
Subject:

FW: City Hall Project: Thoughts from Dwight

From: Dwight Worden

Date: November 27, 2014 at 12:07:59 PM MST

To: Lee Haydu - Private , Donald Mosier - Private , Terry Sinnott - Private, Al Corti - Private , Sherryl Parks - Private

Cc: Scott Huth, Andrew Potter, "Kathleen A. Garcia"

Subject: City Hall Project: Thoughts from Dwight

Friends:

My thoughts:

1. Work with a Professional to Design Options and the Ballot. Let's work with the professional (to be identified) firm that will conduct the election in framing how choices will be presented on a ballot. We will have the cart before the horse if we spend too much time now locking down three options. There are other ways to approach a vote that MIGHT be better. For example: a ballot could present the basic Civic Center proposal and then ask for a vote on a series of add-ons: Add surplus parking--up to 50 extra spaces? Up to 109? Add residential? Add Commercial? Add a larger Town Hall? Add phasing? Other? I've checked out Everyone Counts and Simply Voting. They and others can do the job.

We should be compiling a list of issues we want resolved by voters and take that to the professionals with direction that we want a draft ballot we can review that is clear and simple that resolves the issues. Maybe they will come back with the three options currently on the table, but I suspect not. I suspect there are better ways to get at what we want to know.

2. City Take Control of the Village Square Option. The City needs to take full control of the options being outlined, including the Village Square option. Bless Jim Watkins and Kit Leeger for the great work they have done. They have put an intriguing vision on paper and they have really helped move things forward. BUT when we go to the voters the choices need to be evenly presented. Right now, we have two options without detail--blocks on a rough plot. We then have a 3rd option with design elements and text showing green space, a cafe, a restaurant, a bakery, containing financial assumptions and a phasing plan, and other details missing from the first two options. Either we need to design the first two options to a similar level, or down design the 3rd.

3. The Village Square Option Needs Independent Vetting. There's no polite way to say this, so I'll just say it: I don't think important aspects of the Village Square proposal submitted by Watkins-Leeger will stand analysis. I'd love to be proven wrong! The City needs its own, independent analysis of the finances, compliance with zoning, marketing, and feasibility of this option. Right now we have an unvetted 3rd option.

4. The Town Hall: Is it Enough?. The Winston School is preparing a Master Plan for its facilities. They want/need an auditorium. I understand Winston is nearing the point where a draft master plan can be released. They are open to cooperating with the City. A process to develop a

Shores Master Plan is also in early stages. It COULD include a Town Hall/auditorium as COULD the City Hall site and the Winston site. We need only one facility to serve all, but WHERE?

We have other needs and facilities to consider. The Powerhouse has performance seating for about 120, so what we may need is a larger Town Hall auditorium, not a duplication of capacity we already have.. DMCC and the Del Mar Foundation (and the Historical Society storage) are currently housed on the Shores property in the Community Building. They need more space for the future, and we may want to accommodate other important NGO's (art gallery? Theater Company? etc). We know from the workshops that there is strong community support for cultural and arts type activities.

It doesn't make sense to me to plan out the city hall site independent of these other factors. We (City, Winston, Shores, DMF, DMCC, Historical Society, NGO's) need ONE meeting hall/performance space that will meet all our needs where we can share costs. A facility to meet all our long term needs might be best placed on the City Hall site, on the Shores property, or at Winston. Let's figure that out. The 3200 square foot town hall currently in all 3 options (seating about 100) won't do it. Limiting ourselves to that option is, as a practical matter, a decision that all other needs will be met at the Shores or Winston site, by a later (no doubt expensive) expansion at the city hall site, or not at all. All less attractive alternatives. Same for the Alvarado house. The historical society says (per the Del Mar times) it is no longer pursuing a Seagrove Park option, so either we adapt the city hall options to include the house or we make a default decision to move it to the Shores or leave it at the Fairgrounds. I think we need to, and can, make these decisions affirmatively and not by default.

Parking. Oh boy, not sure what to do about this one. Questions, questions, and worries! Currently we have surplus parking at and near the City Hall site and what we need is parking nearer to 15th street. . If we spend big \$\$ on more surplus parking at the City Hall site are we not undermining the likelihood we will get parking down where it is really needed? Will we really acquire and build a 2nd facility on a site nearer 15th? (yes, there are some sites with potential). Do we have the money to do both? Will we compete with ourselves if we have facilities at both ends of the downtown? Shouldn't we, first, make a serious run at getting parking where we REALLY want it--down nearer to 15th-- saving our \$\$ for that, and only pursuing surplus parking at City Hall if we fail?

Free or Pay Parking at City Hall. Currently we have free parking, no time limit (except during Farmers Market) at the City Hall site, yet we have surplus. Assuming the City fronts the construction costs for MORE parking at City Hall, will we charge for it to recoup costs? If business customers and employees can park for free, aren't we subsidizing them? If we charge, we can't FORCE anyone to use the parking (can we?) and won't customers and employees still park free in the neighborhoods? Hmmm. If we charge, and count on that revenue, won't the city have a stake in NOT providing competing parking nearer 15th? Hmmm again. We have some in lieu parking fees. If we spend those for parking at City Hall, those spaces must be free spaces per code because they are parking required by zoning for the business. Do we end up with some pay and some free but restricted spaces in the same lot? How does that work? By code such in lieu parking must be within 500 feet walking distance of the business served. DMMC Section 30.80.150A. Will surplus parking at City Hall meet this standard? For how much of the downtown? Hmmm yet again.

I don't have the answers to these parking issues, just the questions and concerns. The good news is that we can do the basic Civic Center plan without delay, and through phasing take the time to

figure these issues out before committing that they we will, or will not, do surplus parking on the city hall site.

Please include a copy of this email in the public record and as a red dot for Monday's meeting,

Best to all,
Dwight

Subject:

FW: City Civic Center options

From: Judd

Sent: Wednesday, November 26, 2014 10:30 AM

To: Kathleen A. Garcia

Cc: Nate McCay; tommcg; Lee Haydu; Al Corti; Donald Mosier; Sherryl L. Parks; Terry Sinnott

Subject: City Civic Center options

Kathy,

I am confused about the 3 options the City is considering and hope that the City Council will make the options clear prior to our voting.

The Watkins plan that was voted on at the workshop is not the Watkins plan that is being circulated now. That only adds to the confusion as folks might not know what they are voting for. My suggestion is that the Council approach Jim and ask him to support the civic only plan with the proviso that the plan looks like his most recent drawing that has the City Hall and Civic Center on the west side of the site, leaving the Camino del Mar street frontage open. He would have to agree that the City couldn't mention "future commercial development; or allude to "phasing with commercial development in later phases", thus allowing the site to develop without EIR issues.

That doesn't preclude future development on the site or any other development the City may want to consider in the future and the citizens may want to vote for.

If the City Council decides to keep the commercial option on the ballot then the Council must make sure that they clearly identify:

1. Is the City going to select a commercial developer through an RFP process to be responsible for the commercial concept(What is the optimum amount of commercial? What type? Restaurants? Side shops? Who owns the commercial buildings? The City? Who finances them? The City? Is it a ground lease? Who pays for the vote? Who pays for the EIR which will cover the entire site?)
2. All the same questions apply to the residential portion of the site.

Right now we as citizens have a clear understanding of the two options not involving commercial. We know the path that we have to follow to achieve completion of either option. The commercial option is a pretty picture with little to no actual knowledge of the process. In summary, a public private partnership involving public buildings, private housing and several different types of retail is a very complicated negotiation that we as a City should stay away from at this time. I don't believe the commercial option should be put on the ballot unless we as citizens have a clear understanding of what is being voted on.

Regards, Judd

Judd G. Halenza

The Judd Company

South Sierra Ave.

Solana Beach, CA 92075

858.847.9323

Subject:

FW: City Hall Item #8 on Dec 1, 2014 meeting

From: Tom McGreal

Date: November 28, 2014 at 5:04:39 PM MST

To: Lee Haydu, Al Corti - Private , Terry Sinnott - Private , Donald Mosier, Sherryl Parks - Private

Cc: Scott Huth, "Kathleen A. Garcia", Andrew Potter, Claire

Subject: Fwd: City Hall Item #8 on Dec 1, 2014 meeting

Council Members,

Thanks to Dwight Worden for raising good questions that need further discussion at Council. In particular, we support the suggestion that further discussion is needed on the merits of a larger Town Hall facility.

We also want to add our two cents on City Hall parking.

The need for additional parking in the Village has been discussed for years with no apparent solution / location. If there are real opportunities for creating parking in the 15th St area, let's pursue them to a final conclusion right now. The development of a new City Hall creates a near term opportunity to add 100 extra parking spots tucked under the plaza podium. We should not miss this opportunity unless we have firm plans to build parking in a better location.

Surplus City Hall parking would take the pressure off the need to install diagonal parking from 10th St to 13th St as proposed in the Village component of the Sidewalk Project, which is scheduled for Council review in January. Underground parking allows us to avoid making the village look like a parking lot. It also allows us to retain the bike lanes and avoid creating dangerous sharrows.

Please keep in mind that the distance from City Hall to 15th St is only .3 miles, which is a short walk for people not requiring handicap parking. At a minimum many of these new City Hall spaces could be used as designated employee parking or to satisfy additional in-lieu parking (may need to change the code to 1500 feet). Of course, any later phasing decision to add a restaurant or cafe to the City Hall property would also require additional parking.

The development of the Shores property and the Garden project will also bring additional traffic to the area creating new demand for parking. Maybe we could treat the City Hall parking as in-lieu parking for residential or commercial owners in the Garden project, thereby getting the Garden project to help fund the underground parking cost.

We're in favor of creating additional parking in the village and the new City Hall seems like the best alternative. The cost will be covered by a long term bond, which means there is no pressing financial need to charge for parking to recover the investment quickly.

Regards, Tom & Claire McGreal

On Nov 27, 2014, at 11:17 AM, Dwight Worden <dworden@roadrunner.com> wrote:

Friends:

A copy FYI of my recent submittal on the City Hall project for Monday's council meeting . I don't take office until Tuesday, so am still on the outside for Monday's meeting. Feedback welcome!

Dwight

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Dwight Worden

Date: Thu, Nov 27, 2014 at 11:07 AM

Subject: City Hall Project: Thoughts from Dwight

To: Lee Haydu, Donald Mosier, Terry Sinnott, al corti, Sheryl Parks

Cc: Scott Huth, Andrew Potter, "Kathleen A. Garcia"

Friends:

My thoughts:

1. Work with a Professional to Design Options and the Ballot. Let's work with the professional (to be identified) firm that will conduct the election in framing how choices will be presented on a ballot. We will have the cart before the horse if we spend too much time now locking down three options. There are other ways to approach a vote that MIGHT be better. For example: a ballot could present the basic Civic Center proposal and then ask for a vote on a series of add-ons: Add surplus parking--up to 50 extra spaces? Up to 109? Add residential? Add Commercial? Add a larger Town Hall? Add phasing? Other? I've checked out Everyone Counts and Simply Voting. They and others can do the job.

We should be compiling a list of issues we want resolved by voters and take that to the professionals with direction that we want a draft ballot we can review that is clear and simple that resolves the issues. Maybe they will come back with the three options currently on the table, but I suspect not. I suspect there are better ways to get at what we want to know.

2. City Take Control of the Village Square Option. The City needs to take full control of the options being outlined, including the Village Square option. Bless Jim Watkins and Kit Leeger for the great work they have done. They have put an intriguing vision on paper and they have really helped move things forward. BUT when we go to the voters the choices need to be evenly presented. Right now, we have two options without detail--blocks on a rough plot. We then have a 3rd option with design elements and text showing green space, a cafe, a restaurant, a bakery, containing financial assumptions and a phasing plan, and other details missing from the first two options. Either we need to design the first two options to a similar level, or down design the 3rd.

3. The Village Square Option Needs Independent Vetting. There's no polite way to say this, so I'll just say it: I don't think important aspects of the Village Square proposal submitted by Watkins-Leeger will stand analysis. I'd love to be proven wrong! The City needs its own, independent analysis of the finances, compliance with zoning, marketing, and feasibility of this option. Right now we have an unvetted 3rd option.

4. The Town Hall: Is it Enough?. The Winston School is preparing a Master Plan for its facilities. They want/need an auditorium. I understand Winston is nearing the point where a draft master plan can be released. They are open to cooperating with the City. A process to develop a Shores Master Plan is also in early stages. It COULD include a Town Hall/auditorium as COULD the City Hall site and the Winston site. We need only one facility to serve all, but WHERE?

We have other needs and facilities to consider. The Powerhouse has performance seating for about 120, so what we may need is a larger Town Hall auditorium, not a duplication of capacity we already have.. DMCC and the Del Mar Foundation (and the Historical Society storage) are currently housed on the Shores property in the Community Building. They need more space for the future, and we may want to accommodate other important NGO's (art gallery? Theater Company? etc). We know from the workshops that there is strong community support for cultural and arts type activities.

It doesn't make sense to me to plan out the city hall site independent of these other factors. We (City, Winston, Shores, DMF, DMCC, Historical Society, NGO's) need ONE meeting hall/performance space that will meet all our needs where we can share costs. A facility to meet all our long term needs might be best placed on the City Hall site, on the Shores property, or at Winston. Let's figure that out. The 3200 square foot town hall currently in all 3 options (seating about 100) won't do it. Limiting ourselves to that option is, as a practical matter, a decision that all other needs will be met at the Shores or Winston site, by a later (no doubt expensive) expansion at the city hall site, or not at all. All less attractive alternatives. Same for the Alvarado house. The historical society says (per the Del Mar times) it is no longer pursuing a Seagrove Park option, so either we adapt the city hall options to include the house or we make a default decision to move it to the Shores or leave it at the Fairgrounds. I think we need to, and can, make these decisions affirmatively and not by default.

Parking. Oh boy, not sure what to do about this one. Questions, questions, and worries! Currently we have surplus parking at and near the City Hall site and what

we need is parking nearer to 15th street. . If we spend big \$\$ on more surplus parking at the City Hall site are we not undermining the likelihood we will get parking down where it is really needed? Will we really acquire and build a 2nd facility on a site nearer 15th? (yes, there are some sites with potential). Do we have the money to do both? Will we compete with ourselves if we have facilities at both ends of the downtown? Shouldn't we, first, make a serious run at getting parking where we REALLY want it--down nearer to 15th-- saving our \$\$ for that, and only pursuing surplus parking at City Hall if we fail?

Free or Pay Parking at City Hall. Currently we have free parking, no time limit (except during Farmers Market) at the City Hall site, yet we have surplus. Assuming the City fronts the construction costs for MORE parking at City Hall, will we charge for it to recoup costs? If business customers and employees can park for free, aren't we subsidizing them? If we charge, we can't FORCE anyone to use the parking (can we?) and won't customers and employees still park free in the neighborhoods? Hmmm. If we charge, and count on that revenue, won't the city have a stake in NOT providing competing parking nearer 15th? Hmmm again. We have some in lieu parking fees. If we spend those for parking at City Hall, those spaces must be free spaces per code because they are parking required by zoning for the business. Do we end up with some pay and some free but restricted spaces in the same lot? How does that work? By code such in lieu parking must be within 500 feet walking distance of the business served. DMMC Section 30.80.150A. Will surplus parking at City Hall meet this standard? For how much of the downtown? Hmmm yet again.

I don't have the answers to these parking issues, just the questions and concerns. The good news is that we can do the basic Civic Center plan without delay, and through phasing take the time to figure these issues out before committing that they we will, or will not, do surplus parking on the city hall site.

Please include a copy of this email in the public record and as a red dot for Monday's meeting,

Best to all,
Dwight



City of Del Mar Memorandum



TO: City Council

FROM: Jon Terwilliger, Senior Management Analyst
Via Scott W. Huth, City Manager

DATE: December 1, 2014

RE: Current & Future Parking Demand in Downtown Area

As part of the conversation regarding the development and future uses of the 1050 Camino del Mar property, the following information is related to current and future parking demand in the Downtown Commercial area.

Parking Demand Type	Description	Number of Stalls
Downtown Business Employees	<i>Estimated number of on-street parking stalls utilized by local business employees due to a lack of parking (designated or otherwise) on the property at which their employer is located.</i>	140
In-Lieu Program		
Repurposed Commercial Building Use	<i>Conservative estimate of the additional parking stalls (10+ per block) needed to meet parking requirements if private Downtown commercial properties were repurposed to their "highest and best" use.</i>	50-75
Garden Del Mar Development	<i>Number of off-site parking stalls that Garden Del Mar developers have indicated they would like to provide offsite to meet their public benefit requirement.</i>	15
1050 Camino del Mar Site Redevelopment		
Plaza (15,000 SF)	<i>Estimated number of stalls that may be needed to meet parking requirements for undefined use Plaza space in Civic Center redevelopment.</i>	50-75
Restaurant Uses (6,500 SF)	<i>Number of stalls needed to meet parking requirements for possible restaurant building space in Civic Center redevelopment.</i>	72
Total		330-383



Master Plan Scenarios		Civic Uses Only	Civic Uses + Parking	Mixed Use: Civic Uses + Commercial + Parking		
DRAFT		<i>Description:</i> City Hall, Town Hall, Civic Plaza, 80-stall tuck-under parking structure, with 29 stalls available for surplus public parking. The remainder of the lot (approximately 33,000 SF) would be reserved for future use. In the interim, it could be used for open space area and/or surface parking.		City Hall, Town Hall, Civic Plaza, 60-stall surface parking lot and 100-stall tuck-under parking structure for a total of 160 parking stalls, with 109 stalls available for surplus public parking. The structure parking would be under the building and plaza, and there would be approximately 11,000 SF of podium area that could support future uses.		
		Area	Parking	Area	Parking	
Program	Program:					
	City Hall	square feet	9,250 SF	31	9,250 SF	31
	Town Hall	square feet	3,200 SF	20	3,200 SF	20
	Plaza	square feet	15,000 SF	TBD	15,000 SF	TBD
	Commercial	square feet	0 SF	0	0 SF	0
	Total:			51		51
	Remainder of Site or Podium available for future use	square feet	33,000 SF		11,000 SF	
	Total Parking	stalls	80 stalls		160 stalls	
	Parking Breakdown					
	Required Parking for Uses per Code			51 stalls		51 stalls
Surplus Public Parking			29 stalls		109 stalls	
Provision of Parking:						
Surface Parking			0 stalls		60 stalls	
Structured Parking (under buildings/podium)			80 stalls		100 stalls	
Financials	Project Financials					
	Public Development Costs		TBD		TBD	
	(Less) Commercial Space Value					(4)
	= Net Development Cost to City				\$0	
Entitlements	Entitlements & Processing Time					
	Zoning		Complies with existing Public Facilities (PF) Zone		Complies with existing Public Facilities (PF) Zone	Requires Zoning Change (Specific Plan, Measure B) to allow Commercial
	Entitlement Process		Requires DRB permits, CEQA		Requires DRB permits, CEQA	Requires DRB permits, CEQA
	Estimated Timeframe to Groundbreaking after Decision		18 to 24 months minimum		9 to 12 months minimum	18 to 24 months minimum

(1) Master plan concepts are conceptual in nature and do not represent a design. In the future, a full design process will be undertaken for the preferred direction.

(4) Assumes commercial fee to offset costs to city; 50-year minimum ground lease for commercial use.