

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter - State Clearinghouse, Scott Morgan</b>	
		No response needed. This letter confirms receipt of the document and distribution to appropriate agencies.
	<b>Letter 1 - Ralph Peck</b>	
1-1	Says that Government Code 65852 requires consistent zoning; and how can the proposed Village Specific Plan allow various uses in one zone type?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The uniformity requirement of Government Code section 65852 requires uniformity as to uses within a zone. The uniformity requirement is intended to prevent unreasonable discrimination against or benefit to particular properties within a given zone. Development regulations within a zone may differ provided there is reasonable and rational justification related to a legitimate public purpose for the differences.
1-2	Asks: What legal authority does the City have to offer incentives to private development for uses other than affordable housing and childcare centers?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The City derives its land use authority from its police powers under the California Constitution. The State Planning and Land Use regulations (California Government Code sections 65800 – 65912) are not specific grants of authority but are intended to provide minimum standards to be observed in local zoning regulations. Cities have specific authority under their land use powers to enact supplementary substantive, as well as, procedural regulations not inconsistent with State law. Government Code section 65917 is part of the State density bonus law the purpose of which is to encourage the development of affordable housing. Incentive zoning is commonly utilized to encourage the provision of public benefits through the provision of incentives. State law does not restrict the use of incentive zoning to affordable housing.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<b>Letter 2 - Derek, ITI Corporation</b>	
2-1	Says that a before Plan/after Plan illustration shows that parking places will be replaced by walkways and vegetation. States that: The last thing we need is less parking.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR as parking is not an environmental issue. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan adds approximately 60 public parking stalls along Camino del Mar and parking is not reduced. The Before/After Illustration on page II-14 in the Plan's Chapter 2, The Visions of the Village, illustrates the expansion of sidewalks and pedestrian amenities, which relocates the existing angled parking. The existing angled parking is retained by moving it easterly and is clearly shown in the illustration and described in the caption that accompanies the illustration. Areas that are not large enough for parking or too close to crosswalks can be used for additional landscape areas that provide storm water management.
2-2	Requests that walkways be uniform and contiguous; and that restaurants should be allowed to use portions of the sidewalk for tables.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. A major goal of the Plan is to redesign Camino del Mar to provide uniform and contiguous sidewalks in the Plan area. The implementing strategy to accomplish this goal is described in Chapter II, Section 2.5 Fulfilling the Vision, and again in Chapter IV, Section 4.2.2 Pedestrian Implementation Strategies. Chapter 23.30 of the Del Mar Municipal Code (DMMC) regulates the use of the public right-of-way for Sidewalk Cafes. The Plan will not change this chapter of the DMMC. The Plan encourages the implementation of sidewalk cafes in the Village.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
<b>Letter 3 - Gregory Beckham</b>		
3-1	Requests that commercial development be limited so as to not burden residents ... and that revenue should continue to be sourced from the fairgrounds and hotels, not Village commercial activity.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan contains strategies to protect residential neighborhoods adjacent to commercial development. These are described in Chapter III Protection of Community Resources, Chapter IV Mobility, and Chapter VII Parking. The City relies on a diversity of revenue sources for funding City services.
<b>Letter 4 - Don Cordt</b>		
4-1	Observes that Camino del Mar acts as Interstate 5 bypass during accidents/blockage and asks how this increased traffic will be handled.	The commenter makes the statement that Camino del Mar is used as a bypass for regional traffic using Interstate 5 when there is an accident or other blockage. When these events occur, the delays on Camino del Mar can be very long. In comparing the existing configuration of Camino del Mar (four lanes with stop signs) to the Plan proposal (two lanes with roundabouts), analysis shows that the proposed Plan's configuration for Camino del Mar provides more capacity than the existing configuration even though there would be a reduction in the number of lanes. Therefore, when accidents occur on Interstate 5, Camino del Mar would operate better under the Plan's proposed changes to Camino del Mar than it would if there were no changes to Camino del Mar.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
4-2	Questions how emergency vehicles on Camino del Mar will use the proposed single lane during normal traffic and fair traffic.	<p>City staff consulted with emergency responders during development of the conceptual plan for the two-lane with roundabouts configuration of Camino del Mar. Police and fire protection/emergency medical service providers have reviewed the conceptual plan and have provided their initial input. A memorandum from Del Mar Fire Chief Henry conveys that the operational effectiveness of the planned configuration of Camino del Mar (two lanes with roundabouts). Chief Henry stated that roundabouts are preferred to stop signs by emergency responders because roundabouts have the potential to decrease response times by eliminating the congestion at stop signs. The Fire Marshal also demonstrated that emergency equipment can readily negotiate around similar roundabouts. That video is posted at <a href="http://delmar2.12milesout.com/Special/SpecificPlan-Feb2012.aspx">http://delmar2.12milesout.com/Special/SpecificPlan-Feb2012.aspx</a></p> <p>The conceptual cross section proposed for the two-lane with roundabouts configuration of Camino del Mar includes provision of a 20-foot buffer area behind the diagonal parking stalls which would allow cars to back out of the stall and align with traffic flow before merging into the travel lane. This buffer area would also provide the needed clearance for emergency vehicles to bypass any stopped vehicles, or for vehicles to pull over to allow an emergency vehicle to pass. Detailed engineering plans will refine the conceptual design to ensure this area is adequate to meet safety concerns.</p>
4-3	Asks: Can the proposed four roundabouts handle traffic better than two at 15th and 9 <sup>th</sup> Streets?	<p>The Plan proposal for two-lanes with roundabouts at each key intersection along the two-lane road segment (i.e., at 9<sup>th</sup> Street, 11<sup>th</sup> Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Street and 15<sup>th</sup> Street) is proposed in order to increase capacity at intersections beyond either what the stop controls currently allow at these intersections and beyond what only two roundabouts (at 15<sup>th</sup> Street and 9<sup>th</sup> Street) could handle.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
4-4	Asks: Why was a diagonal pedestrian crossing for 15th Street and Camino del Mar not considered as an alternative?	Allowing for pedestrians to cross diagonally from all four corners at one time (also called a pedestrian scramble) was considered at the intersection of 15th Street and Camino del Mar. Diagonal pedestrian crossing would require intersection controls such as stop signs or traffic signals. The City ultimately selected a roundabout at 15th Street and Camino del Mar based on the desire to provide balanced pedestrian, vehicular traffic, and parking improvements. Proposed pedestrian crossings at this intersection would include perpendicular crosswalks with flashers, as described in PEIR Section 3.3.3.2. Alternative configurations of Camino del Mar with stop signs and/or traffic signals that could allow diagonal pedestrian crossings are addressed in Chapter 9 of the Plan. However, diagonal pedestrian crossings would not reduce or avoid a significant impact of the proposed Plan and were therefore not analyzed specifically in the PEIR alternatives analysis (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6).
4-5	Considers existing sidewalk widths as adequate and asks: Why not expand seating and landscaped areas, eliminating a few parking spaces while retaining four or three lanes of traffic like Encinitas?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The sidewalks on both sides of Camino del Mar between 9th and 13th Streets consist of a variety of paved and unpaved surfaces. Some sections are located on private property and some sections are within the public right-of-way. The pedestrian is required to weave between parked cars, use stairs and walk on the shoulder of the roadway in some places because sidewalks do not exist. The City Council has directed that contiguous and continuous sidewalks be developed within the public right of way that average 10 feet wide and meet the standards of the Americans with Disability Act (ADA). During the course of the Plan development, the four-lane configuration was analyzed. With stop signs, the four-lane configuration has more environmental impacts and carries less traffic volume than two lanes with roundabouts.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
4-6	Opines that any pedestrian and open space improvements will attract visitors and locals as long as a parking garage is built	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. A parking garage that will provide additional public parking is proposed in the Plan for the City Hall Site. The implementing strategies for the City Hall site are described in the Plan's Chapter XI Special Study Areas.
<b>Letter 5 - Louise Keeling</b>		
5-1	Supports second story apartments allowing middle/low income residents	The commenter is noting support for the inclusion of residential units within the second story of the development along Camino del Mar. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; the comment is noted.
5-2	Supports roundabout concept, but indicates "three" might be excessive.	The commenter is noting support for the incorporation of roundabouts along Camino del Mar, but includes an opinion that three may be too many. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR but rather elements of the proposed Plan. The proposed Plan includes four roundabouts, which are to be located at 9 <sup>th</sup> , 11 <sup>th</sup> , 13 <sup>th</sup> , and 15 <sup>th</sup> Streets along Camino del Mar. This roadway configuration was concluded, through previous traffic analysis, to be the most effective at maintaining consistent traffic flow.
5-3	Supports wider sidewalks and pedestrian orientation.	The commenter is noting support for the incorporation of wider sidewalks and a focus on pedestrian orientation. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR and the comment is noted.
5-4	Fears that allowing a 26 foot height limit and eliminating side yard setbacks along the entire west side of Camino del Mar will create a wall effect.	Comment noted. Visual impacts of the Plan were addressed in PEIR (Section 4.1) and were determined to be less than significant. The current development standards in the Central Commercial zone do not require side yard setbacks. The Plan does not propose to change this existing development standard. All proposed development will require design review, which will evaluate the siting of structures, the relationship of structures with adjacent structures, views and other aspects of building design that might create an undesirable wall effect. Thresholds have also been established in the Plan to review cumulative height by block over the life of the plan. The Plan also provides incentives to encourage public view corridors.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
5-5	Observes that new development of commercial properties will have to undergo design review, but questions if the design Review Board would be compelled by the proposed Village Specific Plan to allow each to be 26 feet high?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The proposed Plan would allow for all buildings along Camino del Mar to be up to 26 feet tall. In addition, on sloping sites, the 50-foot wide zone adjacent to the residential zones would be restricted to 26 feet tall. All proposed development will require design review, which is regulated by Chapter 23.08 of the Del Mar Municipal Code (DMMC). The review criteria in the Design Review Ordinance require the Design Review Board to not allow a proposed project to unreasonably encroach upon the primary scenic views of neighboring properties. In addition, the City Council has directed that the Design Review Ordinance be modified to better address view blockage and building height issues for commercial building design in the Village.
5-6	Requests that the Plan encourage adobe-style shops.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR but rather expresses a preference for adobe-style architecture. The Plan includes strategies for the protection, restoration and adaptive reuse of buildings with strong architectural character such as the adobe-style shops referenced in this comment. These Plan strategies are listed in Chapter III, Section 3.2.2 Historical Resources and Architectural Character Implementation Strategies.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
5-7	Requests that the proposed Plan allow space between buildings to preserve ocean views.	The Plan’s potential to block ocean views is analyzed in Section 4.1.4.1 of the PEIR and is based on a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA). That analysis determined that potential ocean view blockage associated with Plan implementation would be less than significant in consideration of the comprehensive view protection standards already contained in the City’s Municipal Code, specifically its Design Review Ordinance. In addition, the Plan includes new street side-yard setbacks and corner setbacks to preserve and enhance ocean views along the east-west street corridors. Also, the draft Plan was revised to add incentives to preserve existing or create new view corridors. These new Plan standards and incentives are contained Chapter VI, Allowed Uses and Development Standards.
<b>Letter 6 - George Conkwright</b>		
6-1	States that "Park Once is socialism" and that property owners/developers will not deed their private parking to the City ... and that instead they will develop elsewhere.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The "Park Once" strategy does not require property owners/developers to deed their private property to the City. This strategy instead offers the property owner/developer the option of 1) providing the number of parking spaces currently required by the DMMC or 2) providing a lesser number of parking spaces if the general public is allowed to use the parking spaces in a shared manner. This strategy is described in the Plan’s Chapter VII Parking, Section 7.2 Specific Plan Parking Alternatives.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
6-2	Comments that the Plan should require commercial property owners that are deficient in parking to help fund a public parking garage.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; and is noted as the author's opinion. The most viable options for financing the public improvement and the anticipated revenue sources for paying for the public improvements are included in the Public Finance Chapter IX of the Plan.
6-3	Opines that under-parked properties will lose out on redevelopment potential.	Comment noted.
6-4	Requests that the 1:90 parking standard for restaurants be revised to a ratio more competitive with other cities.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The "Park Once" strategy in the Plan provides for an alternative parking ratio of one/half of the parking ratio currently required for restaurants in the DMMC.
6-5	Requests that parking requirements for outside seating on private property be waived.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Both the current Del Mar Municipal Code and the "Park Once" strategy of the Plan require that parking be provided for restaurant's outdoor dining seating on private property, as it is a use of that property. The draft Plan has been refined to categorize retail food establishments (such as delis or bakeries that do not offer table service) as retail establishments and allow these outdoor seating areas to be parked at the same ratio as retail uses. This is per Chapter VI, section 6.4.7.3, of the Plan.
6-6	Requests: Allow the Urban Land Institute methodology of calculating peak-hour parking demand to be applied to individual properties.	The City of Del Mar retained a qualified traffic engineering firm and retains a qualified City Engineer to analyze parking demand for the Plan. The proposed parking requirements and parking ratios in the Plan ("Park Once" strategy) is based upon a principal similar to the Urban Land Institute methodology but is tailored to the unique mix of uses and locational situation of Del Mar. This strategy is described in the Parking Chapter VII of the Plan, in Section 7.2 Specific Plan Parking Alternatives.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
6-7	Requests that the Plan allow curbside parking spaces along a building's frontage to be included as part of that property's parking inventory.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; and the comment is noted. The "Park Once" strategy in the Plan maintains the inventory of curbside parking spaces along a building's frontage as public parking.
<b>Letter 7 - Gregory Beckham</b>		
7-1	States that the Village has never looked or functioned better. Does not feel a change is needed; and that instead the City should focus its efforts on cleaning up City Hall.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; and the comment is noted. Staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Traffic congestion on Camino del Mar continues to increase every year due to increased development in surrounding communities. In addition, many buildings in the Village (Plan area) do not meet the demands and needs of retail tenants and have difficulty competing with surrounding retail centers. The redevelopment of the City Hall property is discussed in Chapter XI, Section 11.1 Civic Center Site, of the Plan.
<b>Letter 8 - Ivan Gayler and David Winkler</b>		
8-1	Requests inclusion of the parcel located at 1435 Camino del Mar, APN# 300-03-82, into the Village Specific Plan.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Village Specific Plan includes the referenced parcel.
<b>Letter 9 - Rick Hoffman</b>		
9-1	Observes that revitalization around a pedestrian experience requires a diverse retail atmosphere (restaurants, clothing shops, sporting goods, jewelry, spas...), including smaller-scale offices.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Horizontal Zoning regulations in the Del Mar Municipal Code do not allow for the establishment of real estate offices in street frontage building spaces.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 10 - Lucy Eskeland</b>	
10-1	Generally supports the proposed Plan.	The comment is noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.
10-2	Supports roundabouts, but is not sure they will lessen traffic. Supports the argument that they are better than traffic signals and stop signs.	The commenter has noted general support of the inclusion of roundabouts, though expresses concern regarding their effects on traffic. As indicated in PEIR Section 4.14.4, roundabouts would not lessen traffic (i.e., reduce the number of vehicles traveling) on Camino del Mar but would reduce delay and queuing that is currently experienced with the stop signs/signals along Camino del Mar. Roundabouts would provide greater operational capacity because vehicles would be able to circulate through the intersections without coming to a complete stop.
10-3	Supports wider sidewalks.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.
10-4	Supports a building height limit of 30 feet as long as the resulting buildings do not obstruct views from residential homes and restaurants, nor effect privacy of surrounding neighbors.	The commenter is noting support of the draft Plan's proposed building height limit of 30 feet provided that public views are not obstructed and privacy is not affected. View impacts are analyzed in PEIR Section 4.1.4.1 and were found to be less than significant. Privacy is not an environmental issue and was not specifically addressed in the PEIR. However, it should be noted that the design review of proposed projects on commercial properties is regulated by Chapter 23.08 of the Del Mar Municipal Code. The review criteria in Chapter 23.08 requires the Design Review Board to not approve a proposed project that unreasonably encroaches upon the primary scenic views of neighboring properties or creates an unreasonable invasion of the privacy of neighboring properties. It should also be noted that the draft Plan has been revised to reduce the proposed 30-foot building height to 26 feet.
10-5	States that adding more trees and planters will definitely enhance the beauty of the City.	Comment noted. The Plan proposes to redesign Camino del Mar that will allow the addition of street trees and sidewalk planters within the public right-of-way.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
10-6	Thinks it would be great if sidewalks could be extended to where Camino del Mar splits at Jimmy Durante Boulevard.	Comment noted. The suggested improvement is beyond the Plan boundary and scope of this PEIR. Extension of the sidewalk to the north is under consideration as a Capital Improvement Project.
<b>Letter 11 - Tom McGreal</b>		
11-1	Comments that the community needs a parking plan that encompasses the entire City. Feels that the proposed Village Specific Plan will not be approved without a comprehensive parking plan. Opines that a parking plan is necessary for commercial property expansions, as parking is limiting commercial growth due to costs.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. A parking plan that encompasses the entire City is beyond the scope of the Village Specific Plan. The Parking Management Plan proposed in the Village Specific Plan is intended to address parking management strategies for the Village. However, the Parking Management Plan could be expanded to consider parking in other parts of the City at the direction of the City Council.
11-2	States that a central parking facility that is large enough to address all City parking needs is needed ... and should be borne out by a cost/revenue analysis.	The commenter notes general support for a central parking facility to address parking issues within the Plan area. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan identifies the City Hall Site as a Special Study Area in Chapter XI Special Study Areas. One of the strategies proposed for the City Hall site in the Plan is to provide a public parking lot or structure for additional public parking within the Plan area. The City is considering a variety of funding sources to fund the proposed parking facility.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
11-3	Is concerned that the Village Specific Plan's determination that "a parking meter returns an average of \$3.50 per day" is very low and is may be related to the method of financing the meters.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. This parking meter figure is based on actual annual returns, and it reflects meter revenue from meters not directly on Camino del Mar. It also reflects the fact that at times of the year, certain meters tend to be poorly utilized.
<b>Letter 12 - Rick Ehrenfeld</b>		
12-1	Supports 20 foot rear upper-level stepbacks to eliminate three story buildings, but states that the area should not be used as a deck for a bar or restaurant. Is concerned about noise and lighting impacts if stepback areas are used as restaurant or bar decks. Suggests controlling upper level deck use through requiring CUPs.	<p>The March 19 Public Review draft of the Plan required a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for establishments serving alcohol, restaurants over 10,000 square feet, and establishments providing outdoor amplified entertainment. However, in response to public comments on the draft Plan, the Plan has been revised to include a limitation on the location of outdoor dining areas to require that they be separated from residentially zoned property by an enclosed and sound-attenuated portion of a building on the property. In addition, outdoor dining areas located at the upper building level require the approval of a CUP.</p> <p>Also, as indicated in Section 10.5.2 of the Plan, all future development projects would be reviewed for compliance with all applicable noise and lighting regulations, including those in the Plan, as well as those already existing in the City's Zoning Ordinance and Municipal Code. In particular, future development within the Plan area would be required to comply with existing noise regulations (City's Municipal Code Section 9.20.040 and CCR Title 24) pertaining to bars or restaurants that abut residential uses. Ultimately, the Plan requires all new development to complete a site-specific noise report to demonstrate compliance with the applicable noise standards. Thus, as concluded in PEIR Sections 4.1 and 4.10, the Plan's potential impacts related to noise and lighting would be less than significant.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
12-2	Concerned that a side street frontage parcel could be combined with a Camino del Mar street frontage parcel to construct a very tall building.	The commenter has identified a potential need for further guidelines on allowable building heights on structures constructed on merged lots. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The draft Plan has been revised to state that where a property has been merged with one or more properties to form a larger building site after the date of effectiveness of the Plan, the building height shall be based on the property line configurations that existed for the property as of the effective date of the Plan.
<b>Letter 13 - Russ Broscious</b>		
13-1	Generally opposes the proposed Plan.	The commenter has noted general opposition to the Plan.
13-2	"Creating a substantial traffic slowdown will alienate Coast Highway travelers and eliminate Interstate 5 bypass during major accidents."	The adopted Del Mar Community Plan calls for traffic calming treatments along Camino del Mar and identifies a goal to reduce the amount of diverted traffic from Interstate 5. The proposed Plan was developed pursuant to the Del Mar Community Plan. The proposed Plan promotes the use of Interstate 5 for regional traffic in order to reserve the capacity of Camino del Mar for more local uses or for local destinations (e.g., the beach, the retail and other Del Mar attractions). See also Response to Comment 4-1, which discusses traffic flow during Interstate 5 congestion.
13-3	"One person backing out of a diagonal parking place, being real careful and a bit hesitant because there is a SUV or Van beside them, will stop that lane."	See Response to Comment 4-2, which includes a summary of how the design of the two lanes with roundabouts accommodates a buffer area where vehicles can back into to avoid blocking through traffic on Camino del Mar.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
13-4	"A two lane road with small diameter circles will never carry close to the traffic the 4 lanes we have now. Small circles mean very slow speeds. What about deliveries?"	The commenter provides the assertion that the two-lane design with roundabouts cannot support the same amount of traffic as the existing four-lane configuration (with stop signs). The City's traffic consultant prepared a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) using nationally accepted analysis software to analyze the capacity for existing and proposed design of Camino del Mar. As included in the TIS, and summarized in Section 4.14 of the PEIR, the analysis documents that the proposed two-lane with roundabouts configuration for Camino del Mar would have more capacity (i.e., carry more traffic) than the existing four-lane with stop signs configuration. This is because roundabouts allow for constant flow of vehicles through an intersection, whereas stop signs force drivers to completely stop before traveling through an intersection. In the case of Camino del Mar, the proposed roundabouts would maintain necessary opportunities for side street traffic to traverse the intersection while allowing the drivers in the major movement (north and south along Camino del Mar) to drive without unnecessary stopping due to stop signs when no cross traffic is present.
13-5	"Few people actually walk."	Comment noted as the author's opinion. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR and no further response is necessary. Nonetheless, it is noted that the Camino del Mar area is frequented by pedestrians. For example, approximately 40 people per hour pass through the 15 <sup>th</sup> Street and Camino del Mar area. Approximately 40% of the residents of Del Mar live within ¼ mile of the Plan area, which is a walkable distance.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
13-6	Opposes higher taxes for residents or downtown merchants.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. There are no taxes or fees that will be assessed to residents to finance the Plan. The primary types of fees applicable to businesses will be the parking in-lieu fee and a type of development impact fee called a traffic impact fee (TIF). A TIF is applied to allow businesses to participate in the cost of infrastructure development to mitigate the impacts of the increased average daily trips of the development.
13-7	Thinks roundabouts and diagonal parking are dangerous for bicyclists. ... and requests that the City contact local bike clubs for comments.	Considering that the speeds through the intersections would be greatly reduced through the use of roundabouts, and bicyclists follow the outside of the roundabout, roundabouts are not anticipated to result in any additional traffic hazard beyond that of a signalized intersection. Also, roundabouts are a key traffic calming element supported by cycling organizations as a primary element of "bicycle boulevards", which are designed to enhance the cycling experience. SANDAG's regional bicycle coordinator was consulted during the Camino del Mar Pilot Project Study that studied various traffic calming alternatives. The City will continue to consult with bicycle organizations such as the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition in the design phase.
13-8	Suggests that staff at Del Mar be reduced to be in line with neighboring cities. ...and that taxes on property owners and businesses be reduced in order to increase competition. Also suggests that the Plan eliminate specific zoning; avoid the 9th Street school property; and not create larger offices.	Comment noted as the opinion of the author. California law requires zoning on all properties, so zoning cannot be eliminated. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; and the additional points are not related to the scope of the proposed Plan.
13-9	Concluding remarks summarizing previous points.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; no further response is necessary.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 14 - Maria Weiss, Presidential CA Realty</b>	
14-1	Suggests City of Del Mar annex the Heights area so residents can be a voting member of the community they live in.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; nor is it related to the scope of the Plan.
	<b>Letter 15 - Leslie Burcham</b>	
15-1	Suggests Camino del Mar be increased to four lanes through the entire City (instead of being reduced to two lanes as proposed in the Plan). Is worried about emergency access (especially as related to accidents on Interstate 5) and does not agree that roundabouts increase traffic capacity. States that Camino del Mar is a major road where traffic needs to flow through and that traffic circles [i.e., roundabouts] will not solve the traffic problems.	See Response to Comment 4-1, which discusses what would happen when there is a major accident on Interstate 5, as well as Response to Comment 13-4, which discusses the validity of the analysis methodology used to analyze the proposed two-lane with roundabouts configuration of Camino del Mar. This comment is directed primarily at the Village Specific Plan and does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. No further response is necessary.
	<b>Letter 16 - Dan Sbicca, Sbicca Restaurant</b>	
16-1	[Introductory remarks.]	This comment notes general support of the revitalization efforts, and provides an introduction to the letter with respect to questions and concerns on the proposed incorporation of roundabouts along Camino del Mar. Comment noted. See responses to specific traffic questions below.
16-2	"What was Bird Rock's traffic before the installation of the roundabouts? Both lower and higher numbers. Today's volume high and low and the incremental growth from completion to today."	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, a response is provided as a courtesy to the commenter. According to studies done in 2001 and 2009, La Jolla Boulevard in Bird Rock experienced 21,700 average daily traffic (ADT) before the installation of the roundabouts and 16,625 ADT after installation. Speeds along La Jolla Boulevard have been reduced from 38-42 mph to 22-25 since the installation of the roundabouts.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
16-3	Would like to know Del Mar's high and low traffic numbers.	In response to the commenter's inquiry of current traffic volumes along Camino del Mar, as detailed in the TIS (Appendix F to the PEIR), and summarized in Section 4.14 of the PEIR, Camino del Mar currently experiences 19,000 weekday ADT during both typical weekday summertime and typical weekday non-summertime conditions. Camino del Mar also experiences 19,000 ADT over the Labor Day weekend based on counts taken in 2011. Counts taken during the Del Mar Fair show that weekday ADT increases to 26,000 during this two and half week event. The analysis performed for this study is based on typical conditions experienced throughout the year, rather than the worst 2.5 weeks of the year.
16-4	Would like to know "bicycles high and low numbers and how they impact traffic flow? The bike lane ends and there is not much space to merge."	In response to the commenter's inquiry of current bicycle volumes along Camino del Mar and how those are incorporated into the overall traffic volumes, bicyclists are counted as vehicles within the total traffic volumes. The City's bicycle counts show an average daily ridership of 362 cyclists per day, which peaks on Saturdays with averages nearer to 750 per day. The final design of the roadway will involve input from the recognized cycling advocacy coalition. (See also Response to Comment 35-3.)
16-5	"Pedestrians at 15th Street and Camino del Mar - How will that impact traffic flow? Is this factored into the flow and how many pedestrians did they account for?"	The impact of pedestrians on traffic flow at 15th Street and Camino del Mar was accounted for in the TIS. Currently, the busiest pedestrian intersection is Camino del Mar at 15th Street between Del Mar Plaza and L'Auberge Hotel. Pedestrian counts at the peak vehicular period (summer afternoon) show an average of 298 total pedestrian crossings in an hour at the intersection. As the roundabouts are conceptually designed, the intersections would accommodate nearly 600 pedestrians an hour (200 percent of today's volumes) before there is any impact to the carrying capacity of the intersection during peak vehicle times.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
16-6	"What do they expect to happen at peak times? Track getting out, beach people walking and bike cruising."	The TIS included analysis of "typical non-summer" conditions as well as "peak summer" conditions. Specifically, traffic counts were taken on Labor Day weekend during a race event at the Del Mar Race Track to determine "peak summer" conditions, as well as "typical summer" conditions to model traffic flow during the summer months. Based on this information, Camino del Mar currently experiences approximately 19,000 ADT during both typical weekday summertime and typical weekday non-summertime conditions. Camino del Mar also experiences 19,000 ADT over the Labor Day weekend based on counts taken in 2011. Counts taken during the Del Mar Fair show that weekday ADT increases to 26,000 during this 2.5 week event. See also Response to Comment 35-1 below.
16-7	"How will the increased traffic on Crest and Stratford be handled? This is a problem in Bird Rock according to my friends that live there."	<p>Diversion of traffic from Camino del Mar to alternate roadways, including Crest Road and Stratford Court, were analyzed in the TIS and summarized in the PEIR Section 4.14.4.1d. The analysis evaluated Stratford Court, Crest Road, Luneta Drive and Ocean Avenue and concluded that the proposed Plan would not result in diversion of traffic from Camino del Mar to these neighborhood streets. Nonetheless, the Plan includes the following precautionary measures to address diversion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline traffic counts prior to construction for a minimum of 6 months to sample both high- and off-season traffic volumes.</li> <li>• Post construction traffic counts for a minimum of 6 months to cover both high- and off-season traffic volumes.</li> <li>• Workshops with the community to determine appropriate solutions to particular findings.</li> <li>• A funding `bank' of \$100,000 set aside for implementation should the need arise.</li> </ul>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
16-8	"What will we do if the studies are wrong and traffic flow decreases or stays the same and we have an increase in accidents? Or it just isn't what we hoped for?"	During the design phase of the proposed improvements to Camino del Mar (two-lane with roundabouts), a simulation could be conducted to determine the operations of the roundabouts using traffic control to verify the traffic volumes and flow. If during the simulation the roundabouts resulted in deficient traffic flows, then the City would take this into consideration and adjust the design as appropriate. There is substantial national and international evidence that roundabouts would not cause an increase in accident rates along a corridor of this type.
<b>Letter 17 - Hershell Price</b>		
17-1	Concerned with 26 feet plus 4-foot articulated roof building heights. Would like to see story poles erected prior to the Plan going to vote.	Visual impacts from the Plan's building height limit were addressed in PEIR Section 4.1 and included visual simulations of the proposed maximum allowable building heights. In addition, City staff erected and photographed story poles at several locations in the Plan area. These photographs were exhibited to the public during the June 18, 2012 City Council meeting and are available for continued viewing on the City's website (link to the June 18 City Council meeting). In accordance with existing City regulations, story poles would be erected once a specific development is proposed and is undergoing review by the Design Review Board. City Council, as a result of public comment, deleted the 4-foot for articulated roofs and has required that roofs be articulated within the maximum 26 foot height limit.
17-2	Proposes "height limit should be raised to 17 feet (13 feet plus 4 feet for facades) to accommodate one-story businesses as they are now."	The commenter's preference of maintaining single story buildings on the west side of Camino del Mar with a maximum height limit increased to 17 feet (13 feet plus 4 feet for facades) is noted. However, it should additionally be noted that several existing buildings along the west side of Camino del Mar are currently two stories. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR and no further response is necessary.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
17-3	Is concerned about emergency vehicles' use of roundabouts, and residential streets being used as a bypass. Suggests a 15 mph speed limit be installed on residential streets.	As indicated in PEIR Sections 4.14.4.3 and 4.14.5, the Plan would result in a less than significant emergency vehicle access impact. Plan Implementing Strategies, described in PEIR Section 4.14.4.2, would ensure that adequate emergency access is accounted for in the final design of Camino del Mar. As noted above in Response to Comment 4-2, City staff consulted with emergency responders on the conceptual plan for Camino del Mar and received their concurrence that emergency vehicles could be accommodated with the planned configuration of Camino del Mar as two lanes with roundabouts.  With respect to potential roadway diversion onto side streets and parallel roadways, please refer to Response to Comment 16-7 above. No reduction of speeds on residential streets is proposed or warranted.
17-4	Hopes his comments are incorporated into the Final PEIR.	In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, all comments received during the public review period were evaluated and addressed.
<b>Letter 18 - Warren Spieker</b>		
18-1	Impressed with presentation of the revitalization plan.	This comment provides an introduction to the letter. No response is necessary.
18-2	Fears steady pedestrian traffic crossing at 15th Street roundabout will cause vehicular traffic backup. Encourages implementation of a pedestrian stoplight to allow traffic to flow.	The Plan for two lanes with roundabouts does not preclude the use of pedestrian stoplights to regulate pedestrian cross-traffic. The potential inclusion of pedestrian signals would be considered during the final engineering design process.
<b>Letter 19 - Robin and Dan Crabtree</b>		
19-1	Suggests pedestrian walkways be included where Camino del Mar and Jimmy Durante Boulevard merge.	This suggested improvement is located outside of the scope of the Plan and this comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The suggested walkway is a potential Capital Improvement Project (CIP) and is being reviewed by City Council for prioritization.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
19-2	Thinks merging southbound Camino del Mar and Jimmy Durante Boulevard traffic will bottleneck, especially during summer and horse racing conditions.	The PEIR and associated TIS address the transition from four to two lanes north of Del Mar Heights Road, and the transition from two lanes back to four lanes north of 15th Street. The analysis shows that these transitions would operate at an acceptable level of service and not create a significant bottleneck. As stated in the Plan and PEIR (Section 4.14.4), the final design of the proposed Camino del Mar improvements, including the lane merge geometry, emergency vehicle access, and bus circulation, would be developed through a process of community input and a full engineering analysis. Please also refer to Response to Comment 16-6 for a response on the methods used to account for peak summer conditions and typical summer conditions.
19-3	Suggests Plan traffic evaluation include a small stretch of road on east and west.	Please refer to Response to Comment 19-2 above.
<b>Letter 20 - Udo Wahn</b>		
20-1	Voices dismay with existing noise made by delivery trucks. Thinks delivery trucks should be limited to 7am-7pm deliveries to avoid residential noise impacts.	The revised Village Specific Plan now includes a strategy to include delivery areas on Camino del Mar that can serve the commercial areas.
<b>Letter 21 - Greg Hibbard, Chair, Del Mar Sustainability Advisory Board</b>		
21-1	Advises that roundabouts have significant potential for conserving energy, reducing air pollutants and addressing global warming.	This comment letter was received by the City from the members of the City's Sustainability Advisory Board (SAB) and provides a summary of the SAB's research efforts with respect to replacing signals and stop signs with roundabouts. The SAB's unanimous support of roundabouts is noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; no further response is necessary.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
<b>Letter 22 - Claire and Tom McGreal</b>		
22-1	States that the Village Specific Plan does not provide residents with sufficient certainty about the nature of future development and its benefits to and impacts on neighborhoods and residents.	This comment provides an introduction to the letter and notes general support of the revitalization efforts, while critiquing the Village Specific Plan for the reasons detailed in the remainder of the letter. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. City Council directed that an additional section discussing residential benefits and impacts as part of the Final Village Specific Plan.
22-2	Has concern that the Plan's development requirements (FAR, parking and density) will increase commercial property values, potentially triggering property sales rather than development by current owners.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Decisions regarding the timing of the sale of property or the redevelopment of private property are a private property matter that is not under the control of the Plan or the City. Because of the wide variety of ownership patterns in the Plan area, and based on input from property owners, it is anticipated that some properties will be developed by current owners, while others may not.
22-3	States that the Village Specific Plan does not specify external sources or values of funding ... and that the City must specify cost limits in the Specific Plan.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. A cost range of the public improvements is specified in Plan Chapter IX Public Finance, and includes upper limits of the costs. The exact funding scenario will be optimized when the public improvements are prioritized for construction. The Plan delineates that there are many viable ways in which the public improvement projects can be funded. For example, grant funds are expected to play a role in funding the project, but the percent that grants contribute is undetermined due to the fact that an approved project is necessary to apply for grants.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
22-4	Requests the Village Specific Plan include a comprehensive citywide parking plan.	Comment is noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. A citywide comprehensive parking solution is beyond the scope of the Plan. However, the impacts of the increased demand for parking in the Plan area and those impacts to other areas of the City will be considered in the Parking Management Plan discussed in the Plan’s Chapter VII Parking and as directed by City Council.
22-5	States that while the Park Once strategy of the proposed Plan is a good idea, it has no real force or effect because it is dependent on private property owners.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The "Park Once" strategy offers commercial property owners the option of providing the number of parking spaces currently required by the Del Mar Municipal Code or providing a lesser number of parking spaces if the general public is allowed to use the parking spaces. If the property owners do not allow the public to use their parking spaces, the property owners will be required to provide parking at the current, higher parking ratio.
22-6	Says the Village Specific Plan identifies a Park Once strategy while the City’s TPAC is moving in another direction – calling for suggests paid parking in the beach colony and Stratford corridor.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The TPAC proposals for paid and/or permitted parking are not included within the scope of the Plan. However, the impacts of the increased demand for parking in the Plan area and those impacts to other areas of the City will be considered in the Parking Management Plan discussed in Chapter VII Parking, of the Plan.
22-7	Says a City Hall site parking structure is a good idea, but the commitment to build it needs to be a condition upon which all else follows in redeveloping the central business district [i.e., Plan area].	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The timing of the construction of the parking structure proposed in the draft Plan has been accelerated to the short-term by City Council in the Final Plan. The draft Plan has been revised to include a potential timeline in Chapter X Implementation, Table X-1.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
22-8	Says roundabout configuration must be tested by simulation prior to development to ensure pedestrian safety, access for emergency vehicles and more efficient traffic flow.	As indicated in PEIR Sections 4.14.4.3 and 4.14.5, implementation of the Plan would result in less than significant impacts to pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access. The Plan's Implementing Strategies, described in PEIR Section 4.14.4.2, would ensure that adequate pedestrian safety and emergency access is accounted for in the final engineering design of Camino del Mar improvements. Please refer to Response to Comments 4-2 and 17-3, for more information on the adequacy of emergency access along Camino del Mar under the proposed two-lane with roundabouts configuration. With respect to pedestrian safety, the inclusion and specific design of clearly marked crosswalks for pedestrian traffic would be further refined during final engineering design, and pedestrian signals would be implemented if determined to be necessary to control pedestrian traffic flows. Additional testing is not considered necessary at this time.
22-9	"No left turn" rule for 3pm-6pm will be eliminated on Camino del Mar northbound with roundabouts allowing bypass traffic to use Stratford Court.	The prohibition of northbound left turns from Camino del Mar and signal timing to discourage bypass traffic onto Stratford Court will be maintained in the same manner and locations.
22-10	Believes increased height limits on west side of Camino del Mar will dramatically change the look and feel of the Village. Thinks west side should be limited to no more than two stories.	As determined in PEIR Section 4.1.3.1, the proposed increase in height limit on the west side of Camino del Mar would result in a less than significant visual character impact. This is because much of the existing development already attains or exceeds two stories; and, because the existing Design Review Ordinance regulations would ensure that future building design would be in character with the Village.  The Plan includes new overlay height limit of 26 feet for the portions of the property (50 feet from residential zone) along Del Mar Lane as the commenter suggests. Ultimately, all future projects would be required to undergo formal design review by the City's Design Review Board in order to ensure community character is not significantly impacted. Refer to PEIR Section 4.1 for additional information.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
22-11	The Plan would double the commercial space, thereby increasing density which will impact congestion and parking. Believes the density allowance in the Plan should be decreased.	As indicated in Sections 4.14.4 and 4.14.5, the additional allowed commercial space would generate traffic and has been analyzed, but traffic impacts would be less than significant. Parking is not considered an environmental effect and is therefore not analyzed in the PEIR. The City Council considered the commenter’s request and added thresholds to review cumulative development at regular intervals into the Plan.
22-12	Creating 140 new residences will have detrimental effects on parking, traffic and noise and air pollution.	<p>The Plan would allow for an additional 138 units, as two residential units already exist within the Plan area. The proposed allowable number of residences would generate approximately 1,104 additional daily traffic trips, which is about 16 percent of the additional external trips projected to be generated by the Plan’s allowable land uses. As discussed in PEIR Section 4.14, Plan implementation would result in less than significant traffic impacts assuming incorporation of the proposed roundabouts.</p> <p>Residences are not substantial noise generators nor air pollutant emitters and would not result in significant noise or air quality impacts, as indicated in Sections 4.2 and 4.1. Residences would generate air pollutants during construction and operation (mainly due to transportation sources). As concluded in Section 4.10, air quality impacts from overall buildout of the Plan would be less than significant (see PEIR Sections 4.2.4 and 4.2.5). See also Response to Comment 52b-2 for further information regarding residential noise issues. Parking is not considered an environmental effect in CEQA and was therefore not analyzed in the PEIR.</p> <p>The draft Plan has been revised to create residential development thresholds that are described in Chapter X, Section 10.5 Thresholds for Development Review.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
22-13	Believes fire trucks cannot move along a single lane configuration of Camino del Mar as quickly as a two lane configuration.	Plan Implementing Strategies, described in PEIR Section 4.14.4.2, would ensure that adequate emergency access is provided for in the final single-lane design of north- and south-bound Camino del Mar. The proposed two-lane with roundabouts configuration of Camino del Mar would provide a 20-foot buffer along each side of the roadway that may be used by emergency vehicles. Also, the roundabouts would improve traffic flow and capacity relative to the existing conditions. Thus, a reduction of speeds on residential streets is not warranted. Please refer to Response to Comment 4-2 for more information on the adequacy of emergency access along Camino del Mar under the proposed two-lane with roundabouts configuration.
22-14	Suggest reverse angle parking rather than diagonal parking to ensure safety for cyclists, children, handicapped people, and pets.	The design of angled parking will be determined by City Council during the preparation of the detailed engineering plans.
22-15	Suggests back striping reverse angle parking stalls on Camino del Mar to preclude oversized vehicles from overlapping the space required by emergency vehicles.	The details for the parking design will be determined by City Council during the preparation of the detailed engineering plans.
22-16	Development impact fees should be imposed to help the City defray the attendant costs of revitalization and fund public projects.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Development Impact Fees are discussed in the Plan's Chapter IX, Public Finance. The revised Plan includes additional detail about Traffic Impact Fees (TIFs), and their applicability. TIFs are a type of development impact fee requiring "growth to pay for growth." They permit equitable sharing of expenses that would otherwise be borne by the greater community. TIFs are widely implemented across the nation. Del Mar is unusual in not requiring traffic impact fees/development impact fees. The City Council has directed that a fee study be produced so as to evaluate this potential funding source.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
<b>Letter 23 - Jim Eckmann</b>		
23-1	Suggests the Village Specific Plan increase allowable FAR above 1.0	This comment provides an introduction to the letter and general support of the Plan is noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The City Council considered this commenter's suggestion and decided to limit the floor area ratio to 1.0 FAR with increases to a maximum of 1.5 FAR for providing exceptional public benefits. Floor Area Ratios (FAR) and Exceptional Public Benefits (EPBs) are discussed in the Plan's Chapter VI Allowed Uses and Development Standards.
23-2	"My question as to whether financial aspects are discussed in the PEIR was not idle curiosity. It springs from a meeting I had with civil engineering expert when tunnels under Camino del Mar we part of high-speed rail concepts. He advised that a then-emerging line of legal attack on the adequacy of PEIRs was whether economic impacts were addressed, even though as you noted CEQA does not expressly require that."	As noted by the commenter, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes unless the change would result in a significant physical environmental impact. The Plan's potential economic impacts to the City have been identified in Chapter IX, Public Finance, of the Plan.
<b>Letter 24 - Jim Benedict</b>		
24-1	FAR ratio should allow 1.0 FAR and up to 1.5 with 'council discretion'.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. See the response to previous Comment 23-1.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
<b>Letter 25 - Mark Stuckelman</b>		
25-1	Neighborhood Workshops were not posted on the City's website as promised and create secrecy around the process.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Neighborhood Workshops were gatherings that were sponsored by private citizens. Individual members of the immediate neighborhood were invited to attend these informational gatherings. City representatives were also invited to address the attendees, receive input and answer questions. During the public review period there were also noticed City Council meetings that discussed the same issues.
<b>Letter 26 - Sally Middleton</b>		
26-1	"This plan leans strongly in favor of the business community over the needs of the residential community and their quality of life."	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan has been revised to list benefits to residents in its Chapter III, Section 3.9 Community Benefits.
26-2	Supports parking garage for visitors and employees.	Comment noted.
<b>Letter 27 - Randall Stoke</b>		
27-1	Questions traffic associated with the fair and its potential impact on traffic capacity.	With respect to the commenter's concern about the effect of San Diego County Fair traffic on Plan area streets, the PEIR and associated TIS include analysis of peak traffic related to summer and special events at the Del Mar Fairgrounds (e.g., San Diego County Fair and Del Mar Race Track). Please refer to Response to Comment 16-6 above and 35-1 below for further information concerning analysis of "peak summer" conditions.
27-2	Believes objectives of the Plan should direct traffic to and through the Village.	Comment noted.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
27-3	Says San Francisco has eliminated angle parking in the beach area and returned to parallel. Asks the City to consider the difficult scenarios of reversing out of an angle space with an SUV on your right.	The commenter is concerned with head in angled parking. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR but raises questions about the Plan parking. Head in angled parking is used broadly throughout the region and the country. There are advantages and disadvantages to angled parking, but it is nationally accepted as a standard parking treatment. Adequate back up areas will be provided so that backup will not interfere with the travel lanes.
27-4	Del Mar does not fit the criteria for roundabouts, which are recommended for large areas. Signals can be synchronized that accommodate emergencies. Sees no benefits to roundabouts.	<p>The commenter notes concerns with respect to emergency access and high traffic events such as the San Diego County Fair. Please refer to Response to Comment 4-2 regarding the adequacy of emergency access under the proposed two-lane with roundabouts configuration for Camino del Mar, as well as Response to Comment 16-6 and 35-1 for further information on the analysis of "peak summer" conditions.</p> <p>With respect to the latter part of this comment, the commenter has generally referenced discussion with a traffic expert concerning the proposed roundabouts, but provides no further documentation. It should be noted that other communities with similar traffic volumes and street width (e.g., Vista Street Bike Boulevard in Long Beach and Bird Rock, La Jolla) have successfully implemented roundabouts. The Del Mar staff report from June 4, 2012, provides additional examples of similar roundabouts. Benefits of roundabouts are described in an impartial publication by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and can be found in Attachment B of the Staff Report for Item 10 at the February 6, 2012 City Council hearing. These documents can be found at <a href="http://www.delmar.ca.us">www.delmar.ca.us</a></p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
27-5	States that traffic systems have been developed which electronically synchronize signalization to accommodate emergencies. Also claims that enclosed data indicates there will be no additional benefit from roundabouts.	<p>Comment noted. It is noted that there are sensors that adjust traffic signal phasing at intersections in response to emergency vehicles.</p> <p>The data attached to this comment shows regionally collected average daily traffic (ADT) volumes along Camino del Mar and elsewhere, including street segments that have roundabouts in the City of Encinitas. This data indicates a lower ADT than the ADT used in the Plan TIS. This indicates that the TIS used conservative ADT to evaluate Plan impacts as compared to the regional data attached to the commenter's letter. The TIS for the Plan showed that reconfiguration of the existing lane geometry of Camino del Mar would benefit motorists through increase vehicle capacity, as well as pedestrians and bicyclists through streetscape enhancements and traffic calming.</p>
27-6	Says the Council is proposing a discriminatory parking tax on the westerly portion of the City. Provides an opinion on the City's pension plan.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. The Plan does not include any parking tax on the westerly portion of the City. The City's pension plan is not related to the Village Specific Plan.
27-7	"Camino del Mar is the only street that can handle the movement of anticipated traffic. There will be more traffic regardless of any freeway improvement. Four lanes are essential for the safety and protection of residents, particularly because of the race track and fairgrounds activities."	The TIS addresses existing and cumulative traffic conditions, including traffic generated by the fairgrounds and racetrack. As shown in the TIS and summarized in PEIR Section 4.14.4, the proposed two-lane with roundabouts configuration for Camino del Mar would not result in a traffic safety hazard. The proposed roadway configuration would handle the anticipated traffic and provide additional enhancements to other modes of transportation (i.e., pedestrians and bicycles). Four-lane Camino del Mar alternatives were included in the alternatives analysis in PEIR Section 9.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
27-8	“Insufficient space for roundabouts. A roundabout at 15th St might cause "scatter crossing". (Example roundabout on Santa Fe in Encinitas)	A conceptual design of the proposed Camino del Mar roundabouts shows that there is adequate space to fit them. Allowing for pedestrians to cross diagonally from all four corners at one time (called a pedestrian scramble) requires signalization of an intersection. It was considered at the intersection of 15th Street and Camino del Mar for the signalized alternative, but is not proposed as part of the Plan (two lanes with roundabouts).
27-9	Questions whether Del Mar residents will actually walk to shopping area.	See Response to Comment 13-5.
	<b>Letter 28 - James Eckmann</b>	
28-1	“A developer or owner would not be incentivized to improve their commercial property with a 1.0 FAR because it will not yield an adequate return on investment.”	The commenter has noted general support of the Plan, but raises issues related to the proposed Floor Area Ratio. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131; the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Many factors that are not under the control of the City of Del Mar or affected by the Plan influence the economic viability of commercial development. It is difficult to base the viability or unviability of commercial properties in the Plan area on the single variable of 1.0 FAR.
	<b>Letter 29 - Dr. G. Richard Whelock and Richard Whelock Jr.</b>	
29-1	Believes the proposed Plan would enable the Village to grow in a responsible way.	The commenter has noted support of the Plan for reasons specified within the letter. Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. No further response is necessary.
	<b>Letter 30 - Frank Chisari</b>	
30-1	Concerned about traffic overflow to residential streets if roundabout configuration does not improve congestion.	Please see Response to Comment 16-7. In summary, the Plan is not anticipated to result in traffic diversion from Camino del Mar to residential streets but does include precautionary measures to address potential diversion.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
30-2	Suggests the City should monitor residential traffic during temporary Camino del Mar configuration with statistically valid traffic study and agree to not make the modifications permanent if study proves increased traffic.	As indicated in the Plan's Chapter IV Mobility, the City would monitor traffic before and after roundabout installation and implement precautionary measures if needed. See also Response to Comment 16-7.
<b>Letter 31 - Anna Scipione</b>		
31-1	Introduction to concerns with safety, parking and traffic.	This comment provides an introduction to the letter and lists general areas of concern that are detailed further within the letter. No further response is necessary.
31-2	Says roundabouts seem to be more dangerous for crossing pedestrians due to drivers' distractions with navigating the roundabouts.	The TIS has been updated to include additional information regarding pedestrian safety at roundabouts. Figure 7-6 on page 97 of the TIS shows that there are fewer conflict points between pedestrians and vehicles at roundabouts. The reduced crossing distance and the reduction of a lane also improves pedestrian safety. Also as noted above in Response to Comment 18-2, a pedestrian stoplight may be included in the final design of the roundabouts along Camino del Mar. Such facilities alert drivers of pedestrians waiting to cross, and also regulate the frequency of pedestrian crossings so as to not affect through-traffic.
31-3	"Drivers backing out of diagonal parking spaces will not be able to see bicyclists and will have to back out into the bike and traffic lane."	The proposed design of Camino del Mar provides a buffer area between the rear of the angled parking spaces and the bicycle lane and travel lane.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
31-4	“The Plan claims parking is available at 12 <sup>th</sup> Street, but not at 15 <sup>th</sup> Street, indicating that people are too lazy for the Park Once concept and walk three blocks.”	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR but addresses assumption and features of the proposed Plan. City staff has provided the following response as a courtesy to the commenter. The "Park Once" strategy has been proven to be highly successful in many cities similar to Del Mar. People will walk a reasonable distance from a parking space to their destination, especially if pathways are convenient, safe and interesting as are proposed in the Plan. In addition, the blocks in Del Mar are much smaller than other cities that have successfully implemented a "Park Once" strategy.
31-5	Asks: How does the City intend to convince property owners to open their private parking to the public with liability burdening small shops and offices.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Park Once strategy is an incentive that would require a lower number of parking spaces for the property owner that agrees to open their private parking for use by the public. Many private properties provide public parking and are insured for the liability.
31-6	Concerned with side road traffic increasing due to roundabouts and single lanes.	The commenter has noted concern with side street traffic due to traffic diverting from Camino del Mar, and notes support for four traffic signals along Camino del Mar instead of the Plan’s preferred no signals. Please see Response to Comment 16-7 regarding diversion from Camino del Mar to alternate roadways, including Crest Road, Stratford Court, Luneta Drive and Ocean Avenue.
31-7	Supports continuous sidewalks.	This comment notes support for the continuous sidewalks and parking structure at City Hall, as included in the Plan. Comment noted.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
31-8	Thinks 15th Street roundabout will be a nightmare during race season and hazardous for intoxicated people leaving Jimmy O's at closing time in the summer.	<p>The analysis in the TIS and PEIR addressed existing and cumulative traffic conditions, thus accounting for traffic generated by the fairgrounds and racetrack. As determined in the TIS and summarized in PEIR Section 4.14.4, the proposed two-lane with roundabouts configuration of Camino del Mar would not result in traffic safety hazards.</p> <p>The City's traffic consultant conferred with Police Captain Sherri A. Sarro to review accident data at the roundabouts in Encinitas. This review revealed one fatality since the roundabout installations; however, that fatality was attributed to driving under the influence (DUI) and to being unrestrained (i.e., not wearing a seatbelt). It was not attributed to the roadway design. Nationally, roundabouts are comprehensively evaluated by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and Highway Loss Data Institute. Their periodic publications cite roundabouts' improved safety, especially with reducing the chance of a severe accident.</p>
<b>Letter 32 - Payson Stevens</b>		
32-1	How will increased commercial height limit generate more revenue?	<p>This comment provides an introduction to the letter and background on the individual. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Increasing building height will provide additional flexibility for property owners to use the 1.0 FAR allowed by the Plan. This additional flexibility in building design will allow more opportunities for the building to be responsive to the Design Review Ordinance and incentives for view corridors and plazas, as well as for the property owners to design more efficient, more attractive and more functional retail building spaces.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
32-2	How will the height increase affect residents' ocean views all along CDM?	The PEIR addressed Plan impacts to scenic views in Section 4.1.4.1. As indicated in that section, ocean views would continue to be protected through the Design Review Ordinance, and would also be protected through Plan regulations such as setbacks and setoffs. Refer to Section 4.1.4.1 of the PEIR for more details. With the implementation of these regulations, Plan impacts to private residential ocean views would be less than significant.
32-3	Potential redevelopment of building heights will cause extensive disruptions with no clear cost-benefits for smaller businesses. Many tenants may be displaced by landlords looking to increase their lease incomes with greater square footage.	Impacts of the proposed building height limit increase are addressed throughout the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has attempted to provide appropriate responses as a courtesy to the commenter. Redevelopment and disruptions will occur on a parcel by parcel basis over time. Individual property owners will make independent decisions regarding when they will redevelop, how large a building they build, how much they will charge to lease the space and to which tenants they will lease.
32-4	Will new retail be "attractive" or "mass-branded" that won't distinguish Del Mar? How will "unique" and "quaint" downtown atmosphere be preserved?	Future projects allowed by the Plan would be required to undergo formal design review by the Design Review Board to ensure the small town character is preserved. This design review process comprises an adequate regulatory framework that already exists. Refer to PEIR Section 4.1 for additional information.
32-5	How will the roundabouts and two lanes prevent commuters from taking the side streets and deter North County commuters looking for an alternative route?	As summarized above in Response to Comment 4-1, the two-lane with roundabouts configuration for Camino del Mar would provide more capacity than the existing four lanes with stop signs condition, even though there would be a reduction in the number of lanes. With respect to side street diversion, as summarized in Response to Comment 16-7, the Plan is not anticipated to result in diversion but nonetheless includes precautionary measures to address potential diversions from Camino del Mar to side streets. Refer to PEIR Section 4.14.4.1d.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
32-6	Does the Plan take into account the massive One Paseo development project and its added traffic, air pollution and other impacts?	The One Paseo project was included in the cumulative environmental and traffic analyses (see PEIR Section 7 and Table 4.14-11).
32-7	How can we assess whether this development will benefit the current retail stores with construction disruption of redoing Camino del Mar and/or raising roof heights?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Impacts of private construction exist today. It would be highly speculative to estimate what, if any, financial impact private construction would have on an adjacent business. Business impacts from public roadway construction are believed to be minimal and can be planned for in advance of any construction. A tight and limited construction schedule could increase construction cost, but reduce potential impacts. Most sidewalks adjacent to businesses will be maintained, and new sidewalks will be constructed on the street side, allowing continuous access in most cases. Businesses will be able to work with the City to develop a program for operations during construction. Contractors can be assessed liquidated damages to ensure that they comply with schedules. Short-term construction inconvenience will be more than offset by the long-term investment that the community will make in its downtown.
32-8	Would like to see the City create more parking spaces.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR as parking is not an environmental issue. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The proposed Plan would increase parking by adding additional on-street parking, ensuring that new development provides for parking commensurate with their development, implementing a "Park Once" strategy that increases the utilization of parking stalls, and implementing a Parking Management Plan to manage parking resources. These and more strategies are discussed in the Plan's Chapter VII, Parking.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
32-9	“Integrate southern end 9th Street retail with the active commercial area between 13th and 15 <sup>th</sup> Streets.”	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR but rather the proposed Plan itself. Staff has provided the following response as a courtesy to the commenter. The proposed Plan would connect the southern end of the Plan area (around 9 <sup>th</sup> Street) with the active commercial area between 13th and 15th Streets by creating a continuous sidewalk and providing additional parking on the City Hall Site.
32-10	Notes a preference for Camino del Mar to have a look and feel street ambience like Encinitas	Comment noted.
32-11	“Develop a viable plan (with costs) for the City Hall property with integrated government use and mixed retail and residential uses.”	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Such a plan for the City Hall property will ultimately be developed as a separate Civic Center Master Plan process.
32-12	“Determine how the ball field/Winston School property can be integrated into a larger Camino del Mar development Plan.”	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR and this suggestion is outside of the scope of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. This comment to integrate the Shores Property that contains the ball field and Winston School is outside the scope and geographic area included in the Village Specific Plan. The Shores Property will be developed with its own Master Plan as directed the City Council.
32-13	“Provide real sidewalks on the west side of Camino del Mar, south of 11th Street.”	The proposed streetscape project identified in the Plan would provide sidewalks on the west side of Camino del Mar, south of 11th Street. A recent Capital Improvement Project has implemented some pedestrian improvements in this area, including additional sidewalk.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
32-14	“Offer incentives for landlords to promote cafes and/or restaurants in southern Village.”	The Plan will provide incentives for the development of cafes and restaurants by increasing the development potential for all properties from .45 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) to 1.0 FAR, providing an alternative reduced parking ratio through implementation of a "Park Once" strategy, keeping the Sidewalk Cafe program in place, and providing a strong pedestrian connection between the southern end of the Village and the more active retail activity north of 13th Street.
32-15	“Conduct long-term cost-benefits analysis for significantly altering the downtown.”	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The City has consulted a large number of recognized experts and authorized a great number of studies prior to undertaking the Plan. These efforts are described in detail in the Plan’s Chapter I Introduction. Copies of these studies are available on the City’s website and links are provided to these studies in the References section of the Plan. Significant community input has been obtained through community meetings, public workshops, citywide mailings, numerous presentations to community organizations and groups, multiple articles in community newspapers and publications, email blasts to community members, question and answer workshops at City Hall and weekly attendance at the Farmers Market since the preparation of the Plan was authorized in a public hearing by the City Council. In addition, the Plan is consistent with and implements the Del Mar Community Plan, which is the voter approved document that describes the goals of the community. Finally, the Plan will be placed on the ballot of the November 2012 General Election for a community vote.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 33 - Dwight Worden, Bud Emerson, and Dave Druker</b>	
33-1	[Introductory remarks.]	This text provides an introduction to the letter and does not raise specific issues related to the adequacy of the PEIR. Comment noted; no further response is necessary.
33-2	Proposes "more time be taken to review, revise, and improve the Plan so it can be improved and placed on a calmer ballot, perhaps in the March-June 2013 time frame".	The commenter's suggestion to take more time to review, revise and improve the Plan is noted. During the course of the draft Plan review, the City conducted over 50 meetings or forums for input and dissemination and made substantial changes based upon community input. The City Council is currently scheduled to make the decision to place the Plan on the ballot at the August 6, 2012 City Council meeting.
33-3	Suggests "Council create a citizens ad hoc advisory committee to work with Planning to identify plan modifications likely to garner wider support".	The commenter's proposal that the City Council create a citizens ad hoc advisory committee to recommend modifications to the Plan is noted. The City Council acted as the advisory committee throughout the course of Plan development, with 23 noticed meetings that discussed the Plan and Village revitalization during its fifteen-month work plan.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
33-4	<p>"A financing plan needs to be developed and publicly vetted before the SP is submitted to the voters. The financing plan should address: A) How the economic benefits and burdens of the SP will be equitably shared between principle stakeholder groups of (1) the affected business landowners (2) the city in its governmental capacity (3) the residents who live in DM and (4) DM tax payers. B) How the public improvements called for by the SP will be financed and paid for. C) What exactions and fees will be charged for permit issuance for development pursuant to the SP, how those funds will be expended, and what improvements, exactions and dedications will be required as a condition of development. D) What the best estimates are of increased revenues flowing to the City from implementation of the SP (from property taxes, sales taxes, business license fees, parking fees and any other revenue sources). E) What the best estimates are of increased costs flowing to the City from implementation of the SP (for capital improvements and for service provision including police, fire, maintenance, planning department, etc). F) What the best estimates are of the impacts to property values, both to properties within the SP area and to properties in adjoining neighborhoods, from implementation of the SP.</p>	<p>This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The public financing component of the Plan, particularly as amended, provides considerable detail about possible financing mechanisms for the public improvements. It has been publicly presented for the Finance Committee, the City Council, and the Planning Commission. A) The benefits and burdens are shared between business landowners, city government, residents and Del Mar taxpayers as follows: roadway specific TransNet Funds are collected through sales taxes paid by businesses and residents and the proceeds benefit everyone, the General Fund is a funding source from all of the community, and impact fees and parking fees are specifically provided by new development and users of the new parking and streetscape infrastructure. B) Alternatives for paying for the public improvements are contained in Chapter IX, Public Finance; C) Parking in-lieu fees and traffic impact fees and parking meter revenues are all proposed to allow beneficiaries and users of downtown area to contribute to its development; D) Table 9-1 in the Plan provides a detailed estimate of anticipated new revenue generation; E) Minor increased maintenance and trash collection costs are anticipated, reaching perhaps \$30,000/year at build-out; F) The Brooking Institute study estimates increases to residential and commercial property values associated with walkable downtowns; G) There is ample evidence that the existing FAR provides barriers to redevelopment and studies of successful downtowns indicate that the proposed FAR should be successful in increasing development.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
	G) An economic analysis of the financial needs and constraints of redeveloping under the SP, both for the private owners and for the city, to validate and justify that the FAR, height, and other development changes are needed to achieve the plan goals, that these goals can be feasibly achieved, and that the proposed changes to allow more intensive development are set at appropriate levels to successfully implement the Plan without allowing for more, or less, development than needed."	
33-5	"A phasing plan to set out the timelines and parameters for redevelopment of the downtown needs to be included in the Plan. The phasing plan should cover ..."	The Plan has been revised to include a potential timeline in its Chapter X, Implementation, Table X-1.
33-6	Suggests including more neighborhood protection measures that identify needs and goals of the community, including: 1) control of traffic and parking spill over into residential neighborhoods; 2) control of other spill over impacts to residential neighborhoods; 3) programs for managing parking; 4) programs for protecting property values of adjoining neighborhoods; 5) establishment of thresholds for each of these impacted areas with identification of mitigation measures; 6) provisions to ensure that these basic neighborhood protections cannot be waived or reduced by the City Council or other city bodies or staff.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR but instead recommends items for inclusion in the proposed Plan. City staff has provided the following response as a courtesy to the commenter. Residential neighborhood protection measures were identified in the draft Plan's Chapter III, Protection of Community Resources, and have been expanded based upon community comments. The strategies and programs proposed in the Plan address efforts to reduce or minimize both existing and potential future neighborhood impacts. Monitoring of traffic and parking impacts is included in the proposed strategies. The draft Plan has been revised to include additional neighborhood protection measures in Chapter III Protection of Community Resources, Chapter IV Mobility and Chapter VII Parking. Thresholds have also been identified in Chapter X, Implementation.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
33-7	Suggests Camino del Mar be "attractively" narrowed to one lane between 4th and 9th Streets and north of 15 <sup>th</sup> Street.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR and this suggestion is outside of the scope of the PEIR. The transitions from four lanes to two lanes south of 9th Street and north of 15th Street are described in the Plan's Chapter IV, Mobility. The detail suggested by the commenter will be included in the detailed improvement plans to be completed after the Plan is approved and prior to construction. City Council has directed that the southern transition consider improvements to the 4 <sup>th</sup> Street intersection to improve the transition and traffic flow in the southern portion of the city.
33-8	"Identify the precise number, size and location of proposed residential units and require that second story space on the west side of Camino del Mar be designated for residential use."	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Allowed uses in the Plan, including residential uses, are regulated in the Plan Chapter VI. The maximum unit size was determined in the draft Plan. All properties have equal right to develop housing to the maximum density, FAR and other limits imposed by the development standards. Residential units may be located anywhere within the Plan area except in street level building spaces fronting Camino del Mar. As a result, the exact location is not able to be determined in a zoning code until a development application is submitted. The draft Plan has been revised to add Section 10.5 Thresholds for Development Review to Chapter X, Implementation. This addition provides for thresholds of review to control the number and timing of residential development. All projects, including mixed-use projects, must also undergo full design review.
33-9	"Consider FAR incentives (up to a base FAR of .75 with the ability to go to 1.25)."	Comment noted. The proposed baseline FAR is 1.0 with the ability to go to 1.50 by providing exceptional public benefits.
33-10	Suggests the Plan allow the opportunity for a parking garage to be built on the church property across 15th Street from the Plaza.	Comment noted. The church property mentioned in the comment is outside of the geographic area of the Plan, but is identified as a resource for potential parking.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
33-11	"Measure B shall remain on the books and Measure B votes will be required for any future projects that do not conform to the voter approved Specific Plan. Projects that implement and conform to a voter approved Specific Plan do not require an additional vote, provided that provisions shall be added to the Specific Plan to allow for a public vote on projects larger (in lot size or floor area) than the Measure B thresholds even where they comply with the voter approved Village Specific Plan when petitions are signed by a specific number of concerned citizens or when a public vote is deemed appropriate by a super majority vote of the City council."	Measure B is maintained and is in effect for any qualifying project that does not conform to a voter approved Specific Plan. Chapter XII of the Village Specific Plan identifies the procedures for modification to the Plan, including threshold reviews that could limit the future development.
33-12	"Revise height limit to current 14' by right with the discretionary ability, where specified community goals are met, to go higher: up 4' for architectural and articulation purposes or up to 26' for a second story."	Comment noted. City Council has modified the allowable height to 26 feet, eliminated the 4 feet for articulation, and provided a height overlay zone for those sloping sites on the west side so that no building can be over 26 feet in the fifty-foot band adjacent to the residential.
33-13	"Undertake additional outreach efforts to engage, inform, and educate as much of the community as possible on the reasons for the proposal to reduce Camino del Mar from four lanes to two lanes (one in each direction), how that change will impact traffic flow, parking, the ambiance of downtown, and most importantly how it will impact adjoining neighborhoods and the rest of the community."	Comment noted. Additional outreach efforts (50 forums) have been made to engage, inform and educate the community during the Public Review period of the Draft Plan and PEIR. City Council, at noticed public meetings, conducted additional reviews on Camino del Mar, traffic flow, parking, community character and neighborhood impacts.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 34 - Bud Emerson</b>	
34-1	Believes the PEIR should include stronger mitigations regarding negative impacts on nearby neighborhoods. Both diversion and calming measures should be guaranteed in the plan, not based on measurements after the plan is approved.	As indicated in the PEIR, the Plan impacts to surrounding neighborhoods would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required. The Plan is not anticipated to result in diversion of traffic from Camino del Mar to surrounding neighborhood streets. Nonetheless, precautionary measures have been included in the Plan to address potential diversion. See Response to Comment 16-7 above and PEIR Section 4.14.4.1d.
34-2	Believes the PEIR should consider an alternative focused on lower height limits on the west side of Camino del Mar.	All environmental impacts associated with Plan implementation would be less than significant, including visual impacts (see PEIR Section 4.1). Thus, developing another alternative that would limit the development on the west side to a lower height is not required under CEQA. The Plan does not mandate that heights on the west side be 26 feet high, it allows for the increase should applicants choose to redevelop their properties. Thus, lower building heights are not precluded. As discussed in Section 4.1 of the PEIR, potential impacts (due to shadowing, view blockage or massing/character incompatibility) from the Plan's building height limit were determined to be less than significant. Therefore it was concluded that a reduced building height alternative was not necessary to reduce significant aesthetic impacts. A reduced building height alternative for the west side of Camino del Mar would not necessarily mean reduced square footage, as the proposed allowable square footage could be realized elsewhere. Therefore, air/greenhouse gas, noise, and traffic effects of the Plan would not be reduced with a reduced height alternative.
34-3	Requests the Plan/PEIR limit and specify which properties on the west side of Camino del Mar can be allowed second stories. Believes continuous two stories would create an "imposing façade" and 30' on the west side is too high.	The draft Plan has been revised to change the maximum building height from 30 feet to 26 feet and to add Section 10.5 Thresholds for Development Review (added to Chapter X, Implementation). This addition provides for thresholds of review to require building heights on the west side of Camino del Mar to be reviewed when 50 percent of each block has buildings that are 26 feet high.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
34-4	“Stop light on 15th Street will interrupt the smooth flow of the two lane roundabout plan.”	The two-lane with roundabouts configuration proposed for Camino del Mar includes the removal of the 15th Street traffic signal, as well as the stop signs at 11th and 13th Streets; in order to provide a smooth flow of slow speed traffic along the roadway through the Plan area.
34-5	How can pedestrian and neighborhood car access to Camino del Mar and roundabouts be made easier?	The proposed two-lane with roundabouts configuration of Camino del Mar would balance the pedestrian and vehicular needs in the street corridor. With respect to pedestrian access, clearly marked crosswalks for pedestrian traffic would be included and pedestrian signals would be implemented if determined to be necessary during the design process to control pedestrian traffic flows.
34-6	What measures can be implemented to discourage through traffic from diverting to neighboring streets?	See Response to Comment 16-7 above.
34-7	Wants to see the Plan include more incentives for café/B&B uses such as Café Secret.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan provides incentives for the development of cafes and restaurants by increasing the development potential for all properties from .45 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) to 1.0 FAR, providing an alternative reduced parking ratio through implementation of a "Park Once" strategy, keeping the Sidewalk Cafe program in place and providing a stronger pedestrian environment.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 35 - Barbara Stegman</b>	
35-1	<p>"Include increased "summer" traffic volumes in analysis for Camino del Mar and other affected streets. ... What mitigation measures are suggested for these times?"</p>	<p>The PEIR and associated TIS include analysis of "typical non-summer" conditions, "typical summer" conditions, as well as "peak summer" traffic conditions for which counts were taken on Labor Day weekend 2011 during a race event at the Del Mar Race Track and June 2012 during the fair. The TIS/PEIR used all of these conditions to analyze the proposed two-lane with roundabout configuration of Camino del Mar, and as discussed in the TIS/PEIR, the proposed two-lane with roundabouts configuration would be adequate to support "typical summer," "typical non-summer," and "Labor Day" traffic conditions without mitigation. Thus no mitigation measures are necessary due to the capacity improvements resulting from the roundabouts.</p> <p>Camino del Mar currently experiences 19,000 ADT during both typical weekday summertime and typical weekday non-summertime conditions. Camino del Mar also experiences 19,000 ADT over the Labor Day weekend (although peak hours are different from typical weekday peak hours). Counts taken during the Del Mar Fair show that weekday ADT increases to 26,000 during the peak time of this 2.5 week event.</p> <p>The PEIR and associated TIS illustrate that the existing configuration of Camino del Mar with existing traffic fails at LOS "F" (15 percent over capacity) during typical conditions. With the two-lane roundabout configuration and buildout of the Plan and cumulative traffic growth, the roadway would operate <i>better</i> than it does today (5 percent over capacity). It should be noted that if nothing is done (no additional traffic due to the Plan and no roadway improvement), by the year 2035 Camino del Mar would be 38 percent over capacity.</p>

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
		<p>During the peak of the peak (the 2.5 weeks during the Del Mar Fair and several times during race season, but not during most races or all fair days), traffic becomes very congested along Camino del Mar and elsewhere through the City. As stated above, the two-lane roundabout configuration would actually improve these conditions due to the additional capacity created by the roundabouts. However, at these peak event times drivers will still experience heavy congestion, just as they do today (just less).</p> <p>It is standard planning practice to analyze the roadway network during “typical” conditions experienced throughout the year, rather than the worst 2.5 weeks of the year. As described above, the PEIR and associated TIS account for “typical” conditions in Del Mar and address seasonal variations (summer and non-summer) in traffic. However, it is not standard practice to analyze and accommodate through capacity based on “non-typical” conditions because it leads to: over-building for capacity that is used only rarely; wasted resources; and an unbalanced roadway system that does not accommodate all modes of travel as the Del Mar Community Plan and state law (SB 1358) require. Additionally, the TIS is already based on conservative analysis of the most congested two peak hours of the day. All intersection impacts are based on only these two peak hours. The remaining 22 hours of the day are less congested.</p> <p>The alternative choices for how to address these peak variations in traffic are analyzed in the PEIR and associated TIS. As shown in these documents the vehicle congestion would be less if Camino del Mar is developed as a four-lane road with traffic signals. However, this choice would result in higher speeds along Camino del Mar (45 mph), a significantly more dangerous pedestrian and bicycle environment, and a Plan that does not accommodate or encourage other modes of travel other than the vehicle.</p>

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
35-2	Wants to see a queuing analysis north of 15th Street on Camino del Mar	Only southbound Jimmy Durante Boulevard would be affected by queues at 15th Street at Camino del Mar (northbound is unaffected because Jimmy Durante is downstream). The TIS analyzed traffic conditions under <i>Existing Plus Project</i> and <i>Year 2030 Plus Project</i> conditions and indicates that under two-lanes with roundabouts no queue would develop that would affect southbound Jimmy Durante Boulevard.
35-3	Bicycle traffic needs to be studied. How do cyclists navigate busy circles where traffic never stops?	Bicycles were counted in the same manner as vehicles and are included within the total traffic volumes for roadways. As summarized above in Response to Comment 16-4, while it may seem that cycling through roundabouts would be more challenging than cycling through a signalized intersection, speeds in the intersections are greatly reduced through the use of roundabouts. Roundabouts are a key traffic-calming element supported by cyclist as a primary element of “bicycle boulevards”, which are designed to enhance the cycling experience.
35-4	Considering the crosswalk locations, won't stopping traffic for them back up traffic into the just-passed traffic circle?	Please see Response to Comment 16-5 that discusses pedestrian effects on roundabout operations; Responses to Letter 18 that discuss the potential for the inclusion of pedestrian signals at roundabout locations; and Response to Comment 39-3 that discusses safety at roundabouts.
35-5	Will delivery trucks block the single traffic lane or are there designated parking stalls that affect the available parking count?	Delivery trucks will not block the single traffic lane. The strategies in the Plan call for delivery areas to be designated areas. The number of parking stalls along Camino del Mar is planned to increase.
35-6	[Closing remarks.]	This comment provides closing remarks for the letter and does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. No further response is necessary.
	<b>Letter 36 - Rick Ehrenfeld</b>	
36-1	Introduction to concerns of Shadow Study.	The commenter has provided the following letter concerning the Shadow Study prepared as part of the Plan visual analysis. This comment includes introductory remarks. No further response is necessary.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
36-2	Shadow study may not be applicable to the City Hall site because there is no alley allowing the envelope to be setback only 10' from the property line.	The draft Plan has been revised to reduce maximum building height to 26 feet within 50 feet of residentially zoned properties and a 10-foot building setback is also required for buildings adjacent to residential properties. In addition, the Design Review Ordinance addresses the issue of shadows.
36-3	What was the elevation differential used in the shadow study?	The shadow study used an average 10 percent slope, which is typical of Del Mar side streets.
36-4	Commenter's calculations	The commenter has provided rough estimates for the building envelope for City Hall based on information provided within the PEIR, and requested that review of the estimates for the City Hall property be conducted. The City Hall Site is designated as a Special Study Area and is addressed in the Plan's Chapter XI, Special Study Areas. The complexity of the City Hall site and the widespread interest in how the site gets develop dictate that a master plan be prepared. This is on the Council's Priorities for Fiscal Year 2013-2014.
<b>Letter 37 - Alice Scull McNalley</b>		
37-1	Provide plenty of parking either underground at the City Hall site or the underdeveloped old gas station property.	This comment provides the view of the commenter with respect to revitalization of the proposed Plan area. Specifically noted was support for an increase in parking within the Plan area, including by means of a parking structure at City Hall or on the old gas station property; encouragement or subsidization for retail; entertainment; and "making the most of the village charm". Comment noted.
37-2	Keep up appearances through quality maintenance, workmanship and materials, more through street sweeping, and trash receptacles.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR, but rather has included a summary of what the commenter believes is important to "Keep up appearances". Comments noted.
37-4	Bring people to town by offering train/coaster service and a shuttle service from "train to heights". Keep four lanes open on CDM.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, the commenter's support of keeping Camino del Mar as four lanes is noted. No further response is necessary.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
37-5	No parking permits.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter concerning the City's parking fee program. The comment that there should be no parking permits is noted.
<b>Letter 38 - Hershell Price</b>		
38-1	In order to preserve "Village" atmosphere require new structures to have sloped rooflines such as Watkins, Library and Davidson buildings to allow more view corridors.	While the commenter notes that the letter is responding to the PEIR for the Plan, this comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR, but rather notes preference for a design style that would similar to a "small European village". Though this does not raise issue with the adequacy of the PEIR, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The City Council has directed that the roof articulation be required within the overall 26-foot height limit. Also, they have directed that the Design Review Ordinance be modified to better address commercial building design in the Plan area.
<b>Letter 39 - Bertha Leone</b>		
39-1	Provision of an introduction to the letter identifying general support of the Plan.	Additional concerns are outlined within the letter. No further response is necessary.
39-2	Traffic impacts on residential streets should be monitored and there needs to be a backup plan that can be quickly implemented to reduce traffic volumes on residential streets in the event these Camino del Mar changes do impact neighborhoods.	As stated in Response to Comment 4-1, the two lanes with roundabouts configuration proposed for Camino del Mar would provide more capacity than the existing configuration (four lanes with stop signs) even though there would be a reduction in the number of lanes. With respect to side street diversion, as summarized in Response to Comment 16-7, Plan implementation is not anticipated to result in diversion of traffic from Camino del Mar to surrounding neighborhood streets. Nonetheless, the Plan includes precautionary measures to address diversion from Camino del Mar to alternate roadways, including Crest Road, Stratford Court, Luneta Drive and Ocean Avenue. Refer to PEIR Section 4.14.4.1d.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
39-3	Concerned with safety of the roundabouts as through-traffic will move consistently during rush hours making it difficult to enter from side streets.	The City's traffic consultant has conferred with Police Captain Sherri A. Sarro to review accident data at the adjacent roundabouts in Encinitas. This review revealed one fatality since roundabout installations; however, that fatality was attributed to driving under the influence and to not being restrained driver (i.e., not wearing a seatbelt); and was not attributed to the roadway design. The national Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and Highway Loss Data Institute cites that roundabouts generally offer improved safety, especially in reducing the chance of a severe accident.
39-4	Prefers to see rooflines that vary in height (some single story and some two story) and design to preserve views of the sky, sunshine, sunsets, and ocean. Consistent 26' and 30' heights from 9th to 15th will not retain Village "charm".	The commenter has noted opposition to building heights in excess of two stories; and would rather have varying heights (one- and two-story combination) along Camino del Mar. Though this does not raise issue with the adequacy of the PEIR, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The City Council has directed that the roof articulation be required within the overall 26-foot height limit of the Plan. Also, they have directed that the Design Review Ordinance be modified to better address commercial building design in the Plan area, which could look at a variety of building silhouettes. Also, incentives have been added to the Plan preserve ocean views. The Design Review Board will be addressing the detailed design with each building proposal.
<b>Letter 40 - Sarah Dubin-Vaughn</b>		
40-1	Concerned about the transition from two-lane to one-lane traffic at 9th Street. Suggests to make the transition to one-lane at 4 <sup>th</sup> Street/Del Mar Heights Road intersection.	In response to the commenter's concern regarding Camino del Mar, the PEIR and associated TIS do address the transition from four to two lanes north of Del Mar Heights Road, and the transition from two lanes back to four lanes north of 15th Street. The analysis shows that these transitions would operate at an acceptable level of service and not create a significant bottleneck. Also, the draft Plan has been modified to provide more information on the transition zones.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
40-2	Wants more details on standards addressing the west facing buildings on the west side of Camino del Mar, traffic goals, development timelines, and funding.	Though this does not raise issue with the adequacy of the PEIR, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. See Response to Comment 38-1 that addresses buildings on the west side of Camino del Mar. The draft Plan has been revised to include a potential timeline in its Chapter X Implementation, Table X-1. Also, Chapter IX, Public Finance, as revised in the Plan, provides considerable detail about possible financing mechanisms for the public improvements. It has been publicly presented to the Finance Committee, the Planning Commission, and the City Council
40-3	[Email chain.]	This portion of the comment consists of an email prepared by another individual to the commenter. Because the specific comments were not referenced to be that of the commenter, they are simply noted as an attachment. No further response is necessary.
<b>Letter 41 - Rick Ehrenfeld</b>		
41-1	Concerned with traffic, noise and air quality impacts from the parking garage at City Hall. EIR should study both open-sided and totally enclosed structure options, as it would affect the air and noise analysis.	This comment provides an introduction to the letter and also raises a general concern about the analysis of the proposed parking structure in light of the potential impacts with respect to traffic, noise, and air quality. The PEIR contains analysis of the Plan's potential impacts related to traffic, noise, and air quality on a program level, as the CEQA document is a Program EIR. Once the parking structure development is proposed and design plans are developed, it would be required to comply with CEQA and undergo additional review of potential impacts such as traffic (i.e., access or circulation), noise, and air quality.
41-2	The difference in air quality and noise impacts between an open-sided and totally enclosed parking structure should be analyzed and considered.	As stated above in Response to Comment 41-1, the Plan was reviewed on a programmatic level. Any future development project, including the parking structure, will be required to prepare additional project-level environmental analysis, such as an Initial Study, to evaluate the potential significance of traffic, noise, and air quality impacts and ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
41-3	Also concerned about light impacts from an open-sided structure.	As indicated in PEIR Section 4.1.4.4, the Plan would have a less than significant light impact. Future development projects in accordance with the Plan would be reviewed for compliance with applicable lighting regulations, including the glazing and exterior lighting requirements in the City's Zoning Ordinance and Building Code Ordinance, the specific development standards contained within the Plan, and any other applicable regulations. As such, the future development allowed by the Plan would result in a less than significant change to the glare and ambient light into the nighttime sky.
41-4	A parking structure would lead to increased intensity and would result in traffic impacts to the neighborhood. This needs to be addressed in the EIR.	As indicated in Response to Comment 41-1, the parking structure would undergo further traffic analysis at the project level. The parking structure itself would not generate traffic; however, the location, access, and design of a proposed parking structure would need to be reviewed. It should be noted that the PEIR did include analysis of traffic and circulation for the Plan and no significant impact as a result of Plan implementation, including the development of properties as designated under the Plan, are expected to occur.
41-5	Need to analyze cumulative impacts from vehicle emissions of the vehicles inside the structure and those entering and exiting the structure. Any pollution impacts from the parking structure must include mobile sources from increased vehicular traffic, whether on a road or in a parking structure.	The air quality analysis completed for the PEIR included mobile sources from vehicular traffic generated by the Plan land uses. As stated above, the parking structure itself would not generate traffic. Other proposed uses that would generate traffic that may utilize the proposed parking structure were included in the air quality analysis (see Section 4.2 and Appendix C). As indicated in Section 4.2 and Section 7.2 (cumulative), the Plan's buildout air quality impacts would be less than significant. Should the parking structure be initiated and designed, it would be required to comply with CEQA and undergo additional air quality analysis or localized carbon monoxide hotspot analysis.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
41-6	There has been some talk of including residential units on the City Hall lot. The air quality impacts on these units should be studied.	The commenter has noted concern with respect to the inclusion of residential units within the Civic-City Hall parcel. The Plan does not specifically identify that residential units are to be located on this property. Any proposed project would be required to comply with CEQA and undergo additional analysis.
<b>Letter 42 - Paul E. Chasan</b>		
42-1	Other new development in neighboring areas may take customers from Del Mar. Bird Rock shopping area implemented a specific plan similar to the proposed project and it had positive effects to traffic flow, redevelopment and activity.	This comment provides an introduction to the letter and provides general support of the Plan. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; no further response is necessary.
42-2	Downtown Del Mar has limited parking and unattractive sidewalks. Stores get customers through referrals and not through people walking along the street shopping.	The commenter's observation that critical issues within the Plan area are parking and lack of attractive sidewalks is noted. Though this does not raise issue with the adequacy of the PEIR, in response to these concerns, it should be noted that the Plan would provide for additional parking and sidewalk improvements. No further response is necessary
42-3	Del Mar has potential but is being held back by a small vocal group of citizens who resist any change. I believe that the village specific plan will bring Del Mar more activity for the retail stores and restaurants, and be of significant benefit to the businesses, residents and visitors.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; no further response is necessary.
<b>Letter 43 - Drew Cady</b>		
43-1	Del Mar has the opportunity to resist overbuild like in surrounding developments by taking a conservative approach to redevelopment of its downtown core.	This comment provides an introduction to the letter and background on the individual, as well as general comments on the current development in and around Del Mar. Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; no further response is necessary.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
43-2	What actions has the City taken regarding the proposed One Paseo development project that will add significant traffic, pollution and urban stress to our already encroached upon community?	The One Paseo project is located outside of the City of Del Mar's jurisdiction and impacts are addressed in an EIR prepared by the City of San Diego. Please note that the One Paseo project was included in the traffic and cumulative impact analysis in the PEIR (Sections 4.14 and 7). The City submitted a written comment letter to the City of San Diego addressing their concerns about the traffic impacts of the One Paseo project.
43-3	What are the benefits of increasing the higher building codes for the commercial profile on Camino del Mar? Is there evidence that this will generate more revenues by increasing height?	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. See Response to Comment 32-1.
43-4	Is there data confirming the recommended 1.0 FAR is of interest to developers?	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Discussions with both property owners and real estate developers indicate that the additional FAR and building height proposed in the Plan will increase the financial viability of properties in the Plan area.
43-5	What control will there be when traffic begins to divert onto Stratford Court at the beginning of the roundabouts?	As stated above in Response to Comment 16-7, implementation of the Plan is not anticipated to result in traffic diverting from Camino del Mar to Stratford Court. Nonetheless, the Plan includes precautionary measures to address diversion. Refer to Response to Comment 16-7 for the list of such measures. All existing prohibitions to limit motorists from diverting from Camino del Mar, including prohibition of northbound left turns from Camino del Mar and managing the traffic signal timing at 4 <sup>th</sup> Street and Camino del Mar will be retained and enforced as is currently done. Additional strategies have been added to the Plan to address the commenter's concerns in Chapter IV Mobility, Section 4.3.3 Circulation Implementation Strategies.
43-6	Will there be more Sheriff patrol cars to monitor and issue fines?	The Sheriff patrol and the City of Del Mar would determine the level of service necessary to monitor and issue fines as new development occurs (see PEIR Section 4.12.4.2).

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
43-7	“Bird Rock roundabouts are not comparable to Del Mar as no one diverts from the Interstate 5 onto La Jolla Boulevard.”	Please see Response to Comment 16-7. In summary, the Plan is not anticipated to result in traffic diversion from Camino del Mar to residential streets but the Plan does include precautionary measures to address diversion in Chapter IV Mobility, Section 4.3.3 Circulation Implementation Strategies.
43-8	How will the height increase affect residents' ocean views all along Camino del Mar? Is it possible to referee these residents' concerns with the concerns of developers/commercial space owners?	Residential ocean view impacts are analyzed in PEIR Section 4.1.4.1. As indicated in that section, Plan impacts to residential views would be less than significant because ocean views would continue to be protected through the Design Review Ordinance, and would also be protected through proposed Plan regulations such as new stepbacks and setbacks. Refer to Section 4.1.4.1 for more details. Also, the draft Plan has been revised to increase incentives for view corridors that create or preserve ocean views from the street level.
43-9	Redevelopment of these building heights will create disruption with no clear cost-benefit analysis for the small business owners, who potentially will be driven out by construction upheaval or resulting rent increases. Given this, I do not support the Plan without further research into feasibility and other options.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. A property owner has the right to redevelop his property at any time and charge the rent he feels is commensurate with the marketplace. The Plan does not change that right. The disruption to small business owners by streetscape construction will be minimized as much as possible with the implementation of an outreach program.
43-10	[Overview remarks.]	This comment communicates the individual's lack of support for the proposed Plan as proposed and provides a lead-in to the following five comments (Comments 43-11 through 43-15). No further response is necessary.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
43-11	Issues existing in Del Mar that need to be addressed include: Incentivize individual property owners to make improvements to make their properties more "appealing and complimentary to the Village ambience".	This comment addresses the option to incentivize property owners for downtown improvement. Comment noted. The Plan proposes strategies for addressing issues that already exist in Del Mar. The Plan includes a number of incentives for property owners to make improvements to or redevelop their properties. The improvements will be required to be in conformance with the Design Review Ordinance.
43-12	Create more parking, preferable underground and accessible from Camino del Mar.	This comment addresses the option of increased parking. While this comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR, it should be noted that the Plan does include the provision for more parking within the area, including a parking structure near City Hall. Additional strategies for creating more spaces and increasing the efficient use of existing and new parking spaces are addressed in Plan Chapter VII, Parking.
43-13	Create a more uniform and aesthetic look to the Camino del Mar landscape.	This comment addresses the option of uniform design along Camino del Mar. Comment noted. The improvements to Camino del Mar proposed in the Plan will create a more uniform and consistent streetscape along Camino del Mar by constructing a continuous sidewalk within the public right-of-way, creating consistent angled parking within the right-of-way that is designed block by block rather than parcel by parcel and creating a "build-to-line" that will require buildings to be located adjacent to the sidewalk to create a strong relationship between building facades and the sidewalk.
43-14	Redevelop City Hall employing mixed use concept to offset costs of the rebuild and offer a more inviting street appeal to the property.	This comment addresses the option of redevelopment of City Hall as a mixed-use project. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The City Hall site has been designated as a Special Study Area and the proposal to define a full redevelopment project, with substantial community involvement, is described in Chapter XI, Special Study Areas, of the Plan.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
43-15	Offer incentives for landlords to promote cafes and/or restaurants.	This comment raises the option to incentivize business owners along Camino del Mar. Comment noted. The Plan promotes cafes and restaurants by offering a reduced parking ratio in exchange for allowing public parking and implementing the alternative of paying an in lieu parking fee to pay for off-site parking instead of requiring on-site parking. These parking strategies as described in the Plan's Parking Chapter VII.
43-16	[Closing remarks.]	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; Comment noted and no further response is necessary.
<b>Letter 44 - Ricardo Simons</b>		
44-1	Suggests the City follow the 1974 Citizen's Proposed Revision to the Del Mar General Plan by preserving street level ocean views, limiting density to preserve ocean views and preserve the atmosphere of open space, and establishing architectural controls to keep the pedestrian scale and village character of the community.	<p>The commenter has included excerpts of a document prepared by a citizens committee in 1974 during the preparation of the Del Mar Community Plan. The Village Specific Plan followed the policies adopted in the 1976 Community Plan. It should be noted that public and private residential ocean view impacts were analyzed in PEIR Section 4.1.4.1 and determined to be less than significant because of the Design Review Ordinance protections. Ocean views would continue to be protected through the Design Review Ordinance and would also be protected through proposed Plan regulations such as stepbacks and setbacks. Refer to Section 4.1.4.1 of the PEIR for more details. The draft Plan has also been revised to increase incentives for property owners that build public plazas that create or preserve street-level ocean views.</p> <p>The Plan is consistent with and guided by the goals, objectives and descriptions in the adopted Del Mar Community Plan that was presented to and approved by the residents of Del Mar in March 1976 and amended in 1985. The document titled "Commercial Land Use and Character" is not included in the adopted Community Plan.</p>

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 45a - Al Tarkington</b>	
45a-1	Requests additional review time.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. The commenter has requested more time to review the Plan. The City Council adopted a schedule in July, 2011 with a decision to complete the Plan at its August 6, 2012 City Council meeting.
45a-2	Is there an economic impact report? Is there a projection of costs and offsetting projection of the source(s) of funds to pay for the improvements?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Public Financing component of the Plan, Chapter IX (particularly as amended since the Public Review draft), provides considerable detail about possible financing mechanisms for the public improvements. It has been publicly presented to the Finance Committee, the Planning Commission and the City Council.
45a-3	What is the benefit to residents in regards to increased FAR and height limits?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The primary benefit to the residents of Del Mar would be to implement an important goal of the Del Mar Community Plan; “Focus the major retail and office activity into an economically viable, pedestrian oriented and attractive area that serves the needs of both residents and visitors and is well integrated into the residential fabric of the community”. The Plan has been revised to list additional benefits to residents in its Chapter III, Section 3.9 Community Benefits.
45a-4	Concerned with modifications of existing traffic patterns and the potential effects on residents.	The commenter has noted a general concern with modifications of existing traffic patterns in the area. However, no specificity of these concerns was included in the comment. The PEIR Section 4.14 included an analysis of the traffic and circulation effects of the Plan and proposed Camino del Mar roadway design on the Plan and surrounding areas. As summarized in the PEIR, Plan implementation would have a less than significant impact to traffic.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
45a-5	[Concluding remarks noting general opposition to the Plan.]	The commenter has noted general opposition to the Plan as currently proposed. Comment noted; no further response is necessary.
<b>Letter 45b - Stephanie Tarkington</b>		
45b-1	Documents are too extensive for a private citizen to read or comprehend. Meetings/presentations have been helpful to answer questions. How many Del Mar residents attended one of more presentations given by Staff?	This comment provides an introduction to the letter. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Over 80 meetings have been held during the course of the Plan development; over 50 of those meetings have been held during the draft Plan public review period. During the draft Plan public review, over 200 residents participated in 16 neighborhood workshops. City Council discussed the Plan at 23 individual sessions; each of those meetings are recorded and available on the Del Mar City government website for those who did not attend.
45b-2	Citizens not aware of the benefits of the project. Building owners won't build the street improvements unless they receive the increase in FAR. Supports the current height limit and FAR, likes a mixed use concept with open spaces.	Chapter III of the Plan, Protection of Community Resources, has been modified to define the benefits of the revitalization. Street improvements will be a Capital Improvement Project. Commenter supports the current .45 FAR and height limits, which is noted.
45b-3	How can you assure adjacent residents will not be adversely affected by the roundabouts, more outside eating, more building and more traffic?	The commenter raises general concerns with respect to the analysis of adverse effects of traffic, specifically the proposed roundabouts, as well as the increase in building and exterior uses (i.e., cafes). The PEIR includes an analysis of the effects of Plan implementation on subject areas including traffic and noise to name a few. As detailed within the PEIR, the Plan was determined to not result in any significant environmental impacts.
45b-4	Wants to make a complete circle and then right turn on 11th Street between 3pm-6pm if I was driving north on Camino del Mar. Others think this will again impact residents on Stratford Court.	Please refer to Response to Comment 16-7. The current "no left turn" regulations will stay in effect with roundabouts.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
45b-5	Suggests breaking the ballot measure into a beginning, middle, and final state, and presented on several ballots over time to make it easier for residents to understand what they are voting for or against.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; comment noted.
<b>Letter 46 - Kipp Downing</b>		
46-1	What will the traffic impact of the roundabouts be on Crest, Stratford, Luneta, Coast Blvd, and other neighborhood streets?	As indicated in PEIR Section 4.14, the Plan, including the proposed roundabouts on Camino del Mar, would have a less than significant impact on traffic circulation. As summarized above in Response to Comment 16-7, Plan implementation is not anticipated to result in traffic diversion from Camino del Mar to neighboring streets. Nonetheless, the Plan includes precautionary measures to address diversion. Refer to PEIR Section 4.14.4.1d and Response to Comment 16-7 for additional information.
46-2	Where were these models actually located that this computer generated plan is based upon?	There are several models used in the TIS. SANDAG, the regional planning agency, has developed the forecast model that uses population, employment and other socio-economic data to forecast traffic volumes and growth throughout the region. The engineering firm, KOA Corporation, developed models using Synchro, a nationally recognized software program, to analyze the Plan traffic generation and distribution.
46-3	What will the economic impact be on the City during construction due to lost sales tax revenue?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The City estimates that impacts would be minimal, if any. See Response to Comment 32-7 for additional detail.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
46-4	What will the economic impact be on small businesses during construction due to lost sales?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The City will manage the construction schedule and work with business owners to ensure that sales, business establishment access and public parking can be maintained during construction. The construction phasing plan will be developed with input from property and business owners. See Response to Comment 32-7 for additional detail.
46-5	Has an accurate pedestrian count been taken during the peak summer months for all intersections where roundabouts are being considered?	See Response to Comment 16-5 regarding the pedestrian counts utilized for the TIS (Appendix F to the PEIR), which used a 20 percent factor above current volumes to account for peak season pedestrian activity. Pedestrian counts were taken at 15 <sup>th</sup> and Camino del Mar at low and high season, weekday and weekend times during peak vehicular times. A permanent pedestrian counter is installed at 14 <sup>th</sup> Street and Camino del Mar that provides additional data.
46-6	Has an accurate bicycle traffic count been taken during the peak summer months for all intersections where roundabouts are being considered?	As stated in Response to Comment 16-6, the analysis in the PEIR and associated TIS includes "typical non-summer" conditions, as well as "peak summer" conditions, which include the events at the fairgrounds/racetrack. Bicycle volumes along Camino del Mar are incorporated into the overall traffic as vehicles within the total volumes. There is a permanent bicycle counter at the intersection of 14 <sup>th</sup> Street and Camino del Mar that provided data for the Plan.
46-7	How will pedestrian, automobile and bicycle traffic commingle at the roundabouts?	As conceptually designed, the pedestrians would not cross through the circle, but either before or after in marked crossings with a pedestrian island between the two travel lanes. Bicycle traffic merges with automobiles within the roundabout and obeys the same rules and has the same right-of-way as cars. This is commonly done because automobiles and bicycles travel at approximately the same speeds within the roundabout.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
46-8	How will the roundabouts impact delivery truck traffic?	The two-lanes with roundabouts would be designed to accommodate larger deliver trucks.
46-9	How will the roundabouts impact the traffic patterns of tour bus traffic in the city?	Tour bus operations are similar to larger delivery trucks navigating roundabouts which are discussed above in Response to Comment 46-8.
46-10	How will the narrowing of the streets and roundabouts impact the mass exodus from the Del Mar Racetrack after the races?	Camino del Mar is used as a bypass for traffic accessing the Del Mar Race Track. When such events occur, the current delay at stop signs on Camino del Mar can be very long. Comparing the existing configuration of Camino del Mar as four lanes with stop signs to the proposed two lanes with roundabouts, the roundabout design provides more capacity than the existing configuration even though there would be a reduction in the number of lanes.
46-11	How will the construction schedule be phased and how long will it take?	The Plan is a programmatic document that establishes the program. Any construction of new roadways or public facilities will be further developed as a Capital Improvement Project. At the time a Capital Improvement Project is initiated, a phasing plan will be developed. Construction will be phased to minimize disruption to traffic and businesses. This process will also include outreach with affected business owners and property owners.
46-12	Will the City consider construction during off-hours to avoid business disruption?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Chapter IV of the Plan proposes that the City develop a construction outreach notification effort (C.O.N.E.) program in concert with the business owners to ensure construction efficiencies, minimum disturbance to business establishments, and adequate notification and alternative arrangements in advance and during construction activities. The draft Plan has been revised to add additional explanation and detail in its Chapter IV Mobility, Section 4.3.Circulation Implementation Strategies. See also response to Comment 32-7.
46-13	Which restaurants are considering additional investment in sidewalk cafes?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Sidewalk cafes are regulated with the Sidewalk Café permit. It is not an action of the Plan.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
46-14	Has a survey been done of surrounding zip codes that patronize the Del Mar business community to gauge the impact of the construction of roundabouts on the future business activity and future traffic patterns in Del Mar?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. A survey, as the author describes, has not been conducted.
46-15	What if the roundabouts don't work? Are we stuck with this problem forever?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, it should be noted that the TIS shows that the two-lane road with roundabouts is adequate for existing and proposed traffic along Camino del Mar. Roundabouts have been shown to be very successful in other parts of the country and state under very similar circumstances, including a recently completed project on La Jolla Boulevard in the Bird Rock community of La Jolla. Additional examples of roundabouts in urban settings are provided as part of the June 4, 2012 City Council packet.
46-16	What are the long-term improvements in cars/days with signals "all the way" instead of roundabouts?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however the following response is provided as courtesy to the commenter. The existing four-lane Camino de Mar with stop signs has a capacity of 15,500 cars per day. The Plan configuration for Camino del Mar of two lanes and roundabouts would result in a capacity of 25,000 cars per day. Changing the stop signs to signals at 11 <sup>th</sup> and 13 <sup>th</sup> Streets and retaining the four lanes along Camino del Mar would result in a carrying capacity of 30,000 cars per day. The City selected the two lane with roundabouts configuration, as the City wants to provide a balance between parking, pedestrian/bicyclists, and motor vehicle needs.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
46-17	Is it worth adding 6 spaces per block at the expense of one lane each way on Camino del Mar?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, the City has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. As indicated in the Plan, one of its key objectives is to provide a balance between parking, pedestrian/bicyclists, and motor vehicle needs. The Plan's two-lane with roundabouts configuration for Camino del Mar would increase Camino del Mar capacity while also adding parking and pedestrian-oriented improvements. The additional benefits include wider, contiguous sidewalks; decreased pedestrian/vehicle conflicts; increased pedestrian capacity; and decreased pedestrian roadway crossing distances. While retaining four lanes and providing traffic signals instead of roundabouts would increase capacity over the proposed Plan, maintaining four lanes does not provide for expanded pedestrian or parking benefits
46-18	What are all of the options such as metered parking at Paul Chasen's lot in the old Wells Fargo space that increase parking? What is the net increase in parking of that?	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR, as parking is not an environmental issue required to be addressed in the PEIR. In 2012, the City Council adopted an ordinance that allows pay parking during the hours a business is closed. The location referenced in the comment, 1431 Camino del Mar, has submitted an application under the ordinance but does not have an approved permit. Since it has not been implemented, no increase of parking is recorded.
<b>Letter 47a - Ann Gardner</b>		
47a-1	[Introductory remarks.]	This comment provides an introduction to the letter. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; no further response is necessary.
47a-2	Supports narrowing Camino del Mar and installing roundabouts	This comment notes support for the proposed narrowing of Camino del Mar to two lanes with roundabouts. Comment noted.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
47a-3	"Inadequate public transit" should be added/emphasized as an issue in the Village Specific Plan rather than emphasizing only additional parking for cars.	The commenter has noted that inadequate public transit is an issue that should be addressed, suggesting that improved or new transit options and/or a shuttle service be included within the Plan. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; comment noted. Public transit is provided by North County Transit District. The Plan anticipated the improvements identified in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan, which increases the headways along Camino del Mar to 15 minutes, but does not include additional routes beyond Route 101. The Plan does not preclude additional transit routes.
47a-4	Create a more inviting pedestrian environment with mosaic tiles, agate, colored paving, etc.	This comment provides input on the sidewalk design as detailed within the Plan. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; comment noted. Details such as sidewalk materials and design will be part of the improvement plans that will be prepared prior to construction.
47a-5	Will there really be plazas at our street corners with benches and tables, etc.?	The commenter has requested clarification of the proposed "plaza" to be located at intersections as included within the Plan. While this comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; the following response for clarification of the intent of the Plan has been provided. Figure IV-5 of the Plan shows the curb extensions that will widen the sidewalks at pedestrian crossings of Camino del Mar, creating small plazas. Details such as street furniture and landscaping will be part of the improvement plans that will be prepared prior to construction.
47a-6	Supports smaller increases in FAR and height to assure low intensity scale in the Village. Supports allowance of additional FAR beyond the proposed 1.0 only for residential (second floor) and residential retail (first floor).	This comment notes support for a lower FAR and height limit for commercial/office, with a FAR over 1.0 for residential only. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. However, with regard to CEQA, the Plan would have no significant impacts to visual resources and aesthetics and, therefore, limiting the FAR and height is not warranted per CEQA. No further response is necessary.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
47a-7	Allow 26' height on west side of Camino del Mar only when public views are protected and with roof articulation. Does not support 4' roof articulation increases on either side of Camino del Mar.	The support for specific development regulations along the western side of Camino del Mar when public views are protected is noted. Per the CEQA analysis, the Plan would have no significant impacts to visual resources and aesthetics. City Council, at their June 25 <sup>th</sup> hearing, limited the height (both sides) to 26 feet, including any roof articulation.
47a-8	Supports strengthening Design Review for all Village projects with view protection from residential and public (i.e. library) areas and side streets east of Camino del Mar.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. With implementation of the proposed Plan, future projects within the Plan area would continue to be subject to the Design Review Ordinance. As indicated in Section 4.1 of the PEIR, Plan buildout would thus have a less than significant visual impact. Refer to Section 4.1 of the PEIR for additional information.
47a-9	It is not clear that the benefits of the proposed Village Specific Plan outweigh the proposed increases in bulk and the new 30' height on both sides of Camino del Mar.	Refer to Response to Comments 47-7 and 47-8 above. Community benefits have been added to Chapter III of the Plan.
47a-10	EIR Comments - Visual impacts	The commenter raises concern with the adequacy of the analysis and conclusion that potential effects on visual resources and aesthetics would be less than significant, specifically that the implementation of design review would ensure such impacts would be less than significant. As detailed within Section 4.1 of the PEIR, compliance of future projects with the Design Review Ordinance would ensure consistent design of new and redeveloped properties within the Plan area. These ordinances provide detailed guidelines and standards for which proposed development would be required to comply. Refer to Section 4.1 for the complete analysis of potential impacts under CEQA.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
47a-11	EIR Comments – CEQA Alternatives	<p>The PEIR provides a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Plan, including a reduced project alternative. With respect to the commenter's questions concerning the details of the reduced project alternative, the reduced square footage would include the bonus square footage for exceptional benefits as outlined in the Plan. In this CEQA Alternative, the FAR would remain the same for the Plan area and development or redevelopment would be permitted to occur throughout the Plan area until the 500,000 square feet had been realized, at which time only redevelopment within this upper limit would be permitted. The City would monitor the limits of development to ensure that the upper limit of 500,000 square feet is not exceeded.</p> <p>In addition, Chapter X, Implementation, of the draft Plan has been revised to include a series of thresholds at which the City Council will review the status of Plan implementation. This review will occur when the following three thresholds are reached: after 10 years or attaining a total of 400,000 square feet of floor area in the Plan area (whichever occurs first), after 20 years or a total of 500,000 square feet and after 30 years or a total of 600,000 square feet.</p>
47a-12	Commenter proposed alternative	<p>This comment includes a Plan alternative suggested to address the commenter's above concerns, which includes a lower FAR and restriction of height. The commenter's suggested design restrictions would not result in any significant impacts (similar to the Plan). Therefore, such an alternative would not be required to be further analyzed under CEQA because it would not further reduce significant impacts identified for the Plan.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
47a-13	VSP: Building Height	This comment includes suggested changes to the Plan and does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. However, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The comment to include side streets, and public facilities in the proposed view assessment would be included in the assessment of public views.
47a-14	VSP: Modify FAR	This comment includes suggested changes to the Plan and does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. However, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The commenter's support of a lower FAR was considered by the City Council. City Council maintained the FAR and instituted a cumulative review program with thresholds so as to monitor the cumulative development.
47a-15	VSP: Modify Exceptional Benefits Strategy	This comment includes suggested changes to the Plan and does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. However, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The commenter's proposal to modify the incentives for Exceptional Public Benefits (EPB) was considered by the City Council. The City Council made changes to the EPBs to include incentives for public view corridors, and modified other incentives based upon equity and public benefit.
47a-16	VSP: Horizontal Policy	This comment includes suggested policies to be included in the Plan and does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. However, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The current Horizontal Zoning Regulations of the DMMC and currently applying to the Central Commercial Zone are retained, including the ability to obtain relief from the regulations.
47a-17	Conclusion	This comment concludes the letter. Comment noted; no further response is necessary.
<b>Letter 47b - Ann Gardner</b>		
47b-1	[Amend previous comments.]	This comment letter was provided to amend the preceding comment letter, where it reads "ocean views", replace with "scenic vistas". Comment noted.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 48 - Ann Wooley</b>	
48-1	Supports metered parking on main thoroughfares (CDM & Coast Blvd) rather than neighborhood short streets in beach area.	The commenter's support of metered parking on thoroughfares within the Plan area is noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; no further response is necessary. No metering of parking in residential neighborhoods is proposed as part of the Plan.
48-2	Double-standard of building lifeguard center to attract more people and yet reducing traffic lanes to one, increasing congestion.	The commenter provided general issues of concern with respect to attracting more people while reducing traffic lanes, noting that this would increase congestion. Comments noted; no further response is necessary as this comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. The Plan proposal to utilize roundabouts along Camino del Mar provides additional traffic capacity, thereby allowing the reduction of travel lanes.
48-3	Lack of enforcement of existing laws...Major accidents waiting to happen with City liable?	The commenter's concerns related to law enforcement are noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; no further response is necessary. The law enforcement issues raised by the commenter are beyond the scope of the Plan.
48-4	"Willing to pay annual fee but shouldn't the cost be shared by all Del Mar?"	This comment raises the issue of fees associated with traffic improvements, but does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The alternatives for financing of public improvements, including traffic improvements, are addressed in the Plan in , Public Finance.
48-5	Aren't Restaurants required to provide parking for at least some of their employees? Most of them park on neighborhood streets.	This comment raises the issue of restaurant parking requirements. Parking is not an environmental issue required to be addressed in the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Current parking requirements and ratios are designed to provide adequate parking for customers and employees. However, many restaurants in the Plan area were established prior to the effective date of the current parking regulations.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
48-6	Money is the problem and enforcing existing laws could be a partial answer. Can the City employees be enabled to give more than parking violations?	The issues and questions raised in this comment are not associated with the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The City's Code Enforcement Officer enforces the City's Municipal Code.
48-7	[Concluding remarks.]	This comment concludes the letter. Comment noted; no further response is necessary.
<b>Letter 49 - Nancy L. Stoke</b>		
49-1	Intro with quotes from PEIR	This comment provides an introduction to the comment letter and contains various references from the Plan and the PEIR and associated technical documentation. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; no further response is necessary.
49-2	Please address why the Plan selects the option that increases capacity on roadways bounded by the roundabouts (or residential streets).	As summarized in the PEIR, and included in Table 1-1 of the TIS, the capacity of Camino del Mar as currently designed with four lanes and signal-controlled intersections is 30,000 ADT. The proposed reconfiguration of two lanes with roundabouts has a capacity of 25,000 ADT. While the capacity of the four-lane design with signals would be greater, the design of Camino del Mar as two-lanes with roundabouts was determined to better enhance the pedestrian corridor, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and provide more parking while reasonably accommodating existing and future traffic flows along this roadway. The PEIR found that maintaining the existing conditions with four lanes and stop signs had significant, unmitigated environmental impacts, while the proposed design of two lanes with roundabouts would result in less than significant impacts.
49-3	Please address why Table IV-2 in the Plan says the roundabouts option will have vehicle capacity of 22,000-26,000 ADT which is in conflict with the marketing materials being used and in Plan section 4.3.2.	Table IV-2 in the Plan refers to an evaluation of the various alternatives for Camino del Mar. Typically, the vehicle capacity on roads with roundabouts ranges between 22,000 and 26,000 trips per day. The traffic analysis determined that the actual capacity along Camino del Mar with roundabouts would be 25,000 average daily trips. The text has been modified to reflect this.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
49-4	Please explain how emergency vehicles are supposed to travel along CDM from 15th to 9th Streets when the traffic is backed up in the only available lane and there is no other way to travel along this route.	As indicated in PEIR Sections 4.14.4.3 and 4.14.5, the Plan would result in a less than significant emergency vehicle access impact. Implementing strategies, described in PEIR Section 4.14.4.2, would ensure adequate emergency access. The Fire Marshal has reviewed the proposed plan and has stated that the 20-foot clearance provided in the plan is adequate for emergency vehicles. Please also refer to Response to Comments 4-1 and 4-2 above.
49-5	Please install story poles at the lot south of Bully's Restaurant and at least two other sites that are deemed to be eligible for increased height.	Visual impacts from the proposed building height limit are discussed in PEIR Section 4.1. Visual simulations of the proposed heights are included in that section. In accordance with City standards, story poles would only be erected once development is proposed and under review.
49-6	Encourages a community affirmation to the Community Plan as many things have changed in the community and region since it was written.	This comment concludes the letter and does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Comment noted; no further response is necessary.
<b>Letter 50 - John Giebink</b>		
50-1	[Introductory/overview remarks.]	This comment provides an introduction to the comment letter and raises general issues of concern with respect to the analysis within the PEIR that are detailed below. No further response is necessary.
50-2	The Design Guidelines for the Plan are not delineated and the two examples cited in the document are not inclusive of all the concerns that must be addressed.	Revisions to the Design Review Ordinance that will more appropriately address the design of commercial buildings will be addressed after the Plan has been approved by the voters. Per City Council direction, Design Guidelines will be approved as a separate document and appended to the Plan.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
50-3	It is not clear that the "Upper Building Levels" will be (or even can be) stepped back sufficiently to avoid a looming presence.	The PEIR Section 4.1 includes visual simulations that were completed to illustrate the appearance of upper building levels with the stepped back rear façade adjacent to the residential zone. As shown in the visual simulations (see Figures 4.1-7 to 4.1-17), the increase in building height from one to two stories per the proposed Plan would be consistent with the existing development along Camino del Mar and would result in a less than significant visual impact. The draft Plan has been revised to also establish a maximum building height of 26 feet within 50 feet of a residentially zoned property, increasing this setback.
50-4	Concerned with vagueness of the controls on night time use of outdoor spaces adjacent to residential uses.	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR; however, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan has been revised to include a new development standard that limits the location of outdoor dining areas so that they are separated from residentially zoned property by an enclosed and sound-attenuated portion of a building on the property. In addition, the Plan has been modified to regulate that any outdoor dining area on the upper level will require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
50-5	Nighttime noise and traffic from bars and restaurants	<p>The PEIR included analysis of the increase in traffic noise associated with the maximum allowed development under the Plan. As detailed within the PEIR Section 4.10, the Plan was determined to not result in significant traffic noise impacts. This is largely due to the proposed one-lane configuration of Camino del Mar (that moves the noise source – vehicles – farther from the roadway edge) and the comparably low traffic volumes on side streets.</p> <p>With regard to noise from bars and restaurants, the far west and east edges of the Plan area would be the locations of particular concern, as that is where the backs of commercial buildings along Camino del Mar abut residentially-zoned properties. To ensure that noise impacts from bars and restaurants will be minimized, the Plan has been revised to include a new Development Standard that limits the location of outdoor dining areas so that they are separated from residentially zoned property by an enclosed and sound-attenuated portion of a building on the property and that any outdoor dining on the second level is required to have a Conditional Use Permit. See Response to Comment 50-4 for more details on modifications to the Plan in order to regulate noise and glare. Given these new Plan standards, as well as existing Municipal Code regulations (that establish property line noise level limits) and building code regulations (that require exterior-to-interior noise reduction), potential noise impacts to residential/sensitive uses would be avoided or reduced to less than significant.</p>
50-6	The PEIR does not address the effect of the increase in traffic on Camino del Mar that will result from increased traffic flow supposedly occasioned by the use of roundabouts.	Roundabouts are not traffic generators and would not increase traffic. The proposed roundabouts would increase the traffic capacity at the intersections, but would not increase traffic.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
50-7	Roundabout configuration will eliminate enforcement of the prohibited left turns during peak hours.	This comment expresses concern over the enforcement of left turns during peak hours, and does not specifically address the adequacy of the PEIR. The prohibition of left turns during peak hours will be retained. Signage prohibiting left turns and enforcement will be similar to current standards.
50-8	Reducing Camino del Mar to two lanes will result in massive shift of traffic to adjacent streets. The statement "implement traffic calming measures on residential streets if increased traffic impacts warrant" is vague.	As summarized above in Response to Comment 16-7, while diversion from Camino del Mar to alternate roadways, including Stratford Court, Crest Road, Luneta Drive and Ocean Avenue, is not expected to occur with the proposed design changes to Camino del Mar, measures are incorporated into the Plan to address any increase in traffic on these roadways.
50-9	The Plan notes that there will be parking issues, but does not meaningfully address them.	Parking is not an environmental issue required by CEQA to be addressed in the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Parking strategies are addressed in the Plan in Chapter VII, Parking. The strategies addressed include implementation of a Park Once strategy that will make more efficient use of existing parking and new parking required by new development or intensification of existing development; creation of a Parking Management Plan that will monitor parking usage and implement additional appropriate strategies such as providing for employee parking , valet parking plans, a public parking structure to supply additional public parking; and redesigning Camino del Mar to add approximately 50 to 60 new public parking spaces.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 51 - Ralph T. Peck</b>	
51-1	The proposed redevelopment of moving all of the properties to the front property line is contrary to the Community Plan, which agreed that "various setbacks was more desirable".	The Community Plan goal to "Promote informality of design with varied and interesting setbacks" has been incorporated into the proposed Plan and will be interpreted and implemented through the Design Review Ordinance. The "Build-to-Line" in the Plan provides the flexibility for open plazas, paseos, outdoor dining areas and other non-enclosed uses to be located on private property adjacent to the sidewalk. In addition, upper building levels are not required to be located at the front property line. These standards allow the flexibility for the Design Review Board to require informality of design with varied and interesting setbacks.
51-2	Proposed increase to 30' on the west side of Camino del Mar is contrary to the Community Plan, which requires "low-density, small scale" development.	<p>Based upon community comment, City Council has reduced the allowed height in the Plan to 26 feet, which would include roof articulation. This is the same height limit as is found in the adjacent residential areas. In addition, the Plan imposes an additional height restriction on properties immediately adjacent to the residential zone. That portion of the property which is within 50 feet of the adjacent residentially-zoned property is capped at 26 feet. The proposed two-story height limit would be consistent with the City's goal to preserve the small town atmosphere.</p> <p>The PEIR Section 4.1.4.3 analyzes the character and scale impacts of the proposed Plan. As detailed in that section, much of the development along Camino del Mar is already over the 14 foot height limit and the additional structures that would be allowed to be increased to 26 feet would result in less than significant character impacts considering the proposed stepbacks/setbacks and the required design review (see PEIR Table 4.9-1). Thus, the proposed Plan would not be disruptive to community character and would be consistent with the Community Plan.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
51-3	Objects to roundabout configuration because uncontrolled traffic is hazardous. Concerned with pedestrian ability to cross 15th St. intersection with roundabouts. Suggests alternative of four lanes with synchronized signals.	The proposed roundabouts would decrease the number of pedestrian conflicts in the Plan area from 28 to 8, and would reduce the roadway crosswalk length from 70-80 feet to about 28 feet, which would reduce the interaction of pedestrians with vehicles. The proposed pedestrian crosswalks would also include pedestrian-activated in-pavement flashers or similar devices to alert drivers of the pedestrian crosswalk. Thus, the Plan would not result in a significant traffic hazard.
51-4	Allowing public parking on private lots would have detrimental noise impacts on residential areas... . Proposed increase in restaurant/bar use would also increase evening and late night hours of the adjacent parking with the accompanying parking lot noises.	Parking lot noise impacts from increased private lot usage would be negligible due to the low vehicle speeds associated with parking activities and the infrequency of noise such as car alarms or horns. The change in parking lot noise from increased parking lot use would be unlikely to result in the Municipal Code or CCR Title 24 limits being exceeded, and would therefore be less than significant.
51-5	The Community Plan does not envision the commercial area to be a restaurant row/party area, especially south of 13th.	The Plan does not propose the area to be a “restaurant row”, as it generally allows for increased commercial and residential uses and does not specify for restaurant development south of 13 <sup>th</sup> Street.
51-6	State Law requires the SP to include all of the specifics for facilities to be provided to handle the increased development, but this Plan doesn't include any specifics for parking lots or structures to handle the increased parking required by the proposed increased development.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan includes parking requirements (in Chapter VI Allowed Uses And Development Standards) that require each property to provide their required parking either onsite and/or through other measures as established in the DMMC. Chapter VI of the Plan requires parking for new or intensified development in the Plan area in the same amounts and manner as the existing Central Commercial Zone and includes an option for an overall shared parking program, known as ‘Park Once’ parking ratios. The Plan also includes strategies for providing additional public parking in Chapter VII, Parking. Chapter VII proposes strategies for providing additional public parking, including increasing the on-street parking and parking structure(s), to augment the existing supply of public parking.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
51-7	Adding 140 residential units is contrary to the Community Plan. Why is the State required increase in affordable housing being proposed in the commercial area? These are not compatible land uses.	<p>The Community Plan Goal 4, Objective B, Policy 4 states “Allow mixed residential-commercial land uses within other (not adjacent to Stratford Court) areas of the commercially zoned downtown area.” The Plan proposes this mix of uses.</p> <p>The State Office of Housing &amp; Community Development requires a minimum 20 dwelling units per acre density to obtain certification of the City’s Community Plan Housing Element. Thus, the Plan proposes residential at a density of 20 units per acre meet these policies. With the implementation of the proposed Plan and its neighborhood protection strategies, land use compatibility impacts would be less than significant.</p>
51-8	Supports the No Project/Adopted Community Plan Alternative to be consistent with the adopted Community Plan.	Comment noted.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 52 - Mark W. Stuckelman</b>	
52a-1	Against 30' building heights on west side of CDM. Structures will block views, sunlight and ocean breezes and create a "tunneling effect" that will change the character of Del Mar.	<p>The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) of the draft Plan addressed the potential view blockage, sunlight and character impacts that could result from Plan implementation. As indicated in the VIA and PEIR (Aesthetics Section 4.1), the Plan's projected visual impacts were found to be less than significant. The village character would continue to be protected by the Design Review Ordinance (DMMC Chapter 23.08).</p> <p>The draft Plan includes several strategies and development standards to ensure that future buildings would not create substantial adverse impacts to scenic views and sunlight/breeze access. These are summarized in the Plan's Protection of Community Resources Chapter, Section 3.7 Public Views and Section 3.8 Residential Neighborhood, and include the requirement for a 10-foot diagonal corner setback for buildings fronting the side streets to expand the public view corridor, the requirement for a 10-foot architectural setback for the second story of buildings that border the side streets, and a minimum 10-foot setback from all property lines adjacent to a residential zone. In addition, the draft Plan has been revised to reduce the allowed building heights from 30 feet to 26 feet; and to restrict the height to 26 feet within 50 feet of a residential zone.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
52a-2	Concerned with Design Review Board protecting residential views due to unspecified criteria to evaluate view blockage and visual character. The Design Review Board could easily fall under control of the developers and commercial property owners.	As indicated in the PEIR, residential scenic views are protected by the Design Review Ordinance (DRO) (DMMC Chapter 23.08). These regulations each include several pages of evaluation criteria required to be followed by the Design Review Board. Also, the design review process does include a Citizens' Participation Program and a hearing where individuals can provide input. Ultimately, those disagreeing with the Design Review Board conclusions may file an appeal. City Council has directed a review of the DRO in order to ensure the provisions are applicable with Village (Plan area) commercial projects. Considering the criteria and process in place, there is adequate regulatory framework in place to protect residential views.
52a-3	Supports increasing FAR, but residential units are not an exceptional public benefit. Inclusion of a single very low income apartment should not justify a 40% increase in the size of a building.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The incentives offered for Exceptional Public Benefits reflect a balance between economic viability and community priority. Adding residential uses in the Plan area is an important goal and component of the Plan. In addition, creating adequate incentives for affordable housing is needed for Del Mar to meet its affordable housing mandates. City Council has reviewed the draft Exceptional Public Benefits and has modified them to be more equitable.
52a-4	The added congestion from 140 apartments, 43 additional hotel rooms and a nearly tripling of retail and restaurant space will dramatically increase noise and air pollution and ocean runoff despite mitigation efforts.	While the Plan may potentially increase noise, air pollution, and runoff due to redevelopment and increased intensity, the Plan would result in less than significant impacts related to traffic, noise, air, and water quality based on established criteria (refer to Sections 4.14, 4.10, 4.2, and 4.8, respectively). See also Response to Letter 52b comments.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
52a-5	City representatives have stated that commercial property owners have little incentive to develop existing structures which already exceed 14 feet and 0.45 FAR. This could be addressed easily by grandfathering existing height and FAR.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The existing structures that exceed current development standards have already been “grandfathered”, in that they are legal non-conforming structures. However, when the property owner wants to make substantial improvements or redevelop the property, the new structures must conform to the current development and building code standards.
52a-6	City representatives have stated that 14-foot high buildings don't allow modern retail stores with high ceilings. So why not increase the height limit to 16 or 18 feet? Second floors aren't needed to encourage retail.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Allowing property owners to merely increase the height of buildings would not create enough financial incentive to encourage revitalization. Also see response to Comment 43-3.
52a-7	Supports revitalization of downtown but recommends a lesser building height for the west height and a lesser FAR in order to maintain character and protect the environment.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The draft Plan has been revised to limit building height on the west side of Camino del Mat to 26 feet. The baseline of 1.0 FAR can only be exceeded if the property owner provides Exceptional Public Benefits.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
52b-1	<p>Commenter considers use of SDAPCD Rules 20.2 and 20.3 inappropriate; and states that SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and 20.3 only apply to large, stationary sources of pollution such as factories and power plants. Commenter states that for this reason use of these Rules to determine significance for the Village Specific Plan is irrelevant to the mobile sources of emissions that will be the main source of increased air pollution in Del Mar. Commenter also believes that the doubling of air pollution would be considered significant based on statistics.</p>	<p>The SDAPCD does not provide quantitative thresholds for determining the significance of construction or mobile source-related air quality impacts. However, the District does specify Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA) trigger levels for new or modified stationary sources under its Rules 20.2 and 20.3 as indicated in the comment. The SDAPCD requires stationary sources that exceed these incremental levels (considered screening level thresholds) to perform an AQIA. For projects whose stationary-source emissions are below these levels, no AQIA is required and project-level emissions are presumed to be less than significant</p> <p>In the absence of SDAPC-specified thresholds for determining significance from land use development projects in the San Diego air basin, it has become common practice for air quality analysts and jurisdictions in the San Diego region to apply the AQIA trigger levels. For example, both the County and City of San Diego jurisdictions have included the AQIA triggers as equivalent significance thresholds for CEQA analysis.</p> <p>Although these trigger levels do not generally apply to mobile sources or general land development projects, for comparative purposes these levels are used to evaluate the increased emissions which would be discharged to the San Diego air basin from proposed land development projects. For CEQA purposes, the AQIA screening level thresholds can be used to demonstrate that a project’s total emissions (e.g., stationary and fugitive dust emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality.</p>

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
		As to the issue of Plan buildout doubling the quantity of air pollutants currently being generated within the Plan area, it should be noted that the Plan area is a relatively small area with comparably low emissions levels, relative to the air basin as a whole. Hence, a doubling of the Plan area's emissions is not statistically substantial relative to the established measure.
52b-2	Why did the EIR not estimate and address the increased noise, beyond that created by traffic, from new apartments, restaurants and bars? I'm talking about noise created by people entering and leaving buildings, parking their cars, talking on the street, having parties in their apartments with the windows open, etc. As anyone who has stood in front of Jimmy O's, En Fuego or Sbicca on a Friday night can attest, noise can be significant from a single establishment. Multiplied by the scale of the Specific Plan, it appears that the additional noise could be unbearable to residents living adjacent to the Village without violating current noise ordinances. This needs to be addressed in the EIR.	<p>Please also refer to Response to Comment 50-5 that addresses a similar comment. The concern expressed in this comment is about noise from bars and restaurants that may have affects on nearby residences. Therefore, the concern pertains to the far west and east edges of the Plan area where the backs of commercial buildings along Camino del Mar are adjacent to residential properties. Given the nature of noise transmission and attenuation, of particular concern are outdoor (i.e., unenclosed) dining and bar areas.</p> <p>To create more certainty that noise impacts from outdoor dining will be minimized, the Plan has been revised to include a new Development Standard that limits the location of outdoor dining areas so that they are separated from residentially zoned property by an enclosed and sound-attenuated portion of a building on the property and that any outdoor dining on the second level is required to have a Conditional Use Permit.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
52b-3	<p>Section 4.1.4.1 of the EIR concludes by saying "the Plan impact at this location is considered moderate and would be less than significant." However the firm that was hired to make this determination appears to have a different opinion. In Section 7.2 of their report, which is included as Appendix B, they state: With the implementation of Design Review Board review, the use of story poles, setbacks, stepbacks and corner lot 45 degree chamfers on corner lots, the significant impact on scenic vistas can be lessened but they would remain significant after mitigations. How did the EIR come to a different conclusion than the hired expert?</p>	<p>The VIA (Appendix B-1 to the PEIR) addresses view and character impacts. The PEIR Aesthetics Section 4.1 was based on the analysis and conclusions of this technical assessment, as well as on an inventory and analysis of the applicable regulatory framework.</p> <p>The quote provided by this comment of the PEIR is a summary of the View F1 to F4 view impact only. The PEIR View D1 impact analysis in the PEIR does identify a moderately to highly adverse view impact at D1 that would be potentially significant consistent with the VIA. While the public review draft VIA indicates that Design Review Board review would not reduce this potential scenic vista impact to below a level of significance, additional design review analysis (specifically of the Design Review Ordinance and Scenic View Protection Ordinance) was completed as a part of the PEIR. That analysis determined that the Design Review Ordinance includes adequate regulatory framework to protect scenic views. Specifically, the Design Review Design Regulations (Section 23.08.070) do not allow projects where "design unreasonably blocks significant public coastal views" or "unreasonably encroaches upon primary scenic views of neighboring property." Thus, the height increase example shown in the PEIR Figure 4.1-10 at View D1 would not be in compliance with Design Review regulations and would not be allowed per the Design Review Ordinance as shown in the visual simulation. Considering significant view blockage would not be allowed by existing regulations, scenic vista impacts of the Plan would be less than significant.</p> <p>Section 4.1 of the PEIR has been revised to expand and clarify on the language in the Design Review Ordinance and the impact significance determination analysis. The VIA has also been revised to reflect the expanded Design Review Ordinance analysis.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
52b-4	In Section 4.1.4.1, the EIR deems the impact on private residential scenic vistas to be less than significant based on creating strong measures in the Design Guidelines for the Design Review, Board to assess views and protect these primary views from significant interruption by Village development. What are these measures? What criteria are used to determine significance? How can the EIR possibly conclude that view blockage will not be significant without knowing what these measures will be? There is also a cumulative effect here that needs to be addressed. While one project may not be deemed to significantly impact a view in itself, three less than significant projects, approved at different times, could result in a significant impact together. How will this piecemeal impact be prevented?	<p>The EIR scenic vista impact conclusions do not rely on design guidelines to avoid the potentially significant view impact. Refer to Response to Comment 52b-4 above and PEIR Section 4.1.5.</p> <p>Considering the only new development within the viewshed currently proposed is within the Plan area, the Plan level impact analysis also represents the cumulative impact analysis. Refer to PEIR Section 7.1 for the cumulative visual analysis.</p>
52b-5	Thirty foot high, 1.5 FAR buildings on the west side of Camino Del Mar will block sunlight and ocean breezes and create a more enclosed feeling for pedestrians. This will change the character of the Village. The EIR claims that the visual character will be improved by newer buildings. This may be true, but it's difficult to make that determination if we don't know what those buildings are going to look like. This seems like a huge leap of faith at this point. Given this uncertainty, it is critical that Section 4.1.4.3 address the impact of the Plan on sunlight and creating a more enclosed feeling (i.e. tunneling effect).	Refer to Response to Comment 52a-1 for sunlight information.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
52b-6	Section 4.8.4.2 says that the Plan would create increased runoff pollutants, but that this would be mitigated through several storm drain system implementation strategies. However, in a scenario where Camino Del Mar remains 4 lanes, the most impactful of these mitigating measures would not be possible and a second would be very difficult to implement. Increased runoff pollutants would therefore not be mitigated. This was not properly addressed in Section 9.5.2.8. What would the increased level of pollutants in runoff be without mitigation?	<p>It is noted that the PEIR does not identify hydrology or water quality mitigation for project alternatives or the proposed Plan. The Plan includes storm drain system strategies as a part of the project.</p> <p>The Plan implementing measures in Section 4.8.4.2 were defined specifically for the proposed project and were not intended to apply to project alternatives. If the Four-lane Camino del Mar Circulation Alternative described in PEIR Section 9.5 were to be implemented, specific measures for the alternative would be required to be developed to address stormwater runoff pollution in accordance with the Municipal Code, the Clean Water Program, the SUSMP, and other applicable water quality regulations. As indicated in PEIR Section 9.5.2.8, future development would be required to comply with these regulations and to implement construction and operational Best Management Practices that would ensure hydrology and water quality impacts would be less than significant for this Alternative, similar to the proposed Plan.</p>
<b>Letter 53 - Paul Nevins</b>		
53-1	Putting sharrows on CDM will allow "fast road riders" to zip through without having to constantly merge in and out of traffic when passing slower bikes or parking cars.	The limited right-of-way on Camino del Mar creates the need to prioritize the space provided to the various users. Providing two lanes for bicycle riders would require the limitation of space for other users.
53-2	A pathway at the same level as and next to the sidewalk will allow slow bicyclists to stop, shop, enjoy the cafes without interfering with the flow of traffic on Camino del Mar.	See previous Response to Comment 53-1.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 54 - SANDAG , Susan Baldwin, Senior Regional Planner</b>	
54-1	<p>[Introductory remarks.]</p> <p>Comments are based on policies included in the Regional Comprehensive Plan and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and its Sustainable Communities Strategy (2050 RTP/SCS), and thus reflect a regional perspective. ... Overall, SANDAG supports City efforts to create a pedestrian-oriented environment in the DM-1 Town Center Smart Growth Opportunity Area identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map, and to ensure that the transportation analysis reflects that priority. ... Several specific and general comments are provided for consideration as outlined below.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This comment provides an introduction to the comment letter and raises general issues of concern with respect to the traffic analysis within the PEIR and associated TIS and mobility features of the Plan that are detailed below. No further response is necessary.</p>
54-2	<p>PEIR: Section 3.3.3.4 Project Description - revise bus transit headways discussions to match 2050 RTP.</p>	<p>PEIR Section 3.3.3.4 was revised accordingly.</p>
54-3	<p>PEIR: Section 4.14.1.4 Other Mobility Systems - Public Transit- text indicates six bus station stops, but Figure 4.14-6 indicates four. Also, PEIR does not include ridership analysis per SANDAG Regional Multimodal Transportation Analysis: Alternative Approaches for Preparing Multimodal Transportation Analysis in PEIRs.</p>	<p>While PEIR Figure 4.14-6 does not include the entire Plan area, the text adequately describes all six bus station stops. The figure is intended to display additional information and is not used as a basis for determining impacts to the transit system. The PEIR and TIS do not include a ridership analysis. Rather, in accordance with recent changes to CEQA (SB-97), it focuses on the effects to the existing transit facilities that the project may have.</p>

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
54-4	PEIR: Section 4.14.1.4 Other Mobility Systems - Bicycle - The information mentions the SANDAG <i>Regional Bicycle Plan's</i> reference to the Coastal Rail Trail and recommended Class I bike path. Please consider incorporating these improvements into the Del Mar Village Specific Plan. Figure 4.14-7 does not include the entire project area. The analysis should include existing bicycle ridership.	<p>A Class II bike lane is consistent with the conceptual plan along this corridor, and roundabouts and pedestrian pop-outs will serve as traffic calming elements to slow traffic.</p> <p>While PEIR Figure 4.14-7 does not include the entire Plan area, the text adequately describes that the bike route extends along Camino del Mar within the Plan area and to outside of the Plan area to the north and south.</p> <p>Bicycle ridership information has been added to PEIR Section 4.14.1.4b.</p>
54-5	PEIR: Section 4.14.1.4 Other Mobility Systems - Pedestrian - Are the distances indicated "as the crow flies" or street network defined? Please consider using a street network with a five-minute walking radius. Consider including the Pedestrian Master Plan as an attachment to the PEIR for reference. The analysis should also include pedestrian trips and the maps should include the entire project area.	<p>PEIR Figures 4.14-8 and 4.14-9 show distances "as the crow flies" and are only approximations of the actual pedestrian walk time. These pedestrian maps illustrate the entire Plan area. Figure 4.14-9 has been revised to show more differentiation in land uses and zoning.</p> <p>Pedestrian trip information has been added to PEIR Section 4.14.1.4c</p>
54-6	PEIR: Section 4.14.2- Impact Significance Threshold TRAF-2 - While SANDAG has opted out of the state Congestion Management Program (CMP), this does not eliminate a congestion management process requirement. SANDAG has included Technical Appendix 20 within the 2050 RTP as a tool to comply with the federal process. Please update the paragraph at the bottom of page 4.14-25 and throughout the DEIR as necessary to reflect this process.	<p>As the CMP does not apply to the project, Threshold TRAF-2 does not apply. It is noted that the Plan may still be required to comply with the congestion management process, which includes compliance with the 23 Code of Federal Regulations 450.320 and the 2050 RTP. This has been clarified in PEIR Section 4.14.2; and the analysis is provided in Sections 4.14.4.1 and 4.14.4.3.</p>

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
54-7	PEIR: Section 4.14.4 - Impact Analysis - Trip Generation: clearly express SANDAG (Not so) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates and the MXD Model. See TIS comment below.	The TIS identifies the trip generation rates in Table 1-3 and the resulting trip generation in Table 1-4. See also Response to Comment 54-8 below.
54-8	TIS: Page 6-7 - Project Trip Generation: This table provides unclear information related to SANDAG's trip reduction rates and the MXD Model. (See letter for complete recommendations).	The TIS identifies the trip generation rates in Table 1-3 and the resulting trip generation in Table 1-4. TIS Appendix A has been updated to include the detailed trip generation and MXD model output. The MXD model was not used in conjunction with SANDAG Trip Reduction rates (there was no double counting of trip reductions). Rather, the SANDAG Trip Reduction method was performed and compared to the resulting MXD model output. The two processes resulted in very similar trip generation.
54-9	TIS: Page 99 - Pedestrian Analysis: Are the distances indicated "as the crow flies" or street network defined? Please consider using a street network with a five-minute walking radius.	Refer to Response to Comment 54-5 above.
54-10	TIS: Pages 105-111 - Bicycle Analysis: see [PEIR] comment [54-4] above. Also, please consider incorporating a street network analysis for the five-mile bicycle radius rather than the "as the crow flies" Figure 7-7. Consider expanding upon the Del Mar Community Transportation Plan within the TIS.	Figure 7-7 represents a five-mile bicycle radius "as the crow flies" rather than using a street network analysis. The figure is an approximation of potential high bicycle attraction areas and is not intended to provide a detailed "street network" sensitive analysis. Please also see Response to Comment 54-4.
54-11	TIS: Pages 112 and 113 – Transit: see [PEIR] comment [54-3] above.	See Response to Comment 54-3 above.
54-12	Consider using a street network buffer rather than the "as the crow flies" buffer for Figure IV-2.	Comment noted.
54-13	Consider including Average Daily Pedestrian Counts into the TIS and PEIR.	Existing average daily pedestrian counts have been added to the PEIR Section 4.14.1.4c.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
54-14	Consider including Average Daily Cyclists Counts into the TIS and PEIR.	Existing average daily bicyclist counts have been added to the PEIR Section 4.14.1.4b.
54-15	Suggests including the Rapid Bus service (Route 473 with 10-minute headways) planned for the Del Mar corridor by 2030 connecting from Oceanside to the UTC area.	The Plan has been modified to include reference to future Rapid Bus service.
54-16	Consider the 2050 RTP LOSSAN corridor improvements for the COASTER.	The Plan has been modified to include reference to future LOSSAN corridor improvements.
54-17	"The 2050 RTP includes a tunnel for the LOSSAN corridor in Del Mar. In the event development of an underground parking structure is constructed, this structure should not preclude a future rail tunnel."	Comment noted.
54-18	Supports the City's recommendation to develop a comprehensive Parking Management Plan addressing both public and private parking that will reinforce pedestrian-orientation.	Comment noted.
54-19	Consider including a demand-based approach to parking pricing, ensuring the City's goal of 10 percent parking vacancy rate for premium on-street parking spaces and improving access to businesses.	Comment noted. This approach will be considered in the development of the Parking Management Plan.
54-20	Supports the concept of shared parking among land uses with different peak periods and suggests that the City consider allowing shared onsite parking to satisfy the parking requirements for each use.	Comment noted.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
54-21	Suggests establishing a regulatory framework for including Transportation Demand Management in the development review process for the Plan area. Encourages establishment of peak hour non-single occupancy vehicle mode share goals with a Trip Reduction Ordinance and/or development standards.	Comment noted. This suggestion will be considered in the development of the Parking Management Plan.
54-22	Supports City's inclusion of bicycle infrastructure and amenities in the Plan and encourages the use of bike corrals or a bike station in addition to, or in lieu of, bike racks.	Comment noted.
54-23	Supports programs such as bike sharing to increase mobility, reduce vehicular traffic, and assist the City with meet their sustainability goals.	Comment noted.
54-24	Suggests that if bike racks are used that they complement the existing street furniture and be chosen in terms of the functionality of the rack.	Comment noted. Bicycle racks in the public right of way are complementing the existing street furniture.
54-25	Suggests evaluating the potential for using the best possible bicycle facilities (on road) such as green bicycle lanes, bike boxes, and bike detection loop pavement markings. Cites SANDAG's Riding to 2050 San Diego Regional Bike Plan's Bicycle Design Guidelines.	Comment noted. This suggestion will be considered in the development of the detailed improvement plans. A bike detection loop in the pavement has been installed along Camino del Mar.
54-26	Concluding remarks – encouraging the City to evaluate the plan based on various SANDAG publications.	Comment noted. SANDAG publications were utilized during the drafting of the Plan.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<b>Letter 55 - Louise Keeling</b>	
55-1	Concerned that the Plan does not acknowledge statements included in a background document authored during the creation of the Del Mar Community Plan that is titled "Commercial Land Use and Character". This document proposed to preserve views by limiting construction on some or all of the remaining building sites downtown, limiting density to be in harmony with the preservation of ocean views and the atmosphere of open space, and limiting new construction on the west side of Camino del Mar to one story about street level.	The Plan is consistent with and guided by the goals, objectives and descriptions in the adopted Del Mar Community Plan that was presented to and approved by the residents of Del Mar in March 1976 and amended in 1985. The document titled "Commercial Land Use and Character" is not included in the adopted Community Plan.
55-2	Encourage small apartments on existing second stories, or at least limiting those to the east side. Encourage lower-income people into community rather than expensive condos.	Housing is proposed in the Plan and is limited to a maximum size of 1,500 square feet per unit. Low-income housing is required to be provided with the fourth unit at a rate of 25 percent of the housing.
55-3	Suggests owners of the "more charming one-story structures, and those who have the low-slung tiled roof two-story buildings (now lower than 26') enter in to an Historical Building zone.	Strategies for preserving these important structures are addressed in the Plan in Chapter III Protection of Community Resources, Section 3.2.2 Historical Resources and Architectural Character. This section of the Plan proposes measures, in addition to the Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ), to encourage the protection, restoration and adaptive reuse of additional buildings with strong architectural character.
55-4	Suggests constructing several smaller parking lots throughout town rather than one large lot at 11th Street.	Comment noted. The Plan encourages below-structure or tuck-under parking throughout town, rather than surface parking. Surface parking, especially adjacent to Camino del Mar, is highly discouraged.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
<b>Letter 56 - Madison Marquette</b>		
56-1	Requests that any of the improvements or restructure of ordinances that provide businesses favorable allowances compared to the current Del Mar Plaza Specific Plan (DMPSP) are adopted for the DMPSP.	The Plan will only affect Del Mar Plaza in two respects. The first aspect is that Del Mar Plaza would be able to use the provisions of the Village Specific Plan regarding amendments as described in Chapter XII, Section 12.2 Process for Amendments to the Village Specific Plan. The second aspect will not affect the manner in which the Del Mar Plaza is regulated, however it will remove a portion of the original DMPSP located south of 15 <sup>th</sup> Street from the DMPSP area and put it into the Village Specific Plan. Thus, this parcel south of 15 <sup>th</sup> Street would be regulated by the Village Specific Plan rather than the DMPSP.
56-2	"It is vital that Del Mar Plaza is provided with leniency in the restrictions it is currently encumbered to combat the decrease in customers it has encountered over the last several years."	The Plan does not alter any current restrictions on Del Mar Plaza. Any modification to the Del Mar Plaza Specific Plan would need to follow the amendment procedures outlined in Chapter XII of the Plan should the Plan be adopted.
<b>Letter 57 - Carl Reinholz</b>		
57-1	"The Village Specific Plan as presented is not a Specific Plan but rather a Study or a Proposal with few specifics now available to be analyzed or evaluated."	The Plan is established under authority granted to the City of Del Mar by California Government Code, Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 3, Article 8, Sections 65450 through 65457 (Specific Plans). Specific Plans are further explained in the Plan's Chapter I Introduction, Section 1.9 Authority.
57-2	Requests real parking layouts on Camino del Mar.	The detail needed to determine the precise parking layout on Camino del Mar will be determined when the project is identified as a Capital Improvement Project and the improvement plans are completed.
57-3	Requests "timing and commitment on the proposed 200 parking on the City Hall Site".	The first parking to be developed will be the creation of the new 50 to 60 spaces of diagonal parking along Camino del Mar. Parking at the City Hall site will be developed as soon as practical. The schedule for the design of a parking structure on the City Hall Site has been accelerated by the direction of the City Council to the short-term timeframe.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
57-4	Requests a study on the "impact and access on the Ally on the West side from the proposed five blocks of continuous parking under two story buildings."	The TIS addresses traffic destined for parking locations on the west side. This traffic uses 9 <sup>th</sup> Street to 15 Street to access parking behind buildings. The amount of traffic along the alley is below the threshold necessary to cause a potential impact. The largest block segment would accommodate approximately 80 parking spaces, perhaps only half of which would be new parking spaces. Even if all the parking spaces turned over in the hour only 40 additional trips would be added to the alley (20 in each direction). The threshold for triggering the need for analyzing an intersection is 50 vehicles in one direction in the peak hour. Therefore, the alleys do not experience enough of an increase in traffic to cause a potential impact.
57-5	Requests the "Construction Mitigation and Timing for the Camino del Mar Street Improvements".	Construction will be phased to minimize disruption to traffic and businesses. The exact construction schedule for the streetscape will be developed as part of the Capital Improvement Project and its design process. The draft Plan has been revised to include a potential timeline in its Implementation Chapter X, Table X-1. Also see Response to Comment 32-7.
57-6	Requests details on proposed parking restrictions adjacent to Camino del Mar.	No changes to existing parking restrictions are proposed as part of the Plan. Parking restrictions adjacent to Camino del Mar will be addressed in the Parking Management Plan that will be completed after the approval of the Plan.
57-7	Concerned with "conflicts of parking space size and required back up lanes differ with current City Standards."	Current City parking standards that regulate parking space size and back up lane requirements are in the DMMC and will not be affected by the Plan.
57-8	"With the City acting as Developer over Private Property in the 'Private Realm' there are no checks and balances on the Developer by the City since the City assumes both roles."	The City regulates the uses and development standards of private property within its land use jurisdiction. Private property owners determine if and when they want to develop or redevelop their properties. The City is not acting as developer on any private property.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
57-9	The Village Specific Plan is "only a 'study' to be interpreted and implemented only by the City, with no oversight and for the next 50 years."	The Village Specific Plan is a document that is intended to provide an additional regulatory tool to implement the goals and objectives of the Del Mar Community Plan. The Plan's Chapter X has been modified to include threshold reviews at regular intervals during the next 30 years.
	<b>Letter 58 - Tina and Jim Benedict</b>	
58-1	Supports the proposed Plan except the proposed 1.0 FAR. Property owners and developers will require a minimum FAR 1.5.	Comment noted. Property owners will be able to develop up to a maximum of 1.5 FAR by providing Exceptional Public Benefits as described in the Plan in Chapter VI, Section 6.4.5.1.2. Increase in Maximum Floor Area Ratio with Provision of Exceptional Public Benefit(s).
	<b>Letter 59 - Don Ellis</b>	
59-1	EIR raises issues of negative impact and dismisses them as insignificant. Feels EIR is biased.	The PEIR analysis was completed in compliance with the CEQA Statutes and Guidelines.
59-2	Contrary to the PEIR, increased building size will result in "diminished aesthetics, diminished air quality, increased greenhouse gases and increased noise, increased traffic and increased solid waste.	This comment expresses an opinion that disagrees with the analysis and conclusions of the PEIR. However, no specificity is included regarding the adequacy of the environmental analysis or significance determinations in the PEIR. Based on established methodology and assessment criteria, the Plan's potential impacts to aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, traffic, and waste generation, from a programmatic perspective, were evaluated thoroughly and determined to be less than significant. As described in the PEIR, all potential Plan-level impacts would be avoided or reduced to less than significance (per the CEQA Guidelines) through either existing mandatory local and state regulations or new standards incorporated into the Plan. In either case, the relevant regulations and/or standards are identified in each issue section of the PEIR.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
59-3	"Traffic flow cannot possibly be adequate as proposed but even if it were and the expected increase of overflow traffic to neighborhood streets did not occur - it is implausible that pedestrian crossing of Camino del Mar will be safe and unlikely that it will not severely disrupt traffic flow."	As evaluated in the TIS and summarized in PEIR Section 4.14, the Plan would result in less than significant impacts related to traffic capacity, congestion, pedestrian safety, and diversion of traffic to neighborhood streets. Please also refer to Responses to Comments: 4-3, 13-4, 32-5 and 60-1 pertaining to roadway capacity and level of service; 16-5, 18-2, and 22-8 pertaining to pedestrian crossings; and 16-7 pertaining to potential traffic diversion. Note that the Plan contains implementing strategies, described in PEIR Section 4.14.4.2, that would ensure adequate pedestrian safety and emergency
59-4	Strongly opposes "mixed-use with residential units in the Commercial Zone" as Del Mar residents have been disturbed by patrons of commercial businesses, particularly late at night, in the past.	Please refer to Responses to Comments 50-5 and 52b-2 which address similar concerns. To create more certainty that noise impacts from outdoor dining will be minimized, the Plan has been revised to include a new Development Standard that limits the location of outdoor dining areas so that they are separated from residentially zoned property by an enclosed and sound-attenuated portion of a building on the property and that any outdoor dining on the second level is required to have a Conditional Use Permit.
<b>Letter 60 - Ed and Rolande Fyfe</b>		
60-1	"The City's traffic study indicates that maintaining four lanes and replacing 4-way stops with traffic signals will move traffic through the village at the same rate as two lanes and turnabouts, and both options will move traffic faster than current conditions. Maintaining Camino del Mar's four lanes is clearly the more reliable option for the City."	A two-lane with roundabouts reconfiguration of Camino del Mar would provide a capacity of 25,000 ADT. A four-lane with traffic signals configuration of Camino del Mar would provide a capacity of 30,000 ADT, which is more capacity than the proposed Plan for the two lanes with roundabouts configuration. However, the proposed configuration provides other benefits that are not realized under a four lanes with signals configuration. These benefits include an improved sidewalk that provides adequate mobility for handicapped citizens that is ADA compliant, wider sidewalks, reduced crossing widths, slower speeds and the potential for less traffic by not providing additional capacity that may induce more cut-through traffic.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
60-2	"This is a poor, short-sited plan to gain only 50 plus parking spaces for downtown. This does not begin to address out true capacity needs now and into the future."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The addition of approximately 50 public parking spaces on Camino del Mar is one of many strategies proposed in the Plan to address existing and future parking needs. Additional strategies, including a public parking structure, "Park Once" and creation of a Parking Management Plan, are described in the Plan in Chapter VII, Parking.
60-3	"The City's traffic planning and management must facilitate working Del Mar residents who commute, visitors to Del Mar who generate sales tax revenue that is vital, and service vehicles. It is impossible to accommodate these vehicles and not accommodate the vehicles of commuters just passing through."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The proposed improvements to Camino del Mar will provide increased traffic capacity for all users, including working Del Mar residents.
60-4	Strongly supports the construction of one or more underground parking structures with retail above ground. The vacant lot where the gas station used to be is an excellent location for and underground structure with retail above ground.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan encourages underground parking with mixed use above. The site identified in the comment is currently entitled for an underground parking structure with uses, including office and retail, above.
60-5	Strongly opposes Park Once. Supports a simple parking policy such as After 6 Parking that opens all office/commercial parking in the Village to the public after business" hours.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Park Once strategy is intended to make a portion of the private parking in the Plan area available to the public by providing incentives to property owners that agree to allow public parking. The City does not have the authority to require property owners to allow public parking on their property as is suggested by the commenter as "After 6pm Parking".

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
60-6	Strongly supports a simple on-street parking permit for residents only.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. It is beyond the scope of the Plan to address parking permits in residential areas. However, the commenters' suggestion will be considered if the City elects to prepare a citywide Parking Management Plan as discussed in the Plan's Parking Chapter VII.
60-7	Support trees and planters on Camino del Mar. Trees create "consistent line, height and depth down each side of Camino del Mar" and planters create "visual appeal" and have the "ability to capture storm water". Camino del Mar does not need to be reduced to two lanes to accommodate new planting areas for trees and storm water treatment.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. A regular program of street trees and planter areas for storm water management are proposed in the conceptual plan for Camino del Mar. The reduction in travel lanes provides additional opportunities for creating additional space for new planting areas and storm water treatment, as well as several other uses such as angled parking, wider sidewalks, safer pedestrian crossings and an enhanced pedestrian environment.
60-8	Opposes two story development on the west side of Camino del Mar. Renderings do not show the setbacks on corner lots or show that the setbacks need to be larger.	The renderings in the Plan are intended to help the reader to visualize the descriptions included in the text. The setbacks and stepbacks included in the Plan text regulate, not the renderings. The commenter's preference for larger setbacks is noted.
60-9	Concerned about the City's ability to control architecture and design, based on home designs approved over the last 10 years.	The current Design Review Ordinance and process will be retained. However, the City Council has directed that the Ordinance be revised to more appropriately address the design of commercial buildings.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
60-10	Suggests the City focus more on economic development strategies and collaboration with the owners of commercial properties to attract "desirable" stores and retain them.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Subsequent to the development of the public improvements, the City will take advantage of the tax gap analysis prepared by its sales tax consultant to determine the types of business most likely to be synergistic with other businesses, and to be beneficial to Del Mar residents. A tax gap analysis creates a profile of taxable sales receipts and compares it to typical spending patterns. A lack of taxable receipts in a typical area of spending indicates a business opportunity.
<b>Letter 61 - Michael and Lisa Uhrhammer</b>		
61-1	"The City's traffic study indicates that maintaining four lanes and replacing 4-way stops with traffic signals will move traffic through the village at the same rate as two lanes and turnabouts, and both options will move traffic faster than current conditions. Maintaining Camino del Mar's four lanes is clearly the more reliable option for the City."	Refer to Response to Comment 60-1.
61-2	"This is a poor, short-sited plan to gain only 50 plus parking spaces for downtown. This does not begin to address out true capacity needs now and into the future."	Refer to Response to Comment 60-2.
61-3	"The City's traffic planning and management must facilitate working Del Mar residents who commute, visitors to Del Mar who generate sales tax revenue that is vital, and service vehicles. It is impossible to accommodate these vehicles and not accommodate the vehicles of commuters just passing through."	Refer to Response to Comment 60-3.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
61-4	Strongly supports the construction of one or more underground parking structures with retail above ground. The vacant lot where the gas station used to be is an excellent location for and underground structure with retail above ground.	Refer to Response to Comment 60-4.
61-5	Strongly opposes "Park Once". Supports "a simple parking policy such as 'After 6 Parking' that opens all office/commercial parking in the Village to the public after business" hours.	Refer to Response to Comment 60-5.
61-6	Strongly supports a simple on-street parking permit for residents only.	Refer to Response to Comment 60-6.
61-7	Support trees and planters on Camino del Mar. Trees create "consistent line, height and depth down each side of CDM" and planters create "visual appeal" and have the "ability to capture storm water".	Refer to Response to Comment 60-7.
61-8	Opposes two story development on the west side of Camino del Mar. Renderings do not show the setbacks on corner lots or show that the setbacks need to be larger.	Refer to Response to Comment 60-8.
61-9	Concerned about the City's ability to control architecture and design, based on home designs approved over the last 10 years.	Refer to Response to Comment 60-9.
61-10	Suggests the City focus more on economic development strategies and collaboration with the owners of commercial properties to attract "desirable" stores and retain them.	Refer to Response to Comment 60-10.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
	<b>Letter 62 - Ann Dempsey</b>	
62-1	Opposes raising 14' height limit to 30' on west side of Camino del Mar because there "seems to be no overwhelming benefit to the town to justify changing the Del Mar General Plan.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. As indicated in the PEIR Section 4.1.4.1, the Plan would have a less than significant view blockage impact. The Del Mar Community Plan does not indicate a 14-foot height limit on the west side of Camino del Mar. The draft Plan has been revised to reduce the allowed building heights on the west side of Camino del Mar from 30 feet to 26 feet. See response to Comment 45a-3.
62-2	Supports proposed roundabouts, but suggests firm plans in place for structures to control traffic on residential streets if the roundabouts and one lane each way traffic plan should cause traffic to short cut through the neighborhoods. Suggests "traffic circles in the middle of Crest, Amphitheater and Luneta, a chicane at the northwest corner of Van Dyke and Via Alta, and allow parking on the south side of 15th street west of Carolina Rd and east of the rock gutter.	Refer to Response to Comment 16-7.
62-3	Appreciates the work and effort that has gone into the plan.	Comment noted. No further response is necessary.
	<b>Letter 63 - Al Corti</b>	
63-1	Supports efforts of Village revitalization and will continue to do so if the City remains on schedule for a Nov. 2012 vote.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
63-2	Recognizes the Plan develops a mechanism/incentive to property owners to provide more public areas for art or landscape and sidewalk improvements. Suggests more incentives be provided to benefit the community.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan's incentives for Exceptional Public Benefits (EPB) are addressed in its Chapter VI, Allowed Uses and Development Standards. The regulations for EPBs state that a property owner may petition the City Council to have a project component or amenity not otherwise listed in this Section to be designated as an EPB.
63-3	Supports design guidelines being required in the Plan area because they assure the community that quality designs consistent with their vision will be produced.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. City Council has directed that the Design Review Ordinance be revised to more appropriately address the design of commercial buildings.
63-4	Plan identifies view corridor protections. Suggests the Plan go a "step further to assure the community that they cannot be compromised in the implementation of orderly development".	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The draft Plan has been revised to increase incentives for property owners that provide view corridors that create or preserve street-level ocean views.
63-5	Suggests refining the roundabout design and initiating the funding mechanism to get the project done as soon as possible.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The design of the roundabouts will be refined subsequent to the vote on the Plan. City Council has indicated this is a priority and is identified for short-term implementation after approval of the Plan.
63-6	"Seems like a no brainer that if a road design can be implemented which will increase capacity by more than 65% to 26,000 cars while providing safer intersections, more area for sidewalks, more area for public amenities, wide and safer bike lanes, more public parking which will be safer and convenient that what we have today, that it should be embraced and implemented as soon as possible."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
63-7	Suggests providing the community with more proof that the roundabout configuration works for Camino del Mar.	Roundabouts have been shown to be very successful in other parts of the country and state under very similar circumstances, including a recently completed project on La Jolla Boulevard in the Bird Rock community of La Jolla. Additional examples of roundabouts in urban settings with similar conditions have been provided as part of the June 4, 2012 City Council packet.
63-8	Recommends that traffic engineers study how to discourage and prevent traffic into our residential neighborhoods along Camino del Mar, using more safeguards to help existing problems.	Refer to Response to Comment 16-7. Thresholds and mitigations have been added to the Plan.
63-9	Supports mixed-use residential in the Plan area because they "provide opportunity for many of the workers in our City to live and work, for our children to remain in Del Mar when they enter the workforce and leave home, and the addition of this use to the Village will help fulfill a state mandated requirement that more residential product of this type be planned for in Del Mar."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.
63-10	"The mixture of uses will add vibrancy and activity to our downtown which will only help it to succeed, flourish and make it a safer environment."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.
63-11	"Plan does not provide sufficient incentive for the addition of the residential component." Encourages further incentives for all added housing, not just affordable housing.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. A range of incentives for housing have been added to the Plan as exceptional public benefits.
63-12	Suggests "if a property owner does develop residential that for every unit they get approved, they pay a fee into the City's affordable housing fund, which will help the City fulfill its lawful requirements.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. An increase in floor area or an increase in FAR is proposed to incentivize the construction of affordable housing units.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
63-13	Mixed-use housing should be carefully regulated. "The Design Review Ordinance should be strengthened to ensure that the property owners in the immediate vicinity of the residential component be protected from the potential negative impacts."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. The Plan includes measures to ensure no significant negative impacts would occur to residences from the proposed project.
63-14	"The current FAR of .45 is ridiculously low by any commercial standards...Most quaint little village communities...are all between 1 and 1.5 FAR. If we want commercial development to occur, then we need to make a change to raise the FAR."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan proposes to increase the FAR from .45 FAR to 1.0 FAR. An increase in FAR to 1.5 FAR is only allowed with the provisions of Exceptional Public Benefits, subject to City Council approval.
63-15	"The property owners who are currently at an FAR of .45 are disadvantaged in that they cannot get approval to build what the others have and as a result nothing new gets built nor is there any financial incentive for the property owners to improve their properties."	This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(e) and 15131, the PEIR need not address economic or social changes. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Comment noted. Increasing the FAR from .45 to 1.0 FAR will create more opportunities for property owners to make improvements.
63-16	The community wants "better architecturally designed buildings, more affordable residential opportunities, contiguous sidewalks, safe streets, less traffic in our residential area, more public parking, more public amenities and areas for public use."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.
63-17	"Welcomed public and private property improvements which invoke much community pride is another public benefit which is hard to measure but the related increases of sales tax revenues, property tax, TOT, parking revenues amounting to almost \$1,000,000 annually is measurable and significant."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
63-18	"Community Plan does not limit heights to the west side of Camino del Mar to 14'. It says that buildings in the village area should 'limit the height of structures to preserve view corridors while encouraging low mass intensity structures'." The Plan strengthens the language that view corridors must be protected.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.
63-19	Recommends revising Design Review Ordinance to strengthen it and assure residential neighbors of the Village that new development will not have a detrimental impact on them.	See response to Comment 63-2.
63-20	View protection rights should not be extended to commercial properties on Camino del Mar and the second level residential units in the commercial area should not have the same view protection rights as residential areas to the west or east.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan does not propose view protection rights for properties in the Plan area.
63-21	Supports more public parking that is "well designed and located in the south side of town to spur development". Supports City Hall site for parking and civic plaza.	Comment and support noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.
63-22	Supports redevelopment of the City Hall site in order to be the "catalyst to get other development to proceed in the immediate area".	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The complexity of the City Hall site and the widespread interest in how the site gets develop dictate that a master plan be prepared. This is on the Council's Priorities for Fiscal Year 2013-2014.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
63-23	Supports the Plan's parking ratios and encourages even lower requirements, "one which is compatible with the Smart Growth guidelines". Opposes greater than "3 per thousand square feet".	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The Plan proposes a lower parking ratio for property owners that will allow the public to use the parking spaces on their property. These parking ratios are slightly higher than the Smart Growth Guidelines and instead represent the mix of uses anticipated in the Plan area, as well as the Plan area's nearby residential and beach access.
63-24	Opposes paid parking, rather encourages minimized parking costs and implementation of best practices in parking management.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. No parking fees or meters are proposed as part of the Plan. The determination if paid parking will be necessary to manage the parking resources in the Plan area will be determined in the Parking Management Plan that is created after the Plan is approved.
63-25	"Nothing has been developed since it (Measure B) was initiated. The Plan provides the Community with all the protections we sought from Measure B and will encourage development."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.
63-26	Conclusion - Thanks for the information and looks forward to the completion of the final draft of the specific plan.	Comment noted.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
<b>Letter 64 - Dwight Worden</b>		
64-1	"Where things are measured based on lot size, like FAR, what is counted as the 'lot'? Don't some of these lots go to the center of the alley, or perhaps to the center of the side streets or even Camino del Mar? What if a lot is burdened by an easement in factor of an adjoining lot--which lots gets 'credit' for that area in computing lot area for FAR and other purposes? What if a road or alley easement in on the lot? If a lot has an authorized encroachment onto adjoining property, public or private, does it get 'credit' for that area in computing FAR? If it has an authorized sidewalk cafe is that area counted?"	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. FAR is calculated from net lot area, which is defined in the DMMC. Those provisions for calculating FAR are maintained in the Plan, including the provision that calculates the net lot area. Net lot area excludes access easements serving four or more properties. FAR is only allowed to be counted based on the lot itself and does not allow additional credit for encroachments. Sidewalk cafes are located within the public right-of-way and are not included in net lot area.
64-2	"Where certain encroachments are permitted into Camino del Mar without an encroachment permit, how about adding a condition that they require review if they are proposed to be permanently affixed and clarifying that they remain subject to a removal order from the City. I don't think the City can, or should, grant a non-revocable right to encroach on public property..."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The draft Plan has been revised to allow minor building encroachments subject to the City's Encroachment Permit process that includes covenants for removal.
64-3	"Where the Village Specific Plan addresses uses it talks about requirements for cultural uses, personal service uses, and retail uses and in each case there is a reference to a requirement of 51%, but it does not state 51% of what?"	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The draft Plan has been modified to clarify the definition of uses to better describe which use parameter is described by the 51 percent.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
	<b>Letter 65 - Walk San Diego, Kathleen Ferrier, Policy Manager</b>	
65-1	The Village Specific Plan "will serve and an excellent example for other cities, particularly on its emphasis of walking, biking, traffic calming and parking modifications within an infill environment to promote higher quality of life and economic development."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.
65-2	Supports the City monitoring bicyclists and pedestrians on Camino del Mar.	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR.
65-3	Encourages the inclusion of language about the "improvement of health that will result with this project. Whereas doctors recommend 30 minutes of moderate physical activity daily."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Health benefits of the Plan are noted in the Plan's Chapter III in the discussion of community benefits.
65-4	"In the discussion of transit (page IV-23), please include a policy to ensure signage does not block sidewalk or bus stop access. Ensure the waiting area around bus stops is adequate for wheelchairs."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Bus stop design will be included in the detailed improvement plans completed after approval of the Plan. Conditions for access by persons with disabilities are included.
	<b>Letter 66 - Dwight Worden</b>	
66-1	What is the square footage of the development cap in the Village Specific Plan?	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The development cap in the original draft Plan is 600,000 square feet. This includes the existing approximately 280,000 square feet of floor area. The draft Plan has been revised to include requirements to formally review Plan development intensity at several points. These threshold levels are 400,000 square feet of total floor area or 10 years, whichever comes first; 500,000 square feet or 20 years; and 600,000 square feet or 30 years.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
66-2	What is the role of an overall cap on square footage that can be added in the Plan area?	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The overall cap is considered by CEQA to be the worst case analysis.
66-3	If the FAR limits are lowered, would there be a lower overall cap?	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The overall cap on building square footage for the entire Plan area is independent from the FAR that could be built on each individual parcel.
66-4	What practical effect does the overall cap have on what the Plan area will look like?	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The overall cap would affect the number of trips generated by the uses in the Plan area, the number of parking spaces built in the Plan area, and other non-parcel specific characteristics of the Plan area. When the overall cap is reached, further development or increases in intensity of development would be prohibited without a modification to the Plan. The overall cap would not have an effect on the building character or development potential of each individual parcel until the cap is reached.
66-5	"If there's a cap in place, and if the Plan allows higher buildings on the West side of Camino del Mar, would the properties that are precluded by the cap from having a, higher FAR, still have the right to build higher, to create larger interior spaces, and therefore create the 'canyon' effect we want to avoid?"	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The cap is expressed in terms of floor area in the same way that floor area is measured now; not building volume or mass. The Design Review Ordinance is more appropriate for regulating those interior spaces that may create unacceptable building volumes and masses that might create a canyon or tunnel effect.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
66-6	"If the cap has been reached, what rights does a property owner have to develop their property? Are they precluded from any additional square footage? Is it legally enforceable to preclude a property owner from building up to the default FAR, because other property owners used up the incremental additional square footage provided by the cap? If a property is non-conforming because it already exceeds the new FAR, what FAR would it be allowed if the property had to be rebuilt?"	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. Once the overall cap is reached, the property owner would be precluded from building any additional floor area unless the Plan was amended to allow additional floor area. Except for multi-family housing, the current Municipal Code does not allow a nonconforming structure to be rebuilt, even if it is destroyed by fire or other disaster. Multifamily housing may be rebuilt as long as the nonconformity is not increased.
66-7	"Summarize how the cap relates to the theoretical square footage allowed by the default FAR."	Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the PEIR. Nonetheless, staff has provided a response as a courtesy to the commenter. The overall 600,000 square foot floor area cap proposed in the Plan is approximately the same as the total floor area of all properties developed to 1.0 FAR.
<b>Letter 67 - Ann Ray</b>		
67-1	Opposes the one lane with roundabouts configuration. Concerned with how "15th street corner can work with all the traffic demands of pedestrians, beach goers, post office parking, and bikes."	The TIS illustrates that 15th Street at Camino Del Mar will operate at worst case level of service (LOS) D in the year 2030 weekday PM peak hour and better in the AM peak hour. LOS D is an acceptable level of service.
67-2	Concerned increasing FAR and height will bring more congestion.	The commenter's concern that increased FAR and building height will bring more congestion is noted. The maximum development capacity of this Plan has been analyzed in the TIS.
<b>Letter 68 - Donald Mosier</b>		
68-1	on page IV-19, "the text about bicycle traffic volume appears to conflict with the graphic."	The text now agrees with the graphic.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
68-2	Concerned with narrow sidewalk on 15th Street in front of Del Mar Pizza. Suggests removing the planter to gain a foot wider sidewalk.	<p>The planter in front of the Del Mar Pizza Sidewalk Café on 15<sup>th</sup> Street was created to accommodate the elevation change between the top of the curb and the edge of the sidewalk that could not be sloped any more steeply. The top of the curb is at the maximum elevation allowed and the sidewalk is sloped to the maximum degree allowed by ADA standards.</p> <p>The Plan has added a strategy to address widening the 15<sup>th</sup> Street sidewalks as part of the Camino del Mar Capital Improvement Project.</p>
<b>Letter 69 - Brad Shoan</b>		
69-1	Concerned increased height on west side of CDM would substantially affect ocean views from his commercial property. Encourages maintaining the lower, 14' height on the west side, particularly in the 900 block.	Comment noted. Commercial property views are not protected by the City's Design Review Ordinance and impacts to unprotected commercial property views are considered less than significant.
<b>Letter 70 - Caltrans, Jacob Armstrong, Branch Chief</b>		
70-1	"The project trip generation is unclear related to SANDAG's trip reduction rates, and the Mixed Use Trip Generation (MXD) Model. The MXD Model should not be used in the event SANDAG's mixed use reductions are used as this would be double counting trip reductions."	The MXD model was not used in conjunction with SANDAG Trip Reduction rates (there was no double counting of trip reductions) to complete the traffic analysis for the Plan. Rather, the SANDAG Trip Reduction method was performed and compared to the resulting MXD model output. The two processes resulted in very similar trip generation.

<b>Responses to Comments</b>		
<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Comment Summary</b>	<b>Response</b>
70-2	The LOS at the I-5 ramps at Del Mar Heights Road, and Via de la Valle are different when compared to other studies.	The existing conditions for the Plan TIS was developed based on 2011 traffic counts and information provided by the Caltrans Performance Measurement System (see Appendix F). The 2006 I-5 North Coast HOV existing conditions data was based on 2004/2005 counts and data provided by agencies, local jurisdictions or their consultants. Considering there is approximately six to seven years of volume changes that have occurred between the preparation of the I-5 North Coast HOV/Managed Lanes project and the Plan TIS, including a recession that reduced volumes significantly in the region, it is expected that the report volumes and LOS would differ. The One Paseo project existing condition counts are from 2007 (Via de la Valle) and 2009 (all other roadways). The discrepancy between the Plan TIS and the One Paseo Traffic Impact Analysis at I-5 southbound at Del Mar Heights Road appears to be from the One Paseo Traffic Impact Analysis incorrectly assigning signal phases 2 and 6 for both the westbound and eastbound movements, rather than phase 2 for one and 6 for the other. The analysis for Paseo One at I-5 northbound at Del Mar Heights Road uses a loss time that is greater than the default loss times identified for yellow and all red. This has resulted in a worse level of service in their analysis. Based on this review, we believe our analysis is correctly indicating the level of service at these locations.
70-3	"According to Appendix C Traffic Count Data, the existing Peak Hour Volumes appear low compared to Caltrans volumes in January 2008 at two locations."	The traffic counts used for the TIS reflect the most current existing conditions in the area. Additionally, they were reviewed for volume balancing and verified to be consistent.
70-4	"The Synchro Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) Report for Del Mar Heights Rd. and I-5 NB Exit (off) ramps were mislabeled on 'On-Ramp'."	The Synchro Reports for Del Mar Heights Road and I-5 northbound off ramp have been be relabeled accordingly.

Responses to Comments		
Comment Number	Comment Summary	Response
70-5	"For Traffic Impact Analysis, all state-owned signalized intersection affected by this project shall be analyzed using the Intersecting Lane Vehicles (ILV) procedure per Highway Design Manual (HDM)."	Intersecting Lane Vehicle (ILV) is a Caltrans-only method of determining the intersection operating conditions. These calculations have not been provided. Instead, the nationally accepted Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) method for determining intersection conditions was used to complete the TIS analysis. The HCM method is consistent with the <i>SANTEC/ ITE Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies in the San Diego Region</i> (2000) and is the basis for determining impacts, even for Caltrans-lead studies.
70-6	Supports Plan goals of improving environment for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. Encourages strengthening goals by increasing sidewalk width, increasing bicycle parking, and widening bike lanes on Camino del Mar to 6 feet.	Comment noted. The Plan increases sidewalks from 5 feet to 10 feet, increases bicycle parking both in the public right of way and on private properties and widens the Camino del Mar bike lane to 6 feet.
70-7	"The roundabout alternative seems to offer the greatest advantages, as it would provide for calmed vehicle flow while reducing pedestrian crossing distances and increasing on-street parking."	The configuration of Camino del Mar that includes roundabouts with two lanes of traffic is the one that is proposed in the final draft Plan.
70-8	"The roundabout alternative should consider the FHWA roundabout technical guidance (FHWA-SA-10-006), placing bicycle ramps near the entrances of the roundabouts, and an area that is easily navigable by bicycles."	The two-lane with roundabouts configuration for Camino del Mar will be considered by City Council during the preparation of the detailed improvement plans.
70-9	"To improve lines-of-sights for vehicles exiting parking spaces, back-in angle parking along Camino del Mar is recommended."	This recommendation will be considered by City Council during the preparation of the detailed improvement plans.
	<b>Additional letters received after the May 4, 2012 deadline are not addressed as responses to comments in the Final EIR, but are on file at the City of Del Mar.</b>	