

Encinitas Community Park- Athletic Field Lighting Project
Case # 10-068
425 Santa Fe Dr., Cardiff-by-the-Sea
Report of Citizens Meeting on June 24, 2010

A Citizens Participation Meeting was held on Thursday, June 24, 2010 at 6PM at the Encinitas Community Center, located at 1140 Oakcrest Park Drive in Encinitas. Approximately 127 people attended. Attendees were asked to sign in. The meeting opened with a welcome from Parks & Recreation Department staff, who instructed participants that the meeting was for informational purposes only and specific to the athletic field lighting component of the overall park development project.

At the request of the project applicant (Parks & Rec Department), representatives from Musco Lighting gave a presentation about athletic field lighting specific to the Hall Property site. Visual simulations based on photometric studies (completed by RJM Design Group), equipment specifications, similar projects and spill and glare control were some of the focal points of the presentation.

After the presentation from Musco Lighting concluded, a question and answer session continued for another hour. The Neighborhood Meeting concluded at approximately 8pm.

Project Description:

On October 22, 2008, City Council directed Parks and Recreation Department staff to submit a permit application for installation of athletic field lighting and to pursue all other necessary approvals, including a General Plan Amendment, to exceed the 30ft height restrictions at the park site for installation of the athletic field lighting, located at 425 Santa Fe Dr. in Cardiff-by-the-Sea. The athletic field lighting component of this project is comprised of installation of (3) 40', (13) 60', (4) 70', (10) 80' and (4) 90' steel galvanized poles with pole top luminary assemblies to support lighting equipment for nighttime athletic field lighting, for a total of (34) poles and (158) light fixtures.

All required permits and approvals for the overall park development project have been granted (Case No. 04-197). The project Master Plan and Program EIR have been approved and certified by either the Planning Commission and/or City Council as part of the original park development permitting process. Athletic field lighting was addressed and is included in the certified EIR. Park lighting is addressed specifically in Section 2.5.12 (Aesthetics and Lighting), Section 3.5 (Aesthetics and Lighting), Section 5.4.5 (Aesthetics and Lighting) and Appendix G- Lighting Analysis. The EIR is available on the City's website under City Projects/Hall Property.

1. What techniques did you use to notify and involve the public regarding your application?

A "Neighborhood Letter" was sent on June 7-8th to all property owners and residents within a 1,000 foot radius of the project site, although notification within a 500 foot radius is all that is required under the municipal code. In addition, nearly 1,000 parties on the "Of-Interest" lists for the Hall

property were noticed. In all, approximately 2,300 letters were sent. 137 were returned undeliverable. The letter was also posted in the kiosk at City Hall and on the City website. In addition, the notice was sent as an “e-alert” to subscribers of “City Projects” through the City website. After the meeting, the presentation was posted on the City website on the City Projects webpage for the Hall Property.

2. What concerns, issues and problems did you hear during the process?

Many of the same general comments, questions and issues were brought up during the presentation, during the question and answer period and further detailed on the official comment sheets. Official Comment sheets were received at the meeting and also through July 2. The following is a summary of the comments:

- a) Was it City Council’s direction to proceed with the lighting plan permitting processing?
- b) Explain the approved park plan in regards to lighting; explain the approval process (for lighting over 30 feet).
- c) Was athletic field lighting included in the EIR?
- d) Explain sports park lighting vs. other park lighting.
- e) Explain the CPP notification process.
- f) Explain the distinction between a “community park” and a “special use park.”
- g) Explain all lighting impacts on health and wildlife.
- h) Provide copies of the photometric analysis and equipment layout.
- i) What will the park programming be for field usage, lighting and hours of operation?
- j) Provide photo simulations from the ground looking up at the lights.
- k) Will story poles be used?
- l) How far away will one have to be to see the night sky and not see glare or lights?
- m) Can temporary lights be installed for simulation?
- n) What is Cal Trans’ position on the use of athletic field lighting at the park?
- o) What will the traffic impacts be from athletic field lighting?
- p) Will there be buffer foliage to mitigate lighting spill and glare?
- q) What will the installation and electrical costs be?
- r) What are some examples of other local Musco Light Structure Green projects?
- s) Will the CPP presentation slides be made available?

3. How have you addressed the concerns, issues, and problems raised?

a) On October 22, 2008, the City Council directed Parks and Recreation Department staff to submit a permit application for installation of athletic field lighting and to obtain all other necessary approvals, including a General Plan Amendment, to exceed the 30 foot height restrictions at the park site for installation of the athletic field lighting.

b) The approved park plan includes lighting up to 30 feet, including security and parking lot lighting. A General Plan Amendment is required to exceed the 30 foot height restrictions for installation of athletic field lighting. The next step is for the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing to review the proposed amendments to the general plan height restrictions, specific to this park site and then make a recommendation to the City

Council. The City Council will then hold a public hearing to review the amendments and approve or deny the amendments. A supermajority of the City Council is not required to amend the general plan. Should the Council take action to approve the application and amend the general plan, the project would then go through the Local Coastal Program amendment process with the California Coastal Commission. No hearing dates have been set as of yet.

c) From the EIR (Section S-4)- “Athletic field lighting, with poles up to 90 feet tall, would serve organized resident sports leagues and other events into the evening hours. In addition to the potential lighting of the athletic fields, the park would include lights throughout the facility for safety.” Athletic field lighting is addressed specifically in Section 2.5.12 (Aesthetics and Lighting), Section 3.5 (Aesthetics and Lighting), Section 5.4.5 (Aesthetics and Lighting) and Appendix G (of the EIR) - Lighting Analysis of the EIR. The EIR is available on the City’s website under City Projects/Hall Property.

d) Athletic field lighting, as compared to other park lighting is specific to illuminating the different sports fields in the park project. Each field has different lighting needs and lighting is custom designed for each application. Illumination of the athletic fields would allow play to continue into evening hours and extend the amount of time the fields could be used. All athletic field lighting exceeds the 30’ height restrictions and is therefore subject to a separate approval process.

e) A “Neighborhood Letter” was sent on June 7-8th to all property owners and residents within a 1,000 foot radius of the project site, although notification within a 500 foot radius is all that is required under the municipal code. In addition, nearly 1,000 parties on the “Of-Interest” list for the Hall property were noticed. In all, approximately 2,300 letters were sent. 137 were returned undeliverable. The letter was also posted in the kiosk at City Hall and on the City website. In addition, the notice was sent as an “e-alert” to subscribers of “City Projects” through the City website.

f) From the EIR (Section 3.1-2) - “In the Recreation Element of the General Plan, the project site is designated as a Special Use Park. Special Use Parks are defined as parks that are developed for a specific type of use, rather than a broader range of multiple park and open space uses, though they can provide many of the same facilities as a community park. As stated in the Recreational Element, “Special Use Parks which provide major facilities usually found at Community Parks (athletic fields, community centers, game courts) will be considered as Community Park acreage because they provide facilities serving the entire City or a major portion of the City...” The proposed park is consistent with the description of a Community Park as defined by the Recreational Element, except that a Community Park is limited by City standards to 10 to 20 acres. For that reason, the proposed project is designated as a Special Use Park.”

g) An analysis of lighting impacts is provided in Section 3.5 of the EIR, which determined that such impacts would be mitigated below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures. The mitigation measures would ensure that substantial spill light would not occur in adjacent areas, including the adjacent riparian

area (Rossini Creek) where wildlife may occur. See Section 3.5 of the EIR and Responses to Comments (Volume 3 of the EIR) Nos. C17-16, C17-20, and C136-15.

h) The photometric analysis and equipment layout are included in the EIR (Appendix G- Lighting Analysis, pgs. 97-107) and are also included in the project application on file in the Planning Department.

i) No programming decisions about park field usage or lighting have been made at this time.

j) Additional photo simulations may be provided at the direction of the City Council.

k) Story poles may be used at the direction of the City Council.

l) Views, spill and glare are included in Section 3.5 of the EIR and in Appendix G- Lighting Analysis of the EIR.

m) The use of temporary lights for simulation has not been determined or discussed.

n) Cal Trans' comments in response to the Draft EIR are included in Volume 3 of the EIR-Response to Comments. Cal Trans states: "All lighting (including reflected sunlight) within this project should be placed and/or shielded as not to be hazardous to vehicles traveling on I-5."

o) Traffic impacts are addressed in the EIR, Section 3.2- Traffic and Circulation. Traffic is an issue related to the park use itself, which is already approved, and not related to whether or not lights would be provided. Section 3.5.5 of the EIR provides mitigation measures that would require shielding and adjusting of project lighting to ensure that discomfort glare and significant light trespass. In addition, project structures will be required to have matte or dull finishes with reflectance values no greater than 20 percent.

p) EIR Section 3.5 discusses the use of landscape buffers from the perspective of several "key view locations." In the same section regarding mitigation of spill and glare from athletic field lighting, the EIR states; "While the City's current policies would need to be modified to allow for the height of the athletic field lighting, significant lighting effects would be avoided with the implementation of the measures summarized in Section 3.5.5." Landscape buffers are included in the Park design. The Hall Property Landscape Plan is available on the City Website page for the Hall Property Project.

q) Installation costs for the athletic field lighting will be determined during the bid process. Electrical costs would be determined by overall usage. For reference, electrical costs of athletic field lighting at Cardiff Sports Park are approximately \$35,000 annually and \$30,000 annually at Ecke Sports Park.

r) A list of examples of other local Musco Light Structure Green projects is available on the City website under City Projects/Hall Property.

s) The Musco Lighting presentation is available on the City Website under City Projects/Hall Property

4. If there are concerns, issues, and problems you aren't able to address, explain why?

Any questions or comments which were outside the scope of the proposed lighting project CPP (specifically in regards to athletic field lighting), but rather specific to the CPP process or planning, are excluded from this final report and will be directed to Planning staff. All comments collected are submitted along with this final report to the Planning Department for review.

Please refer any future inquiries regarding Planning Commission, City Council and Coastal Commission hearings to:

Kelly Morgan, Associate Planner
Planning and Building Department
City of Encinitas
505 South Vulcan Avenue
Encinitas, CA 92024
phone: (760) 633-2697
fax: (760) 943-2226
email: kmorgan@cityofencinitas.org