MINUTES OF A
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF CORONADO
Police Facility – Emergency Operations Center
700 Orange Avenue
Coronado, CA 92118
Tuesday, June 1, 2004, 3:00 p.m.

Mayor Smisek called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL:

Present: Councilmembers Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, Tierney and Mayor Smisek

Absent: None

Also Present: City Manager Mark Ochenduszko
City Attorney Morgan Foley
City Clerk Diane Shea

2. **INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.** Mayor Smisek led the invocation.

3. MINUTES: The minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 18, 2004, a copy having been provided Council prior to the meeting, were approved as submitted. The reading of the minutes in their entirety was unanimously waived.

MSUC **(Schmidt/Tanaka) moved that the City Council approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 18, 2004, as submitted**

AYES: **Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek**
NAYS: **None**
ABSENT: **None**

4. CEREMONIAL PRESENTATIONS: None.

5. **CONSENT CALENDAR:** The City Council approved, adopted and/or accepted as one item of business Consent Agenda Items 5a through 5g, and Items 11b, c, and d.

MSUC **(Schmidt/Tanaka) moved that the City Council approve the Consent Calendar Items 5a through 5g, and Items**

AYES: **Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek**
NAYS: **None, except Tierney "nay" on item 5e**
ABSENT: **None**

5a. **Approval of Reading by Title and Waiver of Reading in Full of Ordinances on this Agenda.** The City Council waives the reading of the full text of every ordinance contained in this agenda and approves the reading of the ordinance title only. **The City Council waived the reading of the full text and approved the reading of the title only.**

5b. **Approval of Warrants.** The City Council ratified payment of warrants Nos. 10036196 thru 10036504, as audited and approved by the Audit Committee, provided there are sufficient funds on hand. **The City Council approved the warrants.**

5c. **Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing the Destruction of Certain Documents Located in the City Clerk's Office, City Manager's Office, Administrative Services, Engineering and Project Development Department, Community Development Department, Fire Services, Public Services, and Police Services.** A records retention schedule for the City of Coronado was adopted by the City Council on April 15, 2003. This retention schedule, in accordance with State of California Government Code Section 34090, permits the destruction of certain City records which are no longer required for the effective operation of the City, provided there is approval of the City Council by resolution and the written consent of the City Attorney.

During normal maintenance and management of City records, City departments have identified records that are ready for purging and destruction. In compliance with Gov. C. Section 34090, it is not believed that these records have a lasting administrative, legal, fiscal, historical, or research value. These records have been identified by record type, date of the record, and retention period as listed on the Record Destruction Lists attached to Exhibit A of the Resolution. Destruction of these records comply with the provisions of the City's Records Retention Policy. The City Attorney has reviewed the lists and has approved of the documents' destruction. **The City Council approved A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO AUTHORIZING THE DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS IN THE CITY CLERK'S OFFICE, CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, ENGINEERING AND PROJECT DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, FIRE SERVICES, PUBLIC SERVICES AND POLICE SERVICES. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 7992**

5d. Renewal of Contract with San Diego Harbor Excursion for FY 2004-2005 Commuter Ferry Service. The fare-free commuter ferry service provided by San Diego Harbor Excursion operates weekdays during peak commute periods. Ridership in FY 1999-2000 was 45,810 with a per passenger subsidy of $2.62. Annual ridership increased substantially after September 11, 2001. This year ridership is projected to be approximately 86,000 with a per passenger subsidy of $1.48. This per passenger subsidy compares very favorably with the per passenger subsidy of other peak express transit services. Naval Base Coronado Commanding Officer has requested a minor modification to the morning schedule to accommodate riders coming from East County. **The City Council approved the FY 2004-2005 contract with San Diego Harbor Excursion and authorized the City Manager to execute the contracts and fund transfer agreements with San Diego Harbor Excursion, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS).**

5e. Renewal of Contract with Ledford Enterprises and Appropriation of Funds for Advocacy of the State Route (SR) 75/282 Tunnel Project for Regional Transportation Planning, 2004-2009 Federal Transportation Equity Act (TEA) Reauthorization Bill and Related Funding Initiatives. In 2002 and the SR 75/282 Tunnel Project was submitted to SANDAG for inclusion in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Due to the high cost of the political challenges of the project at the SANDAG Board, a professional advisor was retained to assist in advocating the project. Assisted by the efforts of Ledford Enterprises, the City was successful at advocating the project. Assisted by the efforts of Ledford Enterprises, the City was successful at getting the SR 75 tunnel project included in the 2030 Mobility RTP. The contract with Ledford Enterprises was renewed in 2003 to advocate inclusion of the Tunnel Project in the regional TransNet Extension 2004 ballot measure. The Tunnel Project has now been included in the TransNet Extension 2004 ballot measure with an amount of $25 million construction only funding.

Currently, SANDAG is mounting an extensive campaign to extend the half-cent sales tax TransNet Program through a ballot measure in 2004. The SR 75/282 Tunnel Project is a potential candidate for inclusion in the TransNet Program, as well as other regional transportation planning efforts. In addition, Coronado is continuing to pursue funding for the SR 75/282 tunnel project in the 2004-2009 reauthorization of the Federal Transportation Equity Act and a variety of other federal, state and local sources. Ledford Enterprises continues to provide critical contacts in advocating the tunnel project, with SANDAG, for inclusion in the TransNet Program. **The City Council renewed the agreement with Ledford Enterprises, Inc. for professional services and authorized expenditure of up to $73,200 from account #410735-9820-00901 for this purpose. This item was approved on the Consent Calendar, however, Councilmember Tierney registered a "no" vote on this item.**

5f. Consideration of Adoption of Resolutions (1) Calling and Giving Notice of Holding a General Municipal Election on November 2, 2004 for the Election of Certain Municipal Officers, and (2) Requesting the San Diego County Board of Supervisors to Consolidate the City's General Municipal election with the Statewide General Election to be Held on the Same Date. Three city council seats' terms expire in November 2004. Under the provisions of the laws relating to general law cities in the State of California, a General Municipal Election shall be held for the election of a mayor and two (2) city council members, each to a full four (4) year term. In order to hold the General Municipal Election and to consolidate the election

with the Statewide General Election, certain actions must be taken, including City Council adoption of the resolutions.

The City Council adopted A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO, CALIFORNIA, CALLING AND GIVING NOTICE OF THE HOLDING OF A GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2004, FOR THE ELECTION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AS REQUIRED BY THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA RELATING TO GENERAL LAW CITIES and A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO, CALIFORNIA, REQUESTING THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO TO CONSOLIDATE A GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 2, 2004 WITH THE STATEWIDE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD ON THE DATE PURSUANT TO § 10403 OF THE ELECTIONS CODE. The Resolutions were read by Title, the reading in their entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 7989 and RESOLUTION NO. 7990, respectively.

5g. Resolution Adopting the San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (the "Act"), signed into law on October 30, 2000 (Public Law 106-390), requires all jurisdictions to have an approved hazard mitigation plan in place prior to November 1, 2004 in order to qualify for hazard mitigation program grants and post-disaster mitigation monies. In June 2003, the County of San Diego Office of Emergency Services and their consultant, URS Corporation, commenced meetings with the City of Coronado and other cities and jurisdictions within the County to develop a Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (Plan) to comply with the Act. The Plan is a pre-disaster strategic plan that serves as a guideline to lowering the risk and exposure to natural disasters.

Specific goals, objectives, and action items applicable to the City of Coronado were developed after reviewing the current capabilities of the City of Coronado to lessen the impact of natural disasters and include: enhance public awareness and understanding; create a decision tool for management; provide compliance with State and Federal program requirements; enhance local policies for hazard mitigation capabilities; provide inter-jurisdictional coordination of mitigation-related programming; and achieve regulatory compliance.

The City Council adopted A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN FOR THE CITY OF CORONADO. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 7991.

6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

a. Susan Keith, 801 Tolita, congratulated the community on the Memorial Day Service held at Star Park. It was a great event with young and old alike attending. She complemented staff on the beauty of the park with the new renovations.

b. Amy Conrad, Coronado Historical Association, announced the completion of two fundraising events, the Historic Home Tour and Art and Antique Auction and reported an event was

held for life members and their 35th anniversary. Staff is working on a one page map for distribution in the Visitors Center.

c. Karen Finch, Coronado Chamber of Commerce, announced the arrival of the new Relocation Guide and thanked city staff for their assistance. She invited all to Chamber Sundowner where the Mayor will introduce Capt. Tim Alexander, Commanding Officer of NAB Coronado.

d. Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue asked Council to consider in the future to give "time certains" on agenda items that have of high interest to the community.

e. Councilmember Schmidt complimented staff on how beautiful the City looked for Memorial Day.

f. Scott Aurich, **734 Glorietta Boulevard**, said that contrary to what some people are saying, he is not involved with a client who wanted to purchase the home at 1156 Isabella. He supports Mills Act and of Council being proactive as an incentive to save homes. (This oral communication taken at the end of the Council meeting.)

7. CITY MANAGER:

7a. Update on Council Directed Actions and Citizen Inquiries. No report.

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS: None.

10. COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE REPORTS:

10a. Report from the Port Commissioner Concerning Port Activities. Admiral Robert Spane reported on the Port Commission's Joint Meeting with the City of Chula Vista with discussions on the Bay Front Master Plan. The central issue is the idea of trading Port land so that residential units can be built. This has not been done in the past and would be a landmark idea. The next Port meeting is June 8, 2004 where Deadman's Point will be discussed. The Port and the Airport have settled out of court on their issues. This settlement is good because Coronado has money coming to it for completion of the Linear Park project. A Port workshop will be held on the Tenth Avenue terminal and football stadium concept.

10b. Recommendation from the Traffic Operations Committee Regarding a Request to Install Candlestick Delineators at the Intersections of Palm Avenue/Third Street and Palm Avenue/Alameda Boulevard. Ed Walton, Principal Engineer, stated this issue was raised in a letter received from a local resident brought to Council with a list of traffic improvements to calm traffic on Palm Avenue. Council referred this to the Traffic Operations Committee. The committee directed staff to further investigate several of the suggested improvements including the evaluation of candlestick delineators on Palm Avenue at the intersections of Third Street and Alameda Boulevard.

Mr. Walton described the placement of the candlestick delineators at Palm Avenue and Alameda Boulevard, and Palm Avenue and Third Street as depicted in Exhibits A and B to the staff report. The basic concept is to extend the curb line on Palm Avenue on the south end about 30 feet, making that a narrow entrance for left turning traffic from Alameda onto Palm. Likewise, the 90 degree left turn from Palm Avenue on the southbound Alameda will be narrowed to approximately 20 feet, and the right turn off of Palm Avenue on Alameda is to be narrowed to about 15 feet. The delineators could require the loss of two parking spaces on Alameda. The drawbacks to the delineators are that their appearance is unsightly and difficult to sweep around. A street sweeper could not maneuver around them. The plan is to place the delineators five feet of center so it would prevent cars from swerving and making a short cut on the corner.

Mayor Smisek asked if the delineators would be permanently attached to the street. Mr. Walton responded they would be glued down and are impact resistant, meaning they are on a bungee cord and would bounce back.

Councilmember Tierney asked if the delineators are located anywhere else in City. Mr. Walton said the other location of the candlestick delineators are by the semi-diverters to prevent motorist from shooting across Third and crossing the diverters. Caltrans also has them placed at Pomona and Third Street by the "S" curve.

Jeanne Fox, 230 Palm Avenue, is an advocate for redesigning these corners because of traffic hazards with high speeds at both intersections. She suggested a slight design change.

MSC (Schmidt/Monroe) moved staff recommendation that candlestick delineators be installed at the intersections of Palm Avenue with Third Street and Alameda Boulevard as shown in Exhibits A and B of the staff report.

Councilmember Tierney said the intent is very good, but we are overreacting by putting the candlestick delineators in the street. They look bad and trash collects around them. He doesn't think there is a major traffic problem with these intersections. These types of solutions make the City look junky and it is happening more and more. He suggested raised buttons on street to delineate the area of travel. He will not support this motion. He would support a more permanent solution such as grass, flowers, planters that would improve the intersections.

Councilmember Monroe said this Council has been very consistent with traffic calming measures. There is traffic throughout San Diego County. Traffic is increasing and this is what happens with population growth and economic growth. Approval of this item continues the course the Council has been going in traffic calming. A short amount of time will tell if this action is working and if a more permanent solution should be done, such as a landscaped island.

Mayor Smisek remembered that originally the traffic calming measure on Pomona was temporary, and after it was successful at calming the traffic, a more permanent solution was installed, a landscaped bulb-out. The main purpose of this is a calming technique. It may not be a final solution. If it does work, it could be beautified in some way.

Councilmember Tanaka agreed that the candlestick delineators are ugly but the safety issue outweighs the aesthetics. He has spent some time at the intersections watching the drivers' patterns.

He feels this traffic calming measure will inhibit the action of some drivers to make illegal turns and will slow their speed.

AYES: **Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, and Smisek**
NAYS: **Tierney**
ABSENT: **None**

11. CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS:

11a. Council Reports on Inter-Agency Committee and Board Assignments.

Councilmember Tierney attended the Sharp Coronado Hospital Volunteer Luncheon; went to Lions Spaghetti Dinner; Coronado Cays Homeowners Association monthly meeting representing the City; VFW Star Park Memorial Day Services; and VFW luncheon.

Councilmember Monroe attended two SANDAG meetings, presented Over the Bridge Walk Run awards; attended Silver Strand Corridor Management Committee meeting, MTS Board meeting, Concert in the Park, and Memorial Day Ceremony in Star Park. He complimented Public Services for the improvements in Star Park.

Councilmember Tanaka attended Heartland Communications Facility Authority Board meeting for fire dispatch; attended Memorial Day Service in Star Park which looked glorious.

Councilmember Schmidt attended MainStreet meeting, Capital Improvement Program meeting; met with Andrew Potter, Pam Willis and Jesse Tench on City's affordable housing improvements; RSIP meeting, attended meeting with staff and Mayor on lifeguard tower and met with Scott Huth on a landscaping problem.

Mayor Smisek attended MainStreet meeting; met with Chamber of Commerce President Scott Grimes and Executive Director Karen Finch; Capital Improvement Program subcommittee; the new San Diego Advisory Committee, a group that has broken away from the San Diego Chamber; the Coronado Hospital Volunteer luncheon; Coronado Cays Homeowners Meeting on the proposed Grande Caribe Resort and Spa for a proposed 180 room hotel and spa on North Grand Caribe Isle, the Memorial Day Ceremony; and VFW luncheon.

11b. Discussion of Para-Transit Permit Fees, Possible Fee Adjustments, and the Establishment of a Procedure for Issuing Permits When Demand Exceeds Availability. In March of 2004 City Council amended Title 20, Chapter 20.40 of the Coronado Municipal Code. The approved amendments allowed Low Speed Vehicles (LSVs) to obtain permits as Para-Transit vehicles. The amendments also established that a permit may be deemed "in-active" if the permitted vehicle is out of operation or uninsured for more than ninety days in a twelve month period, or does not provide service to at least 30 fares originating in Coronado in a ninety day period. Using the existing Municipal Code formula there are a maximum of 53 permits that can be issued. The City charges a business license fee of $28 per quarter for each vehicle however, there is no initial permit fee or annual renewal fee. There are also no fees charged for annual inspections or

transfer to another vehicle. The Municipal Code does not specify a procedure to be followed when the level of interest in obtaining a permit exceeds the available number of permits. Currently there are 48 permits issued to 3 companies operating in Coronado. Based on operator responses to a recent letter from the Police Department, 24 of the 48 currently issued permits appear to be "inactive" based on the amended Municipal Code definition. This includes two operators holding 23 permits but no longer accepting fares originating in Coronado. The Police Department is holding 5 permits for one para-transit operator applicant who is awaiting delivery of new LSV's to operate in Coronado.

Regionally (aside from Coronado), an initial Para-Transit permit costs between $118 and $3000. Annual renewal of a permit costs between $25 and $300. Fees should be sufficient to cover the administrative costs to the city to regulate this activity and provide for a consistent level of enforcement. Fees should also be structured to encourage local service and discourage "shelving" of permits to avoid competition and/or MTS permitting and regulation.

Under Consent, the City Council directed staff to prepare a recommendation that revises the current fees and establishes a method of issuing permits when demand exceeds availability.

11c. Award of Landscape Maintenance Services Contract. For the fiscal year 2004/2005 budget, Council approved a total of $209,300.00 for contract services to support continuation of parks, grounds and landscape maintenance. Of this, $34,000.00 was specifically allocated for small park maintenance, and additional funding is budgeted for weed abatement/litter control.

The Public Services Department currently utilized both in-house crews and contractors for the maintenance of landscaped areas and park lands within the City. As the present contract for landscape services, which includes parks, pump stations, and the Public Services yard is on a month-to-month term, it was decided to re-bid the contract for a specified period of time. Staff conducted a formal bid process for parks, grounds and landscape maintenance services for one year, with two one-year fixed-price renewal options. Two responsive bidders were publicly opened on May 20, 2004 with the following results:

Contractor	Monthly Bid Base	Annual Bid Base
Farle Landscape Co.	$2,800.00	$33,600.00
Aztec Landscaping	$4,424.75	$53,097.00

The bidder with the lowest responsive bid was Farle Landscape Company. The second bidder was Aztec Landscape. Farle Landscape Company is the contractor presently providing landscape maintenance services to the City, and is familiar with the needs of the City. Based on the results, staff is recommending Farle Landscape Company. **Under Consent, the City Council awarded a contract to Farle Landscape Company for an annual base bid amount of $33,600.00 for landscape maintenance services for fiscal year 2004/2005, with two one-year renewal options upon mutual consent. Said contract shall not exceed the Public Services Parks Division program budget.**

11d. Award of High-Pressure Power Washing/Cleaning Services Contract. The City contracted out high pressure power washing/cleaning services specifically to cover the commercial area sidewalks, public facilities and public bus stops on a month-to-month contract basis. Since awarding the original contract, the City has added more services, such as bus stop cleaning, graffiti abatement, and more frequent cleaning in the commercial area; therefore it was necessary to solicit formal bids for the expanded services we desire.

Staff conducted a formal bid process for high-pressure power washing/cleaning of concrete surfaces for one year, with two one-year fixed-price renewal options. Three responsive buds were publicly opened on May 20, 2004 with the following results:

Contractor	Monthly Base Bid	Annual Base Bid
California Power Washing	$5,282.50	$63,390.00
J & S Power Cleaning	$16,135.00	$193,620.00
A & A Steam Cleaning	$27,948.00	$335,376.00

California Power Washing providing the lowest base bid at $63,390.00 on an annual basis. The second lowest base bid was provided by J & S Power Cleaning at $193,620.00 annually, and the highest bid was provided by A&A Steam Cleaning at $335,376.00 annually. Staff's review of the applications has found all to be responsive, and therefore recommends that the contract be awarded to California Power Washing. **Under Consent, the City Council awarded a contract to California Power Washing for a base bid amount of $63,390.00 for high pressure power washing/cleaning services for fiscal year 2004/2005, with two one-year renewal options upon mutual consent. Said contract shall not exceed the annual budgeted amount for these services within the Public Services Streets Division.**

11e. Consideration of Request from Councilmember Tierney to Request Mr. Daniel Carrigg, Legislative Representative on Environmental Issues with the League of California Cities, to Seek Inclusion of a Temporary Six Month Relief by California Cities From the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) When Studying and Instituting Temporary Traffic Planning Solutions. Councilmember Tierney explained that he has had discussions with League of California Cities Legislative Representative Dan Carrigg, to seek inclusion of a temporary six month relief by California cities from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) when studying and instituting temporary traffic planning solutions. Mr. Carrigg and others were surprised to learn that CEQA did not allow for temporary relief whiling trying to determine traffic solutions. He explained that the City was in litigation on this very matter in Superior Court and that the court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs and directed the City to perform a CEQA study to remove temporary diverters. Mr. Carrigg requested that the City send him a letter stating the problem and a request for relief while working on temporary traffic solutions. He would then try to work with members of the State Legislature in an effort to see if some exemptions could be made. If this happens it would benefit cities and counties throughout the State saving them both legal costs and time. This issue belongs in Sacramento and with the League of California Cities because they have the ability to pursue it and go forward with their leadership and numbers. Mr. Tierney thinks the City should move forward on this.

Councilmember Schmidt opposes this because it could in some way affect the EIR process on the School District project on traffic issues and will not support.

Mr. Tanaka is more comfortable going through SANDAG first and gauging their interest. . If they are supportive, he would then support taking it to the League of California Cities at a later time..

Councilmember Tierney said in this particular case, this issue is far better resolved at the League's level since it will require legislative change, whereas SANDAG can merely go forward and endorse the change. As the City's representative to the San Diego League of California Cities, he would expect that when he tells you that this would be best placed at state level, then Council should go in that direction. This is very important to the City and to the State.

Councilmember Monroe said he has not taken the item to SANDAG yet, but will bring the issue up at Friday's Transportation Meeting during public comment. He doesn't have a problem with the League going forward at the same time that SANDAG is considering the issue too. He will be talking with others informally to determine if there is support for this.

Mayor Smisek said as Mr. Monroe pursues the issue with SANDAG on Friday, if there is not support he would like to know before sending a letter to the League.

MSC **(Tierney/Monroe) moved that the City send a letter to the Dan Carrigg, Environmental Representative to the League of California Cities to seek inclusion of a temporary six month relief by California cities from CEQA when studying and instituting temporary traffic planning solutions and for Mr. Monroe to continue his work through SANDAG**

AYES: **Monroe, Tierney, and Smisek**
NAYS: **Schmidt and Tanaka**
ABSENT: **None**

11f. **Adoption of an Interim Urgency Ordinance Adding Chapter 70.22 to Title 70 of the Municipal Code Regarding the City's Demolition Permit Process for Residential Structures Seventy-Five Years or Older; and Further Adopting a Resolution Authorizing the Establishment of an Interim Fee for Demolition Permits.** Tony Pena, Director of Community Development, introduced the item saying that the City Council directed staff to prepare an urgency ordinance followed by a permanent ordinance that would provide a discretionary demolition permit process for the City. The Community Development Department issues permits over the counter on a daily basis, one of which is a demolition permit, mostly for single-family homes. Up until now, most of the demolition permits have been considered ministerial in nature and issued over the counter by staff. Under this urgency ordinance and the permanent ordinance to follow, if an individual property owner comes to the department to request a demolition permit for a structure that is 75 years old or older, that permit would not issued over the counter and would instead go into a discretionary process. Anything less than 75 years old would most likely be issued within a few moments over the counter as part of the existing process. When staff has determined that the structure is 75 years or older, they will then request the property owner submit an application to the Historic Resource Commission who will review whether this property qualifies as a significant

property that should be historically designated. Once the City receives the formal application from the property owner, a public hearing will be held by the Historic Resource Commission within 60 days of staff finding that the application is complete. The Historic Resource Commission then conducts the public hearing and 21 days after at least one public hearing is held, the Historic Resource Commission must make a decision whether the property should be designated or not. Within 10 days of that decision, it will become final unless it is appealed to the City Council in which case the City Council would hear all of the testimony that was accumulated previously and review the decision of the Historic Resource Commission. They will either uphold the decision or change the decision with additional findings. Once it is designated and if the property owner wants to pursue demolition, he could then request a demolition permit through the Historic Resource Commission, called a "historic alternations permit." The Historic Resource Commission would then determine whether the demolition would be allowed. The decision of the Historic Resource Commission is appealable within 10 days to the City Council. This process will allow more time for the City to evaluate possible demolition of a significant structure; will allow time for people to discuss with the applicant possible alternatives; and if designated, it will provide incentives relating to land use, parking, and some flexibility in zoning, that the property owner may not have considered before. It would be part of an informational process available to the property owner. Being designated historic does not prevent demolition. If the Historic Resource Commission and City Council finds that there is undue hardship involved, that all remedies have been exhausted in terms of different land uses for the property or there is no one to purchase the property and retain as a historic resource, or cannot be moved or no mitigations available, then City Council can allow a demolition permit to be issued.

Councilmember Monroe apologized that he gave the wrong idea to some people. He thought the urgency ordinance was only in effect for 90 days and would be followed later by a full ordinance. What is being considered today is in fact the ordinance. Another ordinance could be passed making changes to this urgency ordinance if needed. Mr. Pena said this ordinance was expedited because it is not a typical land use ordinance that would go before the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Tierney asked what happens if someone violates the ordinance. City Attorney Foley responded that a misdemeanor is the highest prosecutable offense that the City can impose and it carries a jail time not to exceed 6 months and a fine not to exceed $1,000. Mr. Tierney further inquired if a person has property that goes through the process, can that person be denied the right to move the property. Mr. Pena referred to the portion of the ordinance relating to hardship to allow a demolition permit to be issued but there are other portions of the ordinance that could to be used with discretion to retain the structure. Mr. Tierney asked if City can stop people from pursuing the sale of their property for their own financial benefit. Mr. Pena responded that the City does not interfere with escrows or sale of properties. If the City designates a property historic and demolition request is denied, that may have impacts on the sale.

Councilmember Tanaka is concerned that there are structures that are historically significant but not 75 years old. He suggested that demolition permits for structures less than 75 years old have the demolition process remain ministerial in nature, but have a waiting period of a week before issuance. There needs to be some way to allow more time for all demolition permits to be reviewed.

Mayor Smisek said that Council had a joint meeting with Historic Resource Commission where they discussed taking an inventory of historically significant homes and listing them in some

fashion. Historic Resource Commission could prepare a list of criteria, to include everything over 75 years being automatically included, and certain architects, and other measurements important to Coronado. They would prepare that list.

Councilmember Schmidt is concerned about the lack of punishment for violators of the ordinance. A $1,000 fine is nothing on someone developing a $10 million piece of property. She would like the City Attorney to explore any methods to make the penalties more severe for persons demolishing structures without a permit. City Attorney said that he would research the issue and whatever powers the state gives the City to exercise at a higher level, he would bring that back to Council for consideration.

Mayor Smisek polled the audience of those supporting and those opposing the ordinance. Approximately 40 people raised their hands in support of the ordinance, and three were opposed. The Mayor asked that those opposing first address the council and then a representative number of people in favor then speak.

Renee Wilson, property owner and President of the Coronado Association of Realtors, said she has not polled the association and does not speak on their behalf. She is opposed to the ordinance as there are a lot of questions that have not been answered and asks Council to consider a 90 day moratorium.

Dave Gillingham, 649 Pomona, and a realtor and is concerned about property rights. He is astonished at how easily people seem to usurp those rights. People buy property expecting to be able to modify and sell. To have the City Council, without notice, change the rules does not seem fair. He opposes this ordinance but is supportive of historic preservation through incentives for the property owners such as Mills Act expansion and parking relaxations. He suggested a fund be established to compensate affected homeowners just as it is for low income housing. There should be objective criteria of what should be a historic home. He recommends all potentially affected property owners be notified and allow time for public hearings. This process is going too fast.

Gerri-Lynn Ricciardi, 326 B Avenue, realtor, asked how she should advise clients who have purchased a home for over $1 million but will have to remain a bungalow.

Jesus Monzon, 803 San Luis Rey, said he purchased his property in 1993 with the hopes of building a new house and retiring here. He has been designing his house since then and has been in contact with the Building Department several times. His house is now too small for his family and feels he is being denied his right to build a home large enough for his family. Being forced to live in a small house is illegal and also unconstitutional.

Paulette Fennello, realtor, says realtors protect property owners every day. She questioned what will happen to those people who qualify for the incentives but have not been granted the Mills Act. What will happen to these people?

Susan Keith, 801 Tolita, submitted a letter of support from Mary Gale Buchanan, a Coronado homeowner living in Annapolis. Ms. Keith began by saying she is the Chair of the Historic Resource Commission. The Commission was briefed by staff on this issue at their last meeting and had unanimous support of this ordinance, although they did not see specifics and cannot speak on the details. As a citizen of this City, Ms. Keith wants Council to consider that there needs to be

some leeway for houses that are historic but are less than 75 years old. It has worked with the Historic Preservation Ordinance and should be able to work with this ordinance. She urged Council to find a way for a harsher punishment to send the message that Coronado does not want historic houses torn down. She invites all realtors in town to come to a Historic Resource Commission. There are incentives in the Historic Designation ordinance and urged everyone to read it.

Suzanne Ramirez, 449 D Avenue, was astounded to learn that Coronado does not already have this type of ordinance in place. She urges Council to pass the ordinance as is and then consider making any improvements in the future. The 300' notice requirements in CMC 70.22.190 is inadequate; notice should be community-wide. The 75 year threshold is conservative. SOHO states that the more common age for historic designation 40 – 55 year. She understands limitations to misdemeanor penalties, but asked Council to consider imposing the misdemeanor penalties on any company, any worker, any real estate agent, and anyone who had anything to do with the demolition without the proper permit. Why not have Historic Resource Commission sign off on all demolition permits? She asked for immediate action on this ordinance.

Nancye Splinter, 1027 G Avenue, is also speaking on behalf of her husband who is able to be present. They support this ordinance. She said that Council can adopt a more comprehensive approach in the future and that would encourage more homes to become historic Resource, would increase money going into the Mills Act, would increase the floor area ratio, and would revisit the definition of words, such as "remodel." She referred to a remodel on Encino Row that was taken down to the studs. There is a fine line between private property rights and community property rights. She urged Council to look at the whole package and have a comprehensive program in Coronado to save historic homes.

Dr. Ray Brandes, 230 Laurel Street, said if we don't soon rediscover how to stand in awe of this town that we are so freely dismantling, human history will soon be over to those who can afford to live here. He explained the City's design by city planner John D. Spreckels. We are on the brink of finality of Coronado as a village or even a city and may end up with condos from the Ferry Landing to Imperial Beach. A home sought for demolition should require a detailed study for that approval, in fairness to the City, fairness to the owner and the residents of the community. He urges Council to adopt the ordinance.

Elizabeth Portilla, Willis Allen Company, La Jolla, said she sells historic and architectural properties. Although this is new to Coronado, it is not new to the City of San Diego. These are the same concerns others have had a few years ago when the automatic review of 45 year old homes or significant homes was sent to the Historic Sites Board for review. San Diego has established guidelines and criteria for what Council is considering today and suggested Council take a look at those.

Page Harrington, Coronado Historical Association, 1100 Orange Avenue, applauds the City Council for bringing this issue up for review. CHA staff and their preservation committee are currently researching other cities to see how they are actively planning their futures, and how they are preserving their own historicity. This new demolition permit process along with financial incentives, tax breaks, low interest loans, adaptive reuse including revising a possible B&B ordinance, historic districts, increasing the minimum lot size, are only a few of the issues they will be presenting to Council. CHA urges Council to remember that demolition is permanent and once a home is lost, history cannot be replicated or fully appreciated again.

Bruce Koon, Save Our Heritage Organization, said this ordinance is long overdue. There is no other major town in the San Diego region where you can demolish a house as easily as you can here. He can't think of anything that is of greater threat to the character of the community than this single issue of three properties that are contiguous that are up for demolition. The loss of these properties cut the heart out of Coronado. The County of San Diego has the strongest penalty for demolition without a permit that requires a fine equal to the complete reconstruction cost of the building as determined by historic preservation architects. He urged Council to adopt the ordinance today.

Maureen Steiner, 817 A Avenue, cautioned Council not to leave out the wording "or has achieved significance for other purposes." She gave an example of how a home could be historically significant without being 75 years old, such as the childhood home of a President of the United States. She urged passage of the ordinance.

Doug St. Denis, 710 Adella Avenue, chair of Coronado Historical Association Preservation Committee. The Preservation Committee, the Council and Historic Resource Commission all struggle with this issue. The easy demolition process combined with Coronado's very lenient floor area ratio regulations and with the market for high end development has made Coronado an easy mark for smart money. She suggested Council look at adaptive reuse to save some of these mansions, such as a beautiful B&B.

Story Vogel, 350 D Avenue, complimented Council. He thinks we may look back at the tearing down of the Walbridge mansion as our Mt. Vernon and believes that was the turning point. Although the house was lost, he thanked Dr. Brandes and the late Bunny MacKenzie who were responsible for putting together a list of the houses in town that had historic value and hoped it will be integrated into the survey.

Susan Hovland, 1144 Isabella, owner of the Baby Del. She is not demolishing her house. She loves the diversity of houses in this community. She supports rules that developers have to follow to keep this community as it is.

The Mayor started the Council discussion by saying that in the past when purchasing a home, the money purchased the building. Now in Coronado and throughout the San Diego region, the money is spent on the land, not the building. That creates an upside-down situation. Our laws and rules were not formulated with that situation in mind. He has discussed this issue with the Executive Director of Coronado Historical Association, Page Harrington, to not only look at what California has to offer but to also investigate places like Savannah Georgia, and Charleston, South Carolina. Their rules have been in place for a long time and may not have had the opposition because of the value of the dirt the property was on in those days. The Council is trying to walk the fine line between property rights and community rights, and will take this first step to make this our beginning and fine tune it goes along. The urgency of recent events makes it necessary to take this initial radical step in this community to protect what Coronado has.

Councilmember Tanaka thinks it is important that the ordinance pass today to protect the homes that this City values, and it is clear after hearing everyone talk that we have a lot more to do to make sense of our ordinance and to make sure there is a systematic way of dealing with this issue. His concerns are the industry standard for a historic home at 45 -50 years. We should acknowledge

there are situations where that issue arises. This process may need to be amended to involve the Historic Resource Commission to a greater degree, especially if it is acknowledged that some homes are historic even if they are not 75 years old. Historic Resource Commission will have to conduct its own survey similar to the one mentioned of 23 years ago. That would supplement what is currently proposed of the 75 year old home trigger. If the Historic Resource Commission does a survey, then anything on that list does not get a ministerial demolition permit. The other way is that all demolition permits get routed to the Historic Resource Commission for approval which would be very tedious.

Councilmember Schmidt thanked all for coming. This is the first step and a lot of work yet to do. Council will depend on Historic Resource Commission to do a lot for them.

Councilmember Monroe is delighted. Four years ago he ran on the platform of keeping Coronado a village. One night he talked about the "mansionization" of Coronado and he was badgered for such a phrase and the idea of property rights. He was glad that the phrase "highest and best use" of the property was used. The Supreme Court has absolutely said that it is not the requirement of City government, but that the residents of the community have the right to create the place in which they want to live. We all have to give and take. He is happy to be on this Council because it passed a specific plan a while back for the Orange Avenue corridor to preserve Coronado as a village in our business district. That was a major step. And this is another major step. We've also got the Residential Standards Improvement Plan committee working for the third step in the wide open building rights we have in this city. We are moving in the right direction.

Councilmember Tierney said he will be supporting this urgency ordinance. He's surprised it has taken this long to get this in place and should have been done years ago so we would not have some of the demolitions that are taking place. He feels strongly about strengthening the penalty phase. The approach that San Diego has seems to merit Coronado's usage. He also feels that there should be a list of historical buildings so property owners know if their properties fall in that category.

MSUC **(Monroe/Tanaka) moved that the City Council:**

(1) Adopt AN URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF CORONADO, CALIFORNIA, ADDING CHAPTER 70.22 TO TITLE 70 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING THE CITY'S DEMOLITION PERMIT PROCESS FOR RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES SEVENTY-FIVE (75) YEARS OR OLDER . The Ordinance was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as ORDINANCE NO. 1960; and

(2) Adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO ESTABLISHING AN INTERIM FEE SCHEDULE FOR CHAPTER 70.22 OF THE CORONADO MUNICIPAL CODE; The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 7993; and

(3) Direct the City Attorney to investigate the possibility and/or procedures to seek a court order when this ordinance is violated to require the property owner to return the property to the original condition.

AYES: **Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek**
NAYS: **None**
ABSENT: **None**

11g. Review of the Revised Site Selection and Schematic Design of the Lifeguard Tower Replacement, Lifeguard Service Building and North Beach Restroom (Beach Public Safety and Restroom Project) and Authorization to Proceed with Final Design. Mayor Smisek disqualified himself from the North Beach Restroom discussions because of a conflict of interest due to the close proximity of his residence to this project. He suggested that the item be broken into 3 categories. (1) Lifeguard Tower Replacement, (2) Lifeguard Service Building and (3) North Beach Restroom, so he could be a part of the discussion on the first 2 items.

Jim Benson, Director of Engineering and Project Development began by saying Munro and Orso Architects were retained to program and develop a Master Plan of alternative sites for the Lifeguard Tower, the Lifeguard Service Building, North Beach Restrooms and the Beach Maintenance Restroom Building. The Master Plan was presented in June 2003 to the Council and authorization was given to continue working with the architects. Subsequently, public concerns were expressed about the Lifeguard Service Building at G Avenue. Staff reviewed the proposed site locations and recommended relocating the Lifeguard Services Building to south of the Central Beach Restroom and reducing the program for the Beach Maintenance Public Restroom Building at G Avenue. The Council approval was obtained at the November 11, 2003 meeting. Subsequently, two workshops have been held asking for public comments.

Sean Carey, Beach Lifeguard Captain, gave reported there are 30 lifeguards during peak season, two of which are permanent City employees. The annual beach attendance was just under 2 million in 2003. The department made approximately 4,500 preventive actions, 300 rescues, 500 medical aids, 50 missing persons found, and 2500 enforcement contacts.

Kim Raddatz, Director of Fire Services said there were no problems voiced during the public workshop on the tower. The biggest concern was with the Lifeguard Services Building's size and placement. The Coronado Fire Department has response times of 6 minutes and that is for rapid access to patients and saving their lives. Life guarding is a separate issue. That response time must shrink down to two minutes once a swimmer submerges. If they are in a riptide and lifeguards have to start searching for them before they go down and the ability to get that equipment on and into the water becomes critical. Certain equipment is needed on the beach 24 hours per day to respond quickly to an emergency situation. The close proximity of this building to the Tower is important to accomplish a rapid response time. The Service Building will also have showers, dressing rooms for lifeguards, ready room (lost and found room for children, major incident room) and a Captain's office.

Bill Cecil, Capital Improvements Projects Manager, opened with a description proposed locations and descriptions of the overall site plan. He described the Lifeguard Tower, having a first floor level that will have a first aid room and access to the upper levels. The second level is a transitional area, with a workroom, and the top level will be the observation level. It will perform the same function as today's Tower, except there is a larger first floor to accommodate all of the health requirements for first aid. The current proposed exterior elevation first level is narrowed, compared to the previous plan, and the upper levels are the same elevation with a 16 inch increase in width. A

red cross is also provided on the exterior of the building, so beachgoers will recognize this is an emergency building. He described the reverse side of the building, showing a proposed short wall on the right side that will act as a sea wall and a wave breaker. The height is the same as the current building. The preliminary plans of the Lifeguard Service Building include housing for three vehicles, the inflatable boat and watercraft. The first workshop suggested the relocation of the lockers rooms from the Lifeguard Tower to this building. The other suggestion was to move the storage building from G Avenue to this building also, in order to reduce 270 square feet of building. The proposed exterior elevation will have a rock face similar to the Central Beach restroom, as it faces Ocean Boulevard. The opposite side facing the ocean, shows the split face block that is similar in characteristics as the design of the Central Beach restroom. The Lifeguard Service Building rises above the existing rocks by approximately two feet. It is approximately one foot taller than the Central Beach Restroom.

The North Beach restrooms are tucked behind the rocks, at the end of the rocks and are oriented somewhat towards the prevailing winds in order for air to circulate throughout. The building includes the rock face and the split face block. Also included is an outdoor shower for beachgoers. The rocks are taller in the elevation, which hides most of the building, with an elevation of the finished floor is eight feet.

Jim Benson mentioned the public comments at the first workshop included reducing the first floor of the Lifeguard Tower and staff was able to do that. Another proposal was to eliminate all of the proposed buildings, including existing maintenance building at G Avenue. He stated at this time, the Maintenance Building will remain in place. The other comments were to enlarge the Lifeguard Service Building to include functions eliminated at the Tower at G Avenue and that has been accomplished; add access and public restrooms at South Beach has been discussed with limitations with the Hotel Del. That is not part of the current plan. The need to provide more police presence was expressed loudly at the workshop. They suggested keeping the building close to the rocks, which has been the intent all along.

Jim Benson commented on the workshop #2, saying that the group consensus approved the revised plans for the Lifeguard Tower and the importance of the first aid. A concern was expressed about the height depicted by the story poles of the Lifeguard Support Building, which is approximately two feet taller than the Central Beach Restroom. Certain individuals had expressed they were not satisfied even if the building was lowered. Lowering was not the issue with them. A suggestion was made to Mr. Benson that the lifeguards could use the unisex locker rooms however it is no longer allowed legally, due to the number of female and male lifeguards on staff. All of the facilities seem to be focused on Central Beach. Some of the residents questioned moving some of the facilities farther south of Central Beach and asked if North Beach Restroom could be lowered even though the story poles are not visible from Ocean Boulevard. The concern is the water level and the lower it goes the more chance there is of having to deal with water into the restroom. They asked if the number of vehicles stored on the beach can be reduced thereby reducing the size of the Lifeguard Support Facility. It will not. It was noted at the workshop that the Hotel del Master Plan that the City signed, does include an obligation on part of the Hotel, to do some extensive work in that corner by their property. Also considered was relocating the North Beach Restroom against the North Island Naval Air Station (NASNI) fence in Sunset Park. The concern was the North Beach Restroom requires kids at Sunset Park running across Ocean Boulevard to use the restroom, especially during the busy commute time. There is a desire for the remaining building at G Avenue

to be moved, demolished or if the building would remain, then to upgrade the external appearance somewhat along the plans, as the other facilities. The operational concerns included transients living around the areas of the dunes and the trees. Police response to the disorderly behavior of these people was too slow. Another concern is the dogs at North Beach.

Councilmember Monroe asked about the current building at G Avenue and if the building is to be removed. Mr. Benson stated the building will stay, however the trailer will be removed.

Mayor Smisek asked for the first discussion to be on the Lifeguard Tower Replacement. The three separate issues on the Lifeguard Tower is 1) placement in same location; 2) initial design proposed orientation; and 3) removal of some functions of the Tower and placed elsewhere.

Councilmember Tierney asked about tinted glass and ventilation. Mr. Cecil responded in order to reduce the glare from the water and so the lifeguards have a better visibility, a tint has been added to the glass. There will be heating in the space, but not air conditioning.

MSUC (Schmidt/Tanaka) moved to approve the design and authorization to proceed on the Lifeguard Tower

AYES: Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, Tierney, and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

Mayor Smisek commented on the controversy and history of this project. He stated the emails and telephone calls over the past several days have been overwhelming. Residents have commented on the aspect of this project, the political season and the constant relocation of the project. He shared his personal process of this project as follows. The first time the project was sent out, he had the feeling the project would be located in the G Avenue area. As the City continued to moved forward and investigated the area of this project, the City's findings were that the building would be much higher due to the rocks and the level of the sand versus the rocks. The City found that through other investigations with the lifeguards, that particular location was more of a remote location and not as convenient as it would be centralized. The original diagram showed the Lifeguard Support Building to the north of the walkway going down to Central Beach. Through the investigations, the City ran into some problems with sand dunes, which were going to be a problem. The Council asked the City Manager to investigate. The two main issues that arose were the parking garage on the beach and the height and mass of the facility. When reviewing the project and looking at it from a safety point of view, all of the things the Lifeguards, Fire Department and Police force would need to operate, are included in this product and it is one of the best products you could ask for. Many people notice the story poles and envision a building on this multi-million dollar beach where you'd rather like to see volleyball players on the beach, and this new building is going to an obstruction. He is torn between the project and he apologized for what the project could look like. He stated his father was an architect and he had a visual of the project on paper, prior to seeing the layout with the story poles. The original drawing was downscaled due to the size of the revision. His original feeling is that the Tower was too big, the location when it moved south of the bathrooms was something that actually became a third choice which, he felt a lot of it had to do with the sand dune structure on the north side of the sidewalk. He wanted the Council to consider that this item be separated from the project at this time and look at a couple of options. One, make sure it is not any higher than the current restrooms and diminish the overall bulk and mass of this project. He

suggested one vehicle in case of emergency for after hours. After reviewing the project again, he apologized to the fire and lifeguards for being convinced that it should have been, and now feeling as though, it should not be. He feels the project is over scaled and too big. He mentioned the other options to this facility's meeting room such as the fantastic Community Center, the Winn Room, and Police Facility meeting rooms. The third item would be to review the placement. He stated the north side of the sidewalk would be his personal preference because there is a street abutting that, and not blocking views, and no one would be looking down on the building from their homes. He stated it would not be appropriate to come to a conclusion today, and it would be feasible to send this project back to the drawing board if the Council would agree, and have another public workshop on that piece of it.

Councilmember Schmidt agreed it is necessary to discuss this item in more detail and recognized it is a very large building and needs to be reduced in size.

Councilmember Tanaka stated he was very frustrated, because the Council has visited this issue twice in the past. He stated the first time a large number of options were looked at and the whole issue of location came up then also. As he recalled, the initial location was to the right of the sidewalk and then it was relocated to G Avenue and he did not approve of the relocation, however he went along with the decision because of the consensus. He thought a decision was made at that time, and then found another change had been made. He is also frustrated because we take the work of our lifeguards for granted, and they work extremely hard out of a hovel. They are working out of temporary lifeguard towers, and it is frustrating to see the lifeguard towers in Imperial Beach are much nicer than the City of Coronado. He stated the City prides themselves on our beaches and facilities. He stated the main issue with the Lifeguard Support Building is not the bulk and mass, it is the height. He agreed the poles are too tall, the building is too high, and should not be higher than the rocks, but the location is fine. He does not oppose it moving to the right of the sidewalk, if it can meet the criteria of height. He stated he stood in front of the homes to see what the argument would or could be, and found that a homeowner would be furious to look out of there front yard into the back of a big building. He stated the layout is not excessive. He stated they need a ready room to accommodate the staff of 20-30 lifeguards and it makes sense for them to get their plan of the day done on site, and not somewhere else. If the City is going to spend $2 million dollars on a project, it needs to be done and built right, so the building will not be outdated in ten years.

Councilmember Tierney shared the same concerns as Councilmember Tanaka. He stated it's a case of the lifeguards working with junk and waiting for so long for updated adequate facilities that are not out dated. He stated the equipment that has been used on the beach is located in another part of town and not garaged where it is convenient in the event of an emergency. He stated the City has an obligation to the community and the beach goers to provide a service. The City has a liability factor involved. He was tempted to equate this to the Public Services facility where the Engineering Department was taken out of the Public Services facility, only now to put them into the City Hall which is going to cost the City far more per square foot. This was a major financial mistake. . He stated the City could keep the facility intact, at the present location and he is not opposed to lowering the height. It's for the good of the community, the responsibility issue with safety versus the view from a resident's front yard.

Councilmember Monroe stated the current facility is inadequate for our staff. The Council needs to look at the needs for this critical and important task that the lifeguard and fire services take on a

daily basis. Last year we were voted the #6 Beach in the United States and the # 2 Family Beach in the United States. Three days ago, we were voted the Number 3 Romantic Beach in the United States on the Travel Channel. He commented on moving the facility and possibly running into the Coastal Commission opposition. He stated it is not a trivial opposition. It's a dune and is considered a dune. He asked the City Manager to help out on the review process. He suggested a special meeting with Scott Peters regarding this item and possibly the Commission staff. He stated that if we cannot move the facility, that the people across the street will not be happy, no matter what. He is willing to give a good faith effort to see if the Coastal Commission will move this; go three feet further into the sand and not totally flaw the view of the residents. He said the full lots are affected and burdened by this project. He stated the corner house at 901 Ocean Blvd., is a two-story house, an upside down house, a new dwelling and all the views are from the second story. He stated the owner of 911 Ocean Blvd., want to rebuild on the lot, with the living area on the first floor, however, if the views are obscured, they will scrape the house. The third lot is a vacant lot. He stated he strongly supports the maintenance storage facility for the lifeguards.

Pam McCollum, vacant lot at 915 Ocean Boulevard, purchased this lot five-year ago, and stated they currently have plans at the Community Development Department awaiting approval of a two-story home. If this facility goes in, as it appears now, they will have to start over and redesign their plans because of the obstruction of the view on the first floor of the home. She stated the view from the first floor will not allow views of the beach, white water and possibly see water over the roof. The view from the second story level will be looking onto a roof of this massive structure. She stated if she had known of the plans the City had to build in front of her home, they would have no up-rooted her family and come to Coronado to build their dream home. She stated she is horrified that they have spent so much money purchasing the lot, developing the plans, and now they will have to spend more money to redesign the plans to accommodate the City's future needs. She is not happy with the future plans and wish the Council would reconsider.

Bob Lindsay, 1117 Isabella, stated when you stand on the sidewalk and look over the top of the restrooms, but the story poles make a big difference in seeing the beach view versus just a water view. He stated it's not just the two feet, but the support building has increased depth, probably twice the depth of the restrooms and make a big difference on your angle of view.

Ann Mitchell, 421 Ocean Blvd., stated she approves of the lowering of the building and for taking the time to review the process and not rushing it through. The Council really needs to think it through and how it will affect the visitors and residents surrounding the beach area. She asked the Council to the restrooms close to the rocks.

Councilmember Tierney asked if it is possible to lower the building, and how much room is available. Mr. Benson stated what drives the height of this building is the garage opening and the height allowed for the vehicles with the lights and racks on top. The entire support facility does not have to be that tall; it's only the garage area for the vehicles. The other portion of the building without the garage opening could be scaled-down. The other concern of the lowering the building is the sand and water.

Mike Chapple, 831 Coronado Avenue. He is the property manager for 911 Ocean Boulevard and represents the Michaels family. He stated they object to the proposed project and thanked Councilmember Monroe for his views regarding that particular address. He stated compromise is the state of life that we live in and applauds Mayor Smisek suggestions and great solutions. He

stated doing something is better than doing nothing. He stated the support facility is for safety, and feels all of the equipment that is suggested for daily use is not necessary on a daily basis. He applauds the lifeguard staff for their hard work and again for no fatalities on the beach last year, in spite of their inadequate facilities. He stated they are doing a great job, even under the very strenuous circumstances. He stated he would like the lifeguard station moved farther to the right, possibly to the Dog Beach. He stated the Coastal Commission staff stated it would not work, but maybe the staff doesn't run the whole show. He thanked the Council for recognizing this is a significant problem and appreciates the support of the Council.

Susan Heavilin, 1144 Isabella (Baby del), stated she is concerned about placing the Lifeguard Tower in the area where the vast majority of the people frequent the beach. Between the volleyball players, the sun bathers and the kids, it doesn't seem feasible to take away this space and place a large building. The other concern is standing on the beach and looking at a large garage with doors. She would like the Council to consider turning the base of the building around, more so at an angle and then it would not be hidden by the rocks. This would allow people to get around the rocks and down to the beach.

Michelle Gierke, attorney for Bob and Lorie Michaels, owners of 901 and 911 Ocean Boulevard. She stated her clients are looking for equal process and equal consideration for all residents. At the March, 2004 workshop many G Street residents were concerned about the bulk and the size of the beach maintenance facility on G Avenue. As a result of that, approximately 1200 square feet of the facility was moved from the design plans on G Street to the Central Beach. Because of the revised plans, a second workshop was held on May 25th and within two days of the workshop, the notice for the City Council hearing came out. She agreed with the Mayor's suggestion to table this portion, to look at other suggestions in reducing the bulk and size of the building. She said the City is adding approximately a large building, 3,300 square feet total, onto the Central Beach and feels it is possible to reduce the height, so it is below the restrooms. She was informed the current plans will not allow the reduction in height. She stated, again compromise is the issue and if the City would consider moving the building, then it will alleviate the obstruction of the view of the beach. She stated the Michaels have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on architectural fees and they will have to revise their plans once again and spend more money. She suggested spreading the buildings out versus the one large building. In the June 19, 1993 Master Plan, the goal was to put most of the facilities and garages down at G Street because Central Beach is the common area for the beachgoers to enjoy. She stated a conflict between vehicles and the garage and pedestrian coming onto the beach should be a concern, now and not later.

Eileen Schwartz, 1001 Loma, lives on the busiest beach block in the City and feels it is unfair and unreasonable for the entire 900 block of Ocean Boulevard to carry all of these facilities and have to lose their view.

Scott Aurich, 734 Glorietta, attended the workshop meetings relating to the location and the problem seems to be the height of the garage. He stated it is possible to build below the water table, even though it is a bit more expensive. The cost of the impact on a residents view is certainly well worth the expense. He asked the Council to analysis the cost differential in order to put the building out of sight or moving the garages to another location.

Mya Harbaugh, 917 Ocean Blvd., stated her home is right behind the proposed facility and she asked the Council to reconsider that location. She stated she has three children and is supportive of

public beach safety and rapid response time, however it impacts the view and the property. She stated her family wants the facilities built, but in an area where it can be divided fairly on the beach.

Molly Erskine, 1135 Isabella, stated she is appreciative of the delay of the decision. She said her concerns are on the public access to the beach. She has seen mothers carrying babies down the rocks, kids falling on the rocks, and at the last two meetings, public access was not on the discussion.

Todd Hansen, 611 A Avenue, stated he would like to see a good plan, reduce height and for the Council to explore other options. He has lived in Coronado for 14 years and he is unsure why the rocks exist. He suggested burying the building closer to the sidewalks and reduce the view impact by removing some of the rocks. He questioned if the rocks could be moved to the North Beach.

Mayor Smisek stated he agreed with taking time and not rushing into anything. He stated that once the structure is in place, it will be there for along time. He commented on public input, why the City has workshops and why it's important to look for a better product. He thanked Kim Raddatz, Sean Carey and Jim Benson for their hard work and multiple changes that were made, along with the flexibility and the professional handling of the scrutiny of the community. He suggested that the Council take this back to the drawing board and listen to the input of the community, work up a possible alternative and come back with a better product. He asked that everyone be notified of the product prior to being submitted.

Mark Ochenduszko, City Manager stated he would like the two projects to be moved forward so it will not cause a delay in the overall project, and the staff can review the issues on the Facility Support Building.

Councilmember Monroe stated the second notice for the workshop was slightly deficient. It talked about revised plans and not a revised location. The access to the beach by the Hotel del is unsafe, and the ramp currently by the maintenance facility is quite steep and should be reviewed also.

MSUC (Monroe/Schmidt) moved to continue this item for staff to work on what they have heard today and to work with the Coastal Commission to possibly relocate this building.

AYES: Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, Tierney and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

Councilmember Tierney stated he would like firm figures from Engineering and wants a review of the depth for the reduction of the building to lower the roof line.

Councilmember Tanaka stated he is concerned in putting a huge building in front of someone's home and blocking their view. He stated he has not received any phone calls from anyone on G Avenue regarding the building. He stated he is not happy that individuals are looking at this as a political move. He stated he hopes the next recommendation is based on the needs of our lifeguard department because their facilities are inadequate and we need facilities that are adequate for safety and for our staff to work in an efficient manner.

Mayor Smisek disqualified himself from discussion and voting on the North Beach Restroom item because of the close proximity of his home at 1 Ocean Court.

Mayor Pro-Tem Monroe, took over as Chair of the meeting and Mayor Smisek left the Council Chambers. Mr. Monroe stated the only comment was to sink the building lower and change the restrooms into uni-sex restrooms.

Jim Benson stated the plans have been modified to include two family restrooms.

Ann Mitchell, 421 Ocean Blvd., stated she loves the plan and does not object to anything in front of her home, provided it is low enough and it looks like the rocks. She stated she loves the rocks and asked that they are not moved.

MSUC (Schmidt/Tanaka) moved to move forward with the North Beach restroom, as submitted.

AYES: Monroe, Schmidt, Tanaka, and Tierney
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Smisek

12. CITY ATTORNEY: No report.

13. COMMUNICATIONS - WRITTEN: None.

14. CLOSED SESSION:
The City Council adjourned into Closed Session at 6:23 p.m. Councilmember Tanaka did not attend the Closed Session discussions.

14a. CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS
AUTHORITY: Gov. Code § 54957.6
CITY NEGOTIATORS: Mark Ochenduszko, City Manager; Pam Willis, Assistant City Manager; Leslie Suelter, Director of Administrative Services.
EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS: Coronado Police Officers' Association

14b. CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS
AUTHORITY: Gov. Code § 54957.6
CITY NEGOTIATORS: Mark Ochenduszko, City Manager; Pam Willis, Assistant City Manager; Leslie Suelter, Director of Administrative Services.
EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS: American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 127

The City Council returned to open session at 6:55 p.m. and the Mayor reported that direction was given to the City's negotiating teams on items 14a and 14b.

15. <u>ADJOURNMENT:</u> The meeting was adjourned at 6:56 p.m.

Approved:

_____
Tom Smisek, Mayor

Attest:

_____
L. Diane Shea, CMC
City Clerk