High Visibility Crosswalk Striping
2. Protected Permissive Crossing
3. Signal - Lead Pedestrian Phasing North/South
4. Multi-use Paved Path
5. Parkway
6. Landscaped Median
7. Green Bike Lane Striping
8. Sidewalk
9. Bulbout with New Curb Ramps
SOLANA BEACH LOMAS SANTA FE CORRIDOR FEASIBILITY STUDY

PROPOSED FEATURES
1. Multi-use Soft Surface Path
2. Multi-use Paved Path
3. High Visibility Crosswalk Striping
4. Parkway
5. Green Bike Lane Striping
6. Sidewalk
7. New Pedestrian Crossing Signal
   *Retaining wall where needed to retain slope

MID-BLOCK CROSSING AT
POWERLINE EASEMENT
LOMAS SANTA FE DRIVE
STAFF REPORT
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT: City Clerk’s Office
SUBJECT: Climate Action Commission Appointment

BACKGROUND:

This item is before the City Council to discuss and appoint a community member to serve out the remainder of an existing term on the Climate Action Commission ("Commission"). Commission member Nicole Capretz has resigned from the Commission effective August 7, 2017. This position is designated for a professional from the scientific or environmental community with a term that will expire January 2018. This position may be filled by either a resident or non-resident of the City of Solana Beach.

Policy
Appointments to City Commissions and Committees are conducted in accordance with Council Policy No. 5 - Appointment of Private Citizens to Committees, Boards, Task Forces (Attachment 2). The Climate Action Commission’s appointments are made by Council-at-large. A majority vote of the City Council is required for appointment. As noted above, per Resolution 2015-127, residency within the City is not required for this environmental and/or scientific Commission member position.

DISCUSSION:

As per Resolution 2015-127, members of the Climate Action Commission are all appointed by the Council-at-large. Therefore, the appointment may be made by any Councilmember. The appointment would be filling an existing term that will expire January 2018.

Noticing
On August 10, 2017, the City Clerk’s department posted a Notice of Vacancy (Attachment 1), per Government Code 54974(a), with a deadline of September 1st, in an effort to refill the position and bring the Commission to full membership as quickly as possible. A list of recruitment efforts is listed in Attachment 3. As required, the Vacancy Notice was posted on the City’s bulletin board as well as submitted to the local Library for posting. In addition, the Notice was posted on the City’s website, advertised on craigslist, and an E-blast Notice was emailed out to subscribers.
Application Submittals
Two (2) applications were received by the deadline of September 1st. No additional applications were received after the deadline.

Applicants
An applicant status list (Attachment 4) will be provided to Council and posted online with this report as applications are received before the Council meeting.

CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:
Not a project as defined by CEQA.

FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

WORK PLAN: N/A

OPTIONS:
• Make an appointment to the vacancy.
• Extend the deadline for submittal of additional applications.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the City Council make one appointment (by Council-at-large) to the vacant professional position on the Climate Action Commission with a term expiration date of January 2018.

CITY MANAGER’S RECOMMENDATION:
Approve Department recommendation.

Gregory Wade, City Manager

Attachment:
1. Vacancy Notice
2. Council Policy No. 5
3. Recruitment Efforts
4. List of Applicants
PUBLIC NOTICE
City of Solana Beach
CITIZEN COMMISSION POSITION VACANCY

CITY OF SOLANA BEACH VOLUNTEERS SERVING ON BEHALF OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Applications are currently being accepted through Friday, September 1, 2017, 5:00 p.m.

CLIMATE ACTION COMMISSION
ONE Professional Position Vacancy – term will expire January 2018

Regular Meetings: 3rd Wednesday of each month at 5:30 p.m.

Requirements: One Member: At least 18 yrs old • Must be from the environmental or scientific community • Resident or Non-Resident

Current Composition: 8 appointed by Council At-Large (Residents & Professionals)
1 Councilmember

Staff Liaison: Dan King 858-720-2477

The Climate Action Commission participates in reviewing certain matters regarding reducing the City’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and implementing the Climate Action Plan.

The Climate Action Commission will focus on specific issues surrounding the implementation of a Climate Action Plan including updating the City’s Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory, setting reduction targets, implementing mitigation measures and performing periodic monitoring, verification and evaluations.

Attend a Citizen Commission public meeting. It is recommended that new applicants attend a Commission meeting prior to being considered for an appointment. Agendas are posted on the City’s website. See the City’s website for members, expiring positions, and further information.

Citizen Interest Forms (Applications) and additional information on the Commissions can be found on the City’s website at www.cityofsolanaenglish.org (left tabs: City Government, City Clerk, Citizen Committees) OR at City Hall, 635 S. Highway 101, Solana Beach, (858) 720-2400. Please contact the City Clerk with any questions regarding the recruitment/appointment process.
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

Policy No. 5

COUNCIL POLICY
Adopted: May 15, 1989
Revised: January 23, 2008 by
Resolution 2008-23

GENERAL SUBJECT: Citizen Boards, Commissions & Committees

SPECIFIC SUBJECT: Appointments of Citizens to Boards, Commissions, Committees and Task Forces.

PURPOSE:
The purpose of this policy is to establish a consistent process and procedure for appointments to City sponsored Citizen Boards, Commissions, Committees and Task Forces.

POLICY STATEMENT:
Appointments to Citizen Boards, Commissions, Committees and Task Forces are made in accordance with the municipal code and/or specific guideline, as provided, to provide consistency.

POLICY PROCEDURES:

1. All private citizens interested in serving on any Board, Commission, Committee or Task Force or similar group must complete and file with the City Clerk a Citizen Interest Form (application) which may be obtained from the City Clerk's office.

2. Nominations
Councilmembers may nominate private citizens for appointment subject to ratification by a majority of the City Council. Such ratification shall take place at a regular City Council meeting and a duly docketed agenda item.

3. Appointment Protocol
   a. Appointments will be made in accordance with municipal code requirements. For example, the municipal code may require that a Commission have five positions appointed by individual Councilmembers.

   b. Appointments that are not outlined in the municipal code and are at-large appointment positions may be nominated by any Councilmember. In the event of multiple appointments, appointments may be divided among individual Councilmembers to share the appointment responsibilities. If the appointments are
shared, it will be for that one time and will not be construed as official individual appointments that would carry forward.

c. The decision to proceed with an individual appointment alternative for at-large positions will be subject to majority vote of the City Council with such vote taking place at a regular City Council Meeting.

4. Appointments to Outside Agencies
When the City is asked by an outside agency to recommend a private citizen to serve on a Board, Commission, Committee or Task Force or similar group, such recommendation shall be made by the Council and approved by a majority vote of the City Council.
# Annual Appointments to Citizen Commissions

## Solicitation Efforts August 2017

### POSTINGS

| Notice Posted City Bulletin Board | 08-10-17 |
| Library Notice                   | 08-10-17 |

### PRINTED FLYERS

| City Hall Front Desk flyers      | 08-10-17 |
| Staff Liaisons: place hard copies flyer in mail box for distribution | 08-10-17 |

### WEBSITE

Notice posted on Commissions main webpage AND each Commission agenda webpage | 08-10-17 |

### EMAIL

E-Blasts | 08-13-17
Email Notice and Status Updates to Councilmembers | 08-10-17

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

City Council Meetings - Community Announcements | 08-23-17

### MAILINGS

| Environmental/Scientific (Professionals) | 08-22-17 |
Association for Women in Science, Environmental Health Coalition, Environmental Science Associates, ICLEI Local Govts for Sustainability, San Diego Foundation, San Diego Science Alliance, UCSD Environmental Studies, SCS Engineers, I Love a Clean San Diego,

### PUBLICATIONS

<p>| Union Tribune article | 08-21-17 |
| Craigslist - weekly postings | 8-17-17 |
|                          | 8-22-17 |
|                          | 8-29-17 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Application Received</th>
<th>Application Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Basore</td>
<td>8-21-17</td>
<td>New with 2 recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Martin</td>
<td>8-28-17</td>
<td>Re-submittal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT: Community Development
SUBJECT: Adopt (2nd Reading) Ordinance No. 480 adding Chapter 15.54 to the Solana Beach Municipal Code to Provide an Expedited Streamlined Permitting Process for Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

BACKGROUND:

On September 12, 2017, the City Council introduced Ordinance No. 480, with a change in the wording from “Building Official” to “Community Development Director”, and is now before Council for the second reading and adoption to add Chapter 15.54 to the Solana Beach Municipal Code to Provide an Expedited, Streamlined Permitting Process for Electric Vehicle Charging Systems.

Assembly Bill 1236, which amended Government Code Section 65850.7, requires jurisdictions with a population less than 200,000 residents to establish procedures for expedited, streamlined processes for permitting of electric vehicle charging stations. The amendments to Section 65850.7 include the requirement for a jurisdiction to adopt an ordinance for the expedited, streamlined process on or before September 30, 2017. The ordinance shall include the requirement that a jurisdiction adopt a checklist of requirements with which a permit application for an electric vehicle charging station will be eligible for expedited review.

This process includes the establishment of a checklist containing objective requirements for the installation of an electric vehicle charging station and a process for electronic submittal of permit applications. The content of the checklist requires the permit applicant to check the features of the existing electrical service such as rating in amperes, system voltage, connected or calculated load, spare capacity in amperes, voltage and ampere rating of the electric vehicle supply equipment, circuit rating of the electric vehicle supply equipment, location of the electric vehicle supply equipment, if

COUNCIL ACTION:

________________________________________

AGENDA ITEM C.4.
ventilation is/or is not required, and clearances of the charging equipment to comply with all applicable building and fire safety laws. Government Code Section 65850.7 requires that the City’s checklist may be based on the “Plug-In Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Permitting Checklist” of the “Zero-Emission Vehicles in California: Community Readiness Guidebook” of the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research.

Assembly Bill 1236 also clarifies that a jurisdiction shall not condition approval of a permit for an electric vehicle charging station based on the approval of a homeowners association as defined in California Civil Code Section 4080.

This item is before the City Council to adopt Ordinance No. 480 (Attachment 1) to provide an expedited, streamlined permitting process for electric vehicle charging stations as required by state law.

**DISCUSSION:**

Most of the procedures, such as electronic submittal of plans, are currently in place and would comply with the requirements of Assembly Bill 1236 because a similar bill (AB 1288) and Ordinance 456 (adopted September 2015) provides an expedited, streamlined permitting process for the installation of small residential rooftop solar systems.

Concurrent with Council’s adoption of this Ordinance, City Staff is taking measures to meet all requirements of Assembly Bill 1236 by September 30, 2017. This includes finalizing the application checklist in conjunction with the “Plug-In Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Permitting Checklist” of the “Zero-Emission Vehicles in California: Community Readiness Guidebook,” measures for electrical compliance, and standard items for fire prevention safety. Building Inspection Staff are also developing procedures for expedient and thorough inspection of the electric vehicle charging stations.

**CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:**

This Ordinance is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) pursuant to Section 15308 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines, which exempts actions taken by regulatory agencies for protection of the environment where the regulatory process provides procedures for protection of the environment. Also, there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, the Ordinance is exempt from the provisions of CEQA.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

No fiscal impact is anticipated as the review and inspection costs for electric vehicle charging stations would be recovered through existing building permit fees.
WORK PLAN: N/A

OPTIONS:

- Approve Staff recommendation.
- Provide alternative direction.

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt (2nd reading) Ordinance No. 480 to add Chapter 15.54 to the Solana Beach Municipal Code to Provide an Expedited, Streamlined Permitting Process for Electric Vehicle Charging Systems.

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Department Recommendation.

[Signature]
Gregory Wade, City Manager

Attachments:

1. Ordinance No. 480
2. AB 1236
ORDINANCE NO. 480

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLANA BEACH, CALIFORNIA ADDING CHAPTER 15.54 TO THE SOLANA BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE TO PROVIDE AN EXPEDITED, STREAMLINED PERMITTING PROCESS FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING SYSTEMS

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Solana Beach seeks to implement AB 1236 (California Government Code Section 65850.7) which requires local agencies to adopt an ordinance that creates an expedited and streamlined permitting process for electric vehicle charging systems; and

WHEREAS, the creation of an expedited, streamlined permitting process for electric vehicle charging stations would facilitate convenient charging of electric vehicles and help reduce the City's reliance on environmentally damaging fossil fuels; and

WHEREAS, it is in the interest of the health, welfare and safety of the people of the City of Solana Beach to provide an expedited permitting process to assure the effective deployment of electric vehicle charging systems.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Solana Beach hereby ordains as follows:

Section 1. All of the above statements are true; and

Section 2. Chapter 15.54 of the Solana Beach Municipal Code is hereby added to read as follows:

CHAPTER 15.54
ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING SYSTEMS

15.54.010 Purpose.

The purpose of this Chapter is to adopt an expedited, streamlined electric vehicle charging station permitting process that complies with AB 1236 (Chapter 598, Statutes 2015) to achieve timely and cost-effective installations of electric vehicle charging stations. The provisions of this Chapter encourage the use of electric vehicle charging stations by removing unreasonable barriers, minimizing costs to property owners and the City, and expanding the ability of property owners to install electric vehicle charging stations. The provisions of this Chapter further allow the City to achieve these goals while protecting the public's health, welfare and safety.

15.54.020 Applicability.

A. This Chapter applies to the permitting of all electric vehicle charging station systems in the City.

B. Electric vehicle charging station systems legally established or permitted prior to the effective date of this Chapter are not subject to the requirements of this Chapter unless physical modifications or alterations are undertaken that materially change the size, type, or components of an electric vehicle charging station system. Routine operation and maintenance or like-kind replacements of electric vehicle charging stations shall not require a permit.
15.54.030 Definitions.

A. "Electric vehicle charging station" or "charging station" means any level of electric vehicle supply equipment station that is designed and built in compliance with Article 625 of the California Electrical Code, as it reads on the effective date of this Chapter, and delivers electricity from a source outside an electric vehicle into a plug-in electric vehicle.

B. "Electronic submittal" means the utilization of one or more of the following:

1. Electronic mail or email.
2. The internet.
3. Facsimile.

C. "Specific, adverse impact" means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified, and written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete.

15.54.040 Electric Vehicle Charging Station System Requirements.

A. All electric vehicle charging station systems shall meet applicable health and safety standards and requirements imposed by the state and the California Building Standards Codes, as adopted and amended by the City.

B. Electric vehicle charging station systems shall meet all applicable safety and performance standards established by the California Electrical Code, the Society of Automotive Engineers, the National Electrical Manufacturers association, and accredited testing laboratories such as Underwriters Laboratories and, rules of Public Utilities Commission regarding safety and reliability.

15.54.050 Expedited Permitting Process.

A. All documents required for the submission of an expedited electric vehicle charging station system application shall be made available on the publicly accessible City website.

B. Electronic submittal of the required permit application and documents by email, the Internet, or facsimile shall be made available to all electric vehicle charging station system permit applicants.

C. The electric vehicle charging station system permit process, and checklist(s) shall substantially conform to recommendations for expedited permitting, including the "Plug-In Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Permitting Checklist" contained in the most current version of the Zero-Emission Vehicles in California: Community Readiness Guidebook published the Office of Planning and Research.

D. Prior to submitting an application for processing, the applicant shall verify that the installation of an electric vehicle charging station will not have specific, adverse impact to public health and safety and building occupants. Verification by the applicant includes but is not limited to: electrical system capacity and loads; electrical system wiring, bonding and overcurrent
protection; building infrastructure affected by charging station equipment and associated conduits; areas of charging station equipment and vehicle parking.

E. The permit application and associated documentation may be submitted to the building department in person, by mail, or by electronic submittal together with required permit processing and inspection fees. In the case of electronic submittal, the electronic signature of the applicant on all forms, applications, and other documents may be used in lieu of a wet signature.

15.54.060 Permit Review Requirements.

A. The Community Development Director shall administratively approve an application to install electric vehicle charging stations through issuance of a building permit or similar nondiscretionary permit.

B. Review of the application shall be limited to the Community Development Director’s review of whether the application meets local, state, and federal health and safety requirements.

C. If an application is deemed incomplete, a written correction notice detailing all deficiencies in the application and any additional information or documentation required to be eligible for expedited permit issuance shall be sent to the applicant for resubmission.

D. Upon confirmation by the Community Development Director of the application and supporting documentation being complete and meeting the requirements of the eligibility checklist, the Community Development Director shall administratively approve the application and issue all required permits or authorizations. Such approval does not authorize an applicant to energize or utilize the electric vehicle charging station until approval is granted by the City.

E. The Community Development Director may require an applicant to apply for a conditional use permit, to be issued by the community development director pursuant to SBMC 17.68.010, if the official finds, based on substantial evidence, that the electric vehicle charging station system could have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health and safety.

F. If a conditional use permit is required, the City may deny an application for the use permit if the City makes written findings based upon substantive evidence in the record that the proposed installation would have a specific, adverse impact upon public health or safety and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid, as defined, the adverse impact. Such findings shall include the basis for the rejection of the potential feasible alternative for preventing the adverse impact.

G. Any condition imposed on an application shall be designed to mitigate the specific, adverse impact upon health and safety at the lowest possible cost.

H. The City shall not condition approval of an application on the approval of an association, as defined in Section 4080 of the California Civil Code.

I. Decisions regarding an electric vehicle charging station system permit application may be appealed to the City Council.
Section 3. The City Council finds that this Ordinance is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") pursuant to Section 15308 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, which exempts actions taken by regulatory agency for protection of the environment where the regulatory process provides procedures for protection of the environment. The City Council further finds that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment and that therefore, pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, the Ordinance is exempt from the provisions of CEQA.

Section 4. Severability. If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this Chapter, or its application to any person or circumstance, is for any reason held to be invalid or unenforceable, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remaining sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases of this Chapter, or its application to any other person or circumstance. The City Council declares that it would have adopted each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase hereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more other sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases hereof be declared invalid or unenforceable.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This Ordinance shall be effective thirty (30) days after its adoption. Within fifteen (15) days after its adoption, the City Clerk of the City of Solana Beach shall cause this Ordinance to be published pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 36933.

INTRODUCED AND FIRST READ at a special meeting of the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, on the 12th day of September, 2017; and

THEREAFTER ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California, on the 27th day of September, 2017, by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers –
NOES: Councilmembers –
ABSTAIN: Councilmembers –
ABSENT: Councilmembers –

MIKE NICHOLS, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM: ATTEST:

JOHANNA N. CANLAS, City Attorney ANGELA IVEY, City Clerk
Assembly Bill No. 1236

CHAPTER 598

An act to add Section 65850.7 to the Government Code, relating to local ordinances.

[ Approved by Governor October 08, 2015. Filed with Secretary of State October 08, 2015. ]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 1236, Chiu. Local ordinances: electric vehicle charging stations.

The Planning and Zoning Law, among other things, requires the legislative body of each county and city to adopt a general plan for the physical development of the county or city and authorizes the adoption and administration of zoning laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations by counties and cities. Existing law, the Electric Vehicle Charging Stations Open Access Act, prohibits the charging of a subscription fee on persons desiring to use an electric vehicle charging station, as defined, and prohibits a requirement for persons to obtain membership in any club, association, or organization as a condition of using the station, except as specified.

The bill would require a city, county, or city and county to approve an application for the installation of electric vehicle charging stations, as defined, through the issuance of specified permits unless the city or county makes specified written findings based upon substantial evidence in the record that the proposed installation would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety, and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact. The bill would provide for appeal of that decision to the planning commission, as specified. The bill would provide that the implementation of consistent statewide standards to achieve the timely and cost-effective installation of electric vehicle charging stations is a matter of statewide concern. The bill would require electric vehicle charging stations to meet specified standards. The bill would require a city, county, or city and county with a population of 200,000 or more residents to adopt an ordinance, by September 30, 2016, that creates an expedited and streamlined permitting process for electric vehicle charging stations, as specified. The bill would require a city, county, or city and county with a population of less than 200,000 residents to adopt this ordinance by September 30, 2017. The bill would authorize the city, county, or city and county, in developing the ordinance, to refer to guidelines contained in a specified guidebook. The bill would also authorize the adoption of an ordinance that modifies the checklists and standards found in the guidebook due to unique conditions. By increasing the duties of local officials, this bill would create a state-mandated local program.

ATTACHMENT 2

https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB1236

8/21/2017
The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

Vote: majority  Appropriation: no  Fiscal Committee: yes  Local Program: yes

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 65850.7 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65850.7. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) The implementation of consistent statewide standards to achieve the timely and cost-effective installation of electric vehicle charging stations is not a municipal affair, as that term is used in Section 5 of Article XI of the California Constitution, but is instead a matter of statewide concern.

(2) It is the intent of the Legislature that local agencies not adopt ordinances that create unreasonable barriers to the installation of electric vehicle charging stations and not unreasonably restrict the ability of homeowners and agricultural and business concerns to install electric vehicle charging stations.

(3) It is the policy of the state to promote and encourage the use of electric vehicle charging stations and to limit obstacles to their use.

(4) It is the intent of the Legislature that local agencies comply not only with the language of this section, but also the legislative intent to encourage the installation of electric vehicle charging stations by removing obstacles to, and minimizing costs of, permitting for charging stations so long as the action does not supersede the building official's authority to identify and address higher priority life-safety situations.

(b) A city, county, or city and county shall administratively approve an application to install electric vehicle charging stations through the issuance of a building permit or similar nondiscretionary permit. Review of the application to install an electric vehicle charging station shall be limited to the building official's review of whether it meets all health and safety requirements of local, state, and federal law. The requirements of local law shall be limited to those standards and regulations necessary to ensure that the electric vehicle charging station will not have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety. However, if the building official of the city, county, or city and county makes a finding, based on substantial evidence, that the electric vehicle charging station could have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety, the city, county, or city and county may require the applicant to apply for a use permit.

(c) A city, county, or city and county may not deny an application for a use permit to install an electric vehicle charging station unless it makes written findings based upon substantial evidence in the record that the proposed installation would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety, and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact. The findings shall include the basis for the rejection of potential feasible alternatives of preventing the adverse impact.

(d) The decision of the building official pursuant to subdivisions (b) and (c) may be appealed to the planning commission of the city, county, or city and county.

(e) Any conditions imposed on an application to install an electric vehicle charging station shall be designed to mitigate the specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety at the lowest cost possible.

(f) (1) An electric vehicle charging station shall meet applicable health and safety standards and requirements imposed by state and local permitting authorities.

(2) An electric vehicle charging station shall meet all applicable safety and performance standards established by the California Electrical Code, the Society of Automotive Engineers, the National Electrical Manufacturers...
(g) (1) On or before September 30, 2016, every city, county, or city and county with a population of 200,000 or more residents, and, on or before September 30, 2017, every city, county, or city and county with a population of less than 200,000 residents, shall, in consultation with the local fire department or district and the utility director, if the city, county, or city and county operates a utility, adopt an ordinance, consistent with the goals and intent of this section, that creates an expedited, streamlined permitting process for electric vehicle charging stations. In developing an expedited permitting process, the city, county, or city and county shall adopt a checklist of all requirements with which electric vehicle charging stations shall comply to be eligible for expedited review. An application that satisfies the information requirements in the checklist, as determined by the city, county, or city and county, shall be deemed complete. Upon confirmation by the city, county, or city and county of the application and supporting documents being complete and meeting the requirements of the checklist, and consistent with the ordinance, a city, county, or city and county shall, consistent with subdivision (b), approve the application and issue all required permits or authorizations. However, the city, county, or city and county may establish a process to prioritize competing applications for expedited permits. Upon receipt of an incomplete application, a city, county, or city and county shall issue a written correction notice detailing all deficiencies in the application and any additional information required to be eligible for expedited permit issuance. An application submitted to a city, county, or city and county that owns and operates an electric utility shall demonstrate compliance with the utility's interconnection policies prior to approval.

(2) The checklist and required permitting documentation shall be published on a publicly accessible Internet Web site, if the city, county, or city and county has an Internet Web site, and the city, county, or city and county shall allow for electronic submittal of a permit application and associated documentation, and shall authorize the electronic signature on all forms, applications, and other documentation in lieu of a wet signature by an applicant. In developing the ordinance, the city, county, or city and county may refer to the recommendations contained in the most current version of the "Plug-In Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Permitting Checklist" of the "Zero-Emission Vehicles in California: Community Readiness Guidebook" published by the Office of Planning and Research. A city, county, or city and county may adopt an ordinance that modifies the checklists and standards found in the guidebook due to unique climatic, geological, seismological, or topographical conditions. If a city, county, or city and county determines that it is unable to authorize the acceptance of an electronic signature on all forms, applications, and other documents in lieu of a wet signature by an applicant, the city, county, or city and county shall state, in the ordinance required under this subdivision, the reasons for its inability to accept electronic signatures and acceptance of an electronic signature shall not be required.

(h) A city, county, or city and county shall not condition approval for any electric vehicle charging station permit on the approval of an electric vehicle charging station by an association, as that term is defined in Section 4080 of the Civil Code.

(i) The following definitions shall apply to this section:

(1) "A feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact" includes, but is not limited to, any cost-effective method, condition, or mitigation imposed by a city, county, or city and county on another similarly situated application in a prior successful application for a permit.

(2) "Electronic submittal" means the utilization of one or more of the following:

(A) Email.

(B) The Internet.

(C) Facsimile.

(3) "Electric vehicle charging station" or "charging station" means any level of electric vehicle supply equipment station that is designed and built in compliance with Article 625 of the California Electrical Code, as it reads on the effective date of this section, and delivers electricity from a source outside an electric vehicle into a plug-in electric vehicle.
(4) "Specific, adverse impact" means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified, and written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete.

SEC. 2. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code.
TO: Honorable Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Gregory Wade, City Manager
MEETING DATE: September 27, 2017
ORIGINATING DEPT: City Clerk Dept.
SUBJECT: Establishment of a Solana Beach - Del Mar Council Standing Committee

BACKGROUND:
At the conclusion of the City Council meeting on September 12, 2017, Mayor Nichols requested that an item be placed on a future Council Agenda to discuss the possibility of establishing a Standing Committee consisting of two Council Members each from the cities of Solana Beach and Del Mar that could discuss and address items of mutual interest to each city.

This item is before City Council to consider the establishment of a Solana Beach - Del Mar Council Standing Committee ("Standing Committee").

DISCUSSION:
Staff recommends that the City Council consider and discuss the establishment of this Standing Committee, which would consist of two Councilmembers from each City Council to discuss and address items of mutual interest to each city. The Committee could also provide specific recommendations or reports to each City Council as needed to advise the respective City Councils.

Council Standing Committees are composed of members of the legislative body that are less than a quorum of the body and do not require regularly scheduled meetings and may meet as necessary. However, meetings must comply with all noticing and posting provisions required under the Ralph M. Brown Act (Govt. Code section 54950, et seq.), and meetings are open to the public.

CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT: N/A

COUNCIL ACTION:

AGENDA ITEM C.5.
FISCAL IMPACT: N/A

WORKPLAN: N/A

OPTIONS:

• Approve Staff recommendation and consider the establishment of a Standing Committee and the appointment of its members.
• Approve Staff recommendation with alternative amendments / modifications.
• Provide direction / feedback

DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council:


2. Consider the appointment of two Councilmembers to serve on the Standing Committee.

CITY MANAGER’S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve Department Recommendation.

Gregory Wade, City Manager

Attachments:

1. Resolution 2017-148
2. Council Policy #2
RESOLUTION 2017-148

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLANA BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ESTABLISHING THE SOLANA BEACH-DEL MAR COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE.

WHEREAS, in an effort to better the communication between the City of Solana Beach and the City of Del Mar; and

WHEREAS, to discuss and address items of mutual interest to each City; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council discussed establishing the Solana Beach-Del Mar Council Standing Committee.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, California does hereby resolve as follows:

1. That the above recitations are true and correct.

2. To hereby establish the Del Mar Relations Council Standing Committee as follows:

a. Purpose: To discuss and address items of mutual interest to each city.

b. Membership: Membership of the Committee shall include two Council members.

c. Term: The term of this committee shall continue until disbanded by the City Council. The status of the committee shall be reviewed on an annual basis by the City Council.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Solana Beach, held this 27th day of September, 2017, by the following vote:

AYES:   Councilmembers-
NOES:   Councilmembers-
ABSTAIN:   Councilmembers-
ABSENT:  Councilmembers-

_________________________________________
MIKE NICHOLS, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ATTEST:

JOHANNA CANLAS, City Attorney

_________________________________________
ANGELA IVEY, City Clerk

ATTACHMENT 1
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH
Policy No. 2

COUNCIL POLICY
Date Issued: January 19, 1988
Revised: January 23, 2008 by Resolution 2008-22

GENERAL SUBJECT: Boards, Commissions & Committees

SPECIFIC SUBJECT: Appointments of Councilmembers to Boards, Commissions and Committees

PURPOSE
The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines for appointment of Councilmembers to various Boards, Commissions and Committees.

- Council Regional Committees – not established by this Council.
- Council Standing Committees – established by the City Council.
- Council Ad Hoc Committees – established by the City Council.

POLICY

I. Regional Boards, Commissions or Committees (Outside Agencies)

1. The City Council shall divide appointments of the various Boards, Commissions or Committees so that all Councilmembers share in the representation on outside agencies.
2. The appointment shall be made by vote of at least three members of the City Council.
3. Appointments shall be made only at regularly scheduled Council Meetings.
4. Appointments shall generally be for a term of two years unless the regulations of the body to which the appointment is made requires a different term.
5. Appointments will be reviewed bi-annually in even numbered years to address expiring terms. This cycle is tied into the November Election cycle in consideration of Council reorganization.
6. When appointments are required at a different time than the even numbered year cycle, the appointments will follow the two year term, unless it is changed by Council reorganizations.
7. These guidelines do not prevent Council from annual reviews and changes at any other time, as determined by Council.

II. Council Standing Committees
(City sponsored committees that are ongoing and permanent in nature).

1. Council shall make appointments to Standing Committees sharing
the responsibility among the members.

2. The appointment shall be made by vote of a majority of the City Council.

3. Council shall make appointments to Standing Committees for a two year term.

4. Appointments will be reviewed bi-annually in even numbered years to address expiring terms. This cycle is tied into the November Election cycle in consideration of Council reorganization.

5. When appointments are required at a different time than the even numbered year cycle, the appointments will follow the two year term, unless it is changed by Council reorganizations.

6. These guidelines do not prevent Council from annual reviews and changes at any other time, as determined by Council.

III. Council Ad Hoc Committees
(City sponsored committees that are temporary and are not intended to have a permanent existence).

1. Council shall make appointments to Ad Hoc Committees sharing the responsibility among the members.

2. The appointment shall be made by vote of a majority of the City Council.

3. The term of an appointment shall be for the duration of the Ad Hoc Committee, unless Council majority changes the appointment prior to the expiration of the committee.

IV. A Councilmember may serve any number of terms.

V. If a Councilmember chooses to relinquish an appointment during a term, the alternate shall serve as the regular appointee for the remainder of the term, unless a new appointment is made by the Council majority.

VI. The City Clerk shall maintain a list of Boards, Commissions or Committees with the meeting time and locations. The City Clerk shall periodically advise the Council of vacancies on all Boards, Commission and Committees.