

**MINUTES OF A
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE
PLANNING COMMISSION and the
RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
(RSIP) COMMITTEE
Coronado Library – Winn Room
640 Orange Avenue
Coronado, CA 92118
Tuesday, April 26, 2005, 3:00 p.m.**

Mayor Smisek called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL:

Present:

Councilmembers Downey, Monroe, Tanaka, Tierney
and Mayor Smisek

Planning Commission members Guy Zeller, Deni Herron, Jon Ryan,
Dale St. Denis and Toni Gaylord

Absent:

None

Also Present:

City Manager Mark Ochendusko
Director of Community Development, Tony Pena
City Clerk Linda Hascup

2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None.

3. MEETING BUSINESS:

3a. Presentation and Discussion Regarding the Residential Standards Improvement Project (RSIP) Report Recommendations. Mayor Smisek introduced Tony Pena, Director of Community Development.

Mr. Pena explained that this workshop was arranged so there could be free discussion about the merits of the RSIP Committee's proposal. After the workshop, the Planning Commission will hold at least one public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will then have two hearings as required by State Law, one hearing to introduce the

ordinance and the second hearing to adopt. The ordinance would become effective 30 days after adoption. He explained that additional hearings can be held if there is a need

Jim Strickland, Chair, Residential Standards Improvement Project, presented the RSIP Committees recommendations to the Council. He talked about the formation of the Committee and the process they used to carry out their work. They first established a set of guiding principles which are: 1) to improve single-family development standards (e.g. structural coverage, building height, floor area ratio – including design features, and setbacks) to be consistent with the desires of the broader community. 2) To preserve the village atmosphere within the community through the promotion of visually attractive architecture that is compatible with Coronado's small-town feel. 3) To enhance the quality of life for Coronado residents by striving to achieve a lively, friendly and inviting community that is bonded together by a sense of civility, stewardship and consideration of neighbors.

Mr. Strickland explained that the RSIP committee was developed by the Planning Commission and approved by the City Council. There were 11 members, one representative from the City Council and two representatives from the Planning Commission. When the formation of the committee was advertised in the *Eagle and Journal* 40 applications from very qualified residents were received. To qualify one had to be an owner of a single family, residential property in Coronado. It was also important to have members who had expertise in land use law, building, contracting, architecture, real estate, as well as having members at large. Mr. Strickland introduced the committee members. He is the Chair of the committee and former Chair of the Planning Commission. Jon Ryan is the Vice-Chair, Planning Commission representative and an active real estate agent. Patty Schmidt is a former City Council member. Dorothy Howard is an architect. John Ovrom is a general contractor who holds a real estate broker's license. Allan Rudick is an attorney. Doug St. Denis is a member at large. Larry Brown is a member at large. Lynn Dougan is a member at large. Ralph Greenspan is a member at large. Kelly Purvis is a member at large. Peter Fait is the City staff member who has supported the Committee throughout this endeavor. The first meeting was in September of 2003 and the last was in March 2005.

Mr. Strickland said the first phase of the process was research and education, for themselves and the public. There was a public workshop in February 2004 to introduce the concept and gain public input. Analysis helped fine tune the objectives, problems and solutions. The objectives included controlling bulk and mass, enhancing appearance and strengthening neighborly consideration. There was another public workshop in February 2005 to provide the draft of the report. The Committee's work finished with conclusions and recommendations.

The 2004 public workshop included a questionnaire. A summary of that questionnaire is as follows:

- Houses too large for lot size 71%
- Houses out of scale with neighborhood 71%
- Houses too bulky looking 70%
- Shadowing and loss of light 66%
- Houses too close together 64%
- Loss of backyard privacy 57%
- Setbacks too close to neighbors 57%
- Houses too imposing 53%

- Disagree new and remodeled homes too large 16%
- Do not think residential standards could be improved 9%

Mr. Strickland showed a map of the single family zones in Coronado in the Village which encompass 3,063 lots. He explained that most other cities' smallest lot sizes are around 5,000 square feet, however Coronado's smallest lot size is 3,500 square feet in the R1-B zone, and around 660 lots in the 4,500 square foot range. Coronado also has a significant number of sub-standard and non-conforming lots that need to be treated differently. The Committee used the floor area ratio (FAR) of comparable cities only as a guide. Some cities with similar property value to Coronado, such as La Jolla, Del Mar, Encinitas, use FAR to control bulk and mass. Some coastal cities don't use FAR but set structural coverage, setbacks, and height, and use Design Review to decide what kind of house can go in that envelope. In addition, at least half of the cities that use FAR also use Design Review for single-family development. He said the RSIP Committee did not consider Design Review as an alternative to the FAR. The Committee developed a matrix that showed the problems listed down (bulk & mass, appearance and neighborly consideration) and solutions (setbacks, building envelope, FAR, height, open space and misc.) listed across. The problems were derived from the guiding principles that the Committee had developed.

During the recommendation phase the Committee developed 21 recommendations in 10 areas. The areas are: setbacks, structural coverage, landscaping, carriage house, roof decks, height, floor area ratio (FAR), roof dormers, courtesy notice, and off street parking. They tested and adjusted recommendations for all the various lot sizes. The concept of building envelope was something that helped the Committee understand the relationship of standards and to the effect they would have. The building envelope is a three-dimensional volume that is bounded by setbacks on both sides of a lot, the front and rear, as well as the height. Then, within that building envelope, there is structural coverage, and floor area ratio (FAR).

There were five recommendations under setbacks. They are 1) side yard; 2) average front yard; 3) second story rear yard; 4) side yard exceptions; and, 5) front yard exceptions.

Recommendation 1 - Side yard setbacks: Today's code says that the setbacks need to be 10% of the lot width, to a minimum of 3' and a maximum of 5', regardless of lot width. That results in homes too close together for lots larger than 50' wide. The recommendation is to eliminate the maximum of 5' and use a percentage of lot width to set side yard setbacks.

Recommendation 2 - Average front yard setbacks: The current code has an exception to the front yard setback that says that if the lot is already developed and a house is being scraped and a new one is going to be built, one can average the setbacks of all the houses on the block. In some cases, there are many of those that are well out of tolerance. The general front yard setback is 25' for a 140' lot. What results, generally, is that there will be creep toward the front. The Committee is trying to arrest that creep. The proposal will limit the encroachments into the front yard setback to the maximum of 1/2 of the required front yard setback.

Recommendation 3 - Rear yard setbacks: The current code is 25% of the lot width in the R1-A zone and 10% of the lot width in R1-B, but no more than 15' and 10' respectively for both stories. A second story that extends the full depth of the first story invades the neighbors' privacy and

shades back yards. The proposed code would be to increase the rear yard 2nd story setback to 40% for lots greater than or equal to 100', and 30% for lots less than 100'.

Recommendation 4 - Side yard exceptions: The current code results in excessive bulk and mass due to reduced setbacks. The proposed code will limit the projection distance into the side yard, limit the cumulative linear projections and set a minimum distance between projections.

Recommendation 5 – Front yard garage exemption: The current code results in reduced front yard area and concrete front yards. The proposed code will eliminate the front yard exception.

Recommendation 6 – Porches: The current code results in inadequate porches and the proposed code will increase the front yard exception.

Recommendation 7 - Grade Definition: Under the current code the maximum building height is not changed and this results in excessively tall facades on upward sloping lots. The proposed code will revise the grade definition.

Recommendation 8 – First floor elevation above grade: The current code results in a potential privacy issue. The proposed code will clarify the first floor elevation above grade standard.

Recommendation 9 – Structural coverage exemptions: The current code reduces the effectiveness of structural coverage to control bulk and mass. The current codes state that 50% structural coverage is reasonable which provides architectural flexibility. The proposed code does not recommend any change to that.

Recommendation 10 – Unenclosed Architectural Elements and Landscape Accessory Structures: The current limitations are reasonable and no change in code is proposed. The proposed code disallows exceptions for certain architectural projections.

Recommendation 11 – Sliding Scale FAR: The current code results in excessive bulk and mass in the current code. The proposal has base and maximum FAR that will vary with lot size.

Recommendation 12 – Additional Design Features: The current code can be improved to control bulk and mass. The proposed code will have these weighted by value and will have FAR deductions. Examples of FAR design features include roofs, coverage and a FAR deduction. If there is a variation of roof lines visible from all public street right of ways, there will be a plus of 1%. If the second floor is 50% of the area of the first floor, there will be a plus of 2%. If there is more than 18 lineal feet of garage doors on the front façade, there will be a deduction of 1%.

Recommendation 13 – Garages: The current code exempts 400 square feet for garages. The proposed code will disallow that exemption.

Recommendation 14 – Gross Lot Area: The current code reduces the effectiveness of FAR. The proposed code will amend the definition of gross lot area to be consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance. Panhandle and access easements will be excluded from lot area.

Recommendation 15 – Other FAR Definitions: This reduces the effectiveness of FAR in the current code. In the proposed code, there will be a revision and clarification of FAR definitions.

Projections that add bulk and mass will be counted. Attics, under certain conditions, will be counted as Floor Area Equivalent.

Recommendation 16 – Landscaping: The current code views hardscape and landscape the same. The proposed code will limit the amount of hardscape and increase the front yard landscaping.

Recommendation 17 – Roof Dormers Above 2nd Floor: There are no restrictions in the current code which results in increased bulk and mass. The proposed code will have restrictions on individual and cumulative width, required setbacks from façade and roof peak.

Recommendation 18 – Carriage Houses: This is allowed under the current code if they are connected to the house but there are shading and privacy issues. The proposed code will allow a carriage house without a connection to the main structure, but there will be restrictions.

Recommendation 19 – Courtesy Notice: This is not required under the current code, but under the proposed code notification to immediate neighbors will be required for substantial construction or demolition. This could trigger a ten-day hold.

Recommendation 20 – Roof Decks: Under the current code there are no setbacks required which impacts neighbor's privacy. The proposed code will establish setback minimums. The setbacks will restrict sight lines to neighbors' yards to allow a view.

Recommendation 21 – Off Street Parking for Lots without Alley Access: The current code results in front facades dominated by garage doors, especially for lots less than 50' wide. The proposed code, for lots without alley access, for lots less than 50' wide or lots that are less than 3500 square feet, will allow tandem parking to be used in those lots and one of those spaces can be uncovered.

Mr. Strickland said there is a list of about 16 minor code change recommendations that were developed by staff, as a result of clarifications, adjustments, and interpretations. He said there are other issues for future consideration, such as fences and walls along First Street, underground utilities, Ocean Boulevard area minimum lot size, and R1-B zone minimum lot size. These were discussed and some work done, but they were not completed. The Committee recommends that the City Council and Planning Commission look at these issues for future projects and assignments to staff as Council sees fit. Mr. Strickland reminded everyone of the web address for the City where all the information is available. The website is www.coronado.ca.us.

Mayor Smisek thanked Mr. Strickland and the Committee for their efforts. He invited Planning Commissioners with questions for clarification to begin.

Dale St. Denis asked to revisit FAR on patios or donut shaped houses.

Dorothy Howard helped explain the concept. She said the idea was to control what could happen with the design of a donut or c-shaped house (having an interior courtyard surrounded on three sides or more with structure). There isn't a problem if you have a one story donut-shaped house even if the open side doesn't face the street because it just looks like a regular one story house. This house would have exterior space that is currently part of the floor area or floor area equivalent and the only person who gets the benefit of that open space is the homeowner. If the house goes to two stories, the perception from the sidewalk is the same as if it is a solid two story

house. No one else can see that it has an open interior courtyard. If one portion of that house is one-story and you can see over it, the space isn't enclosed and doesn't really add to the perceived bulk and mass of the structure. Once the structure is enclosed on three sides or more, the perception is that it is a solid, two-story structure. In order to control the perceived bulk and mass of that type of structure, the proposal is to count the interior area at the second floor level, as phantom floor area in the same way that the City currently counts a two-story room. If the open side faces a public street, then it would not be counted. Also it wouldn't be counted if the c-shaped area is no more than 100 square feet.

Mayor Smisek called for City Council questions.

Councilmember Monroe referred to the deduction of 2% for front garage doors. He asked if it is a driveway down to an underground garage and there are garage doors there if they count, or does the rule apply only to surface level garages.

Ms. Howard explained that there isn't a distinction, that there is a deduction if the garage is larger than a two-car garage.

Councilmember Tanaka commented that it seemed FAR restrictions increased rather dramatically for the larger sized lots and asked what the argument was for that.

Ms. Howard responded that the perception and reality is that large houses look bulkier than small houses. A large house on a smaller lot might have a 2,000 square foot house. But with the same FAR restrictions a 10,000 square foot lot could have a 4,850 square foot house that is more than twice as big. Even though it is on a bigger lot it tends to look out of scale against its neighbors even the house on a small lot.

Mr. Tanaka posed the question that if the City was to be too restrictive, it wouldn't that encourage the splitting of 50' lots into two 25' lots. To some that is a crisis in Coronado. And he wouldn't want to encourage that sort of construction.

Ms. Howard agreed she had heard that comment. The person who is looking to maximize value is always going to divide the property, but a person who is making a home for themselves will not want to split the lot and have an even smaller home for themselves.

Mr. Strickland added that in most of the single-family zones in town that have 75' lots, the minimum lot size is 7,500 square feet and the lot would not be able to be subdivided. It could be done in the R-1B area.

Ms. Howard commented that all the lots have had a FAR reduction. Currently, all the lots have the same FAR requirement and it doesn't seem to have slowed the movement towards splitting lots. She is not sure the FAR is really what controls that.

Councilmember Tierney asked if the Committee had discussed mandatory surveying of the lots prior to construction.

Mr. Strickland answered that they did not consider it because it is between the City and the builder.

Councilmember Downey asked for clarification on the enclosed versus not enclosed patio. Ms. Howard gave a brief description.

Mayor Smisek called for public comment for clarification purposes.

Jim Ruzevick, 742 San Jacinto Place, referred to the buildable floor area ratio chart. He asked for clarification. He said that on smaller lots, such as his 4,000 square foot lot, if you take away the 400 square feet, it drastically reduces the amount of livable space there could be in a house. On the current 25' x 140' lots, the houses can be built out to about 2400 square feet. He asked if there could be a 50% allowance on that garage. Right now, taking away 400 square feet really penalizes the houses on the smaller lots more so than on the larger lots.

Mr. Strickland thinks that goes to Mr. Tanaka's thought that the larger lots were being penalized more. Mr. Strickland said he thinks the sliding scale does that, but agrees that it does also affect the small lots.

Peter Fait, staff, explained that part of what drove the sliding scale was the goal to have the definition of FAR be a true representation of bulk and mass. Regardless of the percentage you come up with, FAR should reflect the total bulk and mass for a specific lot.

Mr. Strickland added that there was a lot of debate about that size lot. It was a problematic. Some on the Committee wanted it lower; some wanted it slightly higher. They came to a compromise at 68% after much discussion. There was discussion about including part of the garage, but the decision was not to do that and to count the garage in the FAR for all lot sizes so there is an accurate representation of FAR.

Jon Ryan, Planning Commissioner and Committee member, commented that all underground parking does not count. Mr. Fait added that there was no change regarding basements, which are exempt from FAR.

Mayor Smisek explained that he knows where Mr. Ruzevick lives, and he does have one of those lots where there is no alley and his garage does come in the front. He asked if Mr. Ruzevick would be eligible for tandem parking, and if so, would he be able to subtract 200 feet?

Mr. Strickland responded that he is eligible, and he would be able to gain the 200 feet, as long as it is less than 50' wide. He can have tandem parking with one enclosed and one open parking space and the 200 feet saved can go back in the house.

Mr. Tanaka asked how the Committee reached the sliding scale percentages. Did they come out of the restrictions or was it something the group deliberated on and came up with those numbers specifically somewhere.

Mr. Strickland explained that they deliberated at length about it.

Mr. Tanaka said he feels that it might be possible to reach a political decision later through Council deliberations. The Council could change the sliding scale and change the 68% to a 70% if it wanted to.

Mr. Strickland responded that Council could do that, but the slope of the curve would change. He explained that the Council needs to look at the whole curve to see what the change would do to it.

Kevin Rugee, 1024 Isabella Avenue, said he heard that 70 people responded to the questionnaire. 70 people out of 3600 lots are about a 2 ½ % sample of people who are interested in this issue. He wants to make sure, if the City is redoing the zoning code and imposing significant changes that it is something the public wants. 2 ½% doesn't sound like a whole lot of people to him. He thinks that with the amount of changes being proposed, there are some significant issues with square footage, allowable building area, coverage, etc. He thinks that the City should consider whether this is something the public really wants.

Mr. Strickland responded by saying that the meeting was a publicly noticed meeting that was advertised in the paper and many people came. He doesn't know what a statistical sample of 70 out of 3500 is. He thinks it is pretty high.

Mr. Fait commented that at the 2004 workshop there were about 80 people present, 70 of whom filled out the questionnaire. In 2005, when the Committee was ready to present their recommendations, staff went the extra mile by publishing an article and public notice in the City's quarterly newsletter that was delivered to every single property owner in Coronado. It described the project and notified them of public workshop. It was very well attended.

Mayor Smisek explained that this is the way things happen in Coronado. The City brings up a subject and gets very little participation in the beginning. When the City is about to make it a law, then the roof either caves in or there is a lot of support – one or the other. During the last four elections he has been involved in, especially as home prices have continued to escalate, this topic has been more and more of an issue.

Dave Ditzler, 1830 Avenida del Mundo, also referred to the buildable area. He clarified the calculations and said he is afraid that the proposed code will encourage people to build more house and no garage. Mayor Smisek explained that is not an option for people.

Mayor Smisek called for input from the public on their opinions.

Dave Ditzler, 1830 Avenida del Mundo, Penthouse #9, said he attended the RSIP meetings for about 3 months. He was impressed with the diligence and effort of the Committee members. However, he thinks it important to discuss these serious changes which will affect 3,600 people or 6,000 people or the whole town. He said he hopes that the City will not rush into this, but will consider everything and everyone's opinion. He wondered if some grandfathering might be considered. He asked about the homes that already don't meet the new criteria and how that is dealt with. He brought up the issue of insurance companies that insure and charge for what exists today, would only have to pay for something smaller to be rebuilt in the future. He said that lenders are not going to want to lend 80/90/100% of value of a property that can only be built back to 65-85% of what it was. He said he believes that this will do more to hurt affordable housing in the City. He also talked about the value of an estate being reduced by 15 to 35%. He added that the lots as they exist are legal, buildable lots that people bought with the intent that they could actually build a house on them. He said the privacy issues should also be brought up to the

people. If the majority of the voters support these changes, then there would be the legitimacy to pass them.

Matt Preventure, 455 B Avenue, said he is concerned about double jeopardy. The City had the historical review and commission crammed down the people's throats earlier this spring. The people who own houses that are over 75 years old are in an interesting situation. All of the diagrams have a façade as two stories. On some of the 75 years and older homes the façade has to be preserved on any renovation. He is concerned about the rear setback in historical homes as well as preserving the façade. He wondered what kind of interaction the Committee had with the Historical Commission on this, as well as whether setbacks were discussed. He thinks this is a very important issue because the goal #2 is to preserve the architecture of the community. By doing that, the City needs to look at historical houses and perhaps provide an exemption for the rear lot setback, because they cannot build and change the façade on an historical 75 year or older home.

Bruce Johnson, Country Club, said he grew up in Coronado and has always felt it is a Village. His opinion is that when something is broke you fix it. It is obvious to him that current zoning is out of line with what the people want the Village to be. The Committee did an incredible job of coming up with what he thinks are some amazing and creative concepts to not only fix some things but to encourage some desirable things. He said the creative thinking on the tandem parking and everything else is absolutely wonderful. He is in the real estate industry and he has heard the arguments about losing value but he doesn't believe that at all. He said this is Coronado and whether there is a house on the lots or not, most are going to sell for the same amount of money. In the long run, if the City's village atmosphere is preserved, real estate values will be preserved as will the quality of life. He said that the one thing that was overlooked in the proposed guidelines is the second story side yard setbacks. He pointed out an example of a home being built on Balboa Avenue with a sheer wall that is blocking light and air from the neighbor to the north. He thinks there could be some creative solutions for that.

Russ McKee, 777 B Avenue, Coronado Association of Realtors Local Government Relations Committee, thanked the RSIP Committee for the wonderful work they have done. He said that given the broad scope of the recommendations which are now being presented to the Planning Commission and the City Council his associate is concerned that many people who will be affected by the changes do not understand the magnitude of what is being presented. The Association is in the process of conducting a survey of R1 zones property owners. The Association is not opposing the RSIP initiative, but wants to go on record to request that the City of Coronado publicly notice all R1 property owners by mail of the proposed changes to the R1 zoning prior to adoption. Mr. McKee said that the Association will also want to do their part. They will begin running public service announcements this week in the local newspaper advising property owners about RSIP and will have information from the City's website available for those requesting further information.

Mona Wilson, 60 Half Moon Bend, said she has 14 more responses that didn't make it into the survey. They are all understanding it and wanting more information. They are definitely opposed to putting it on the ballot in the fall, which is another thing that the Board of Realtors is asking. She said her opinion is that good government isn't government by petition or plebiscite. The City elects very good representatives. The last two elections were about mansionization issues, which is what all the hard work by this volunteer committee has been about. She said many people have called her and spoken about the scathing article in *San Diego Magazine* about Coronado and how

sunlight and privacy are being taken away. Those kinds of issues are being paid attention to. As far as losing value on single family residences, she really likes the PowerPoint slide that shows current versus proposed buildable area. She said that people in Del Mar, Pacific Grove, and Carmel are laughing. They would think that Coronado is an easy mark and is too lenient when one sees we allow 4850 square feet on a 10000 square foot lot. She also mentioned two new houses as example of structures that overpower their neighbors at 10th and Olive and on Ocean Court. She said the real issue is that the reason people move here and what realtors are selling is the village way of life. She thanked the RSIP Committee for its hard work.

Harold Myers, 749 C Avenue, said he agrees with Ms. Wilson. It has been know for a number of years the problems with the zoning. He commended the Committee for their hard work and creative and innovative ideas. He said there is no way to satisfy everybody with every feature and every point, but at least it can be said that this is an improvement from what exists now. It may not be enough of an improvement when compared to some other cities but it is a step in the right direction. It is an extremely complex issue that needs to be decided by the City's elected representatives. He advised that he would want the Council to avoid the pitfall of putting this to a vote. He made a recommendation for the information presented on the website. His suggestion was to break the appendices into a number of files because the single 145 page PDF file is so large it is very difficult to open. He agreed that it is important to communicate exactly what is being done with everyone in the community.

Mayor Smisek called for Planning Commission comments.

Commissioner Gaylord echoed the congratulations of the community to the RSIP Committee for the work they did. She said it is a very difficult problem to get across to the general public. It is going to be very important for the Planning Commission and City Council to really understand what is going on. The more input there is from the public and the more chances there are to talk with members of the Committee, the better off everyone will be. She wants to learn more.

Commissioner Ryan commented that this meeting was being recorded and would be broadcast by Time Warner. He suggested it should be advertised and perhaps it could be rebroadcast once a week. He agreed with a suggestion that the website be continually displayed. He was confused about the comment from one of the realtors about concern for affordable housing and property value. The two ideas don't go together. If there is high property value, there is a very difficult time with affordable housing. There were some good questions regarding nonconforming structures, the ability to rebuild an existing structure, and historic properties. He said that there are special rules that apply to historic homes, which is why historic designation is so valuable.

Mr. Pena explained that Chapter 86.50 of the current Zoning Ordinance provides, under the nonconformities provisions, that if an existing non-conforming dwelling that has structural non-conforming aspects to it and is destroyed by fire, the property owner has two years in which to rebuild to the prior nonconforming status. There is a provision to satisfy insurance companies and property owners. Mr. Fait provided further information that the nonconforming question is specifically addressed on page 18 in the RSIP report.

Mr. Pena responded to the issue of the historic preservation program. According to the Historic Preservation Code, the Historic Resource Commission has the flexibility to override some zoning

standards if it is in the best interest of historic preservation. He thinks the two standards will work hand in glove and doesn't see a conflict in the future.

Commissioner St. Denis commented that this work has really been a long time in coming. Some work was done previously to develop a point system for FAR, but the City really needed to visit this issue. He commented on the diverse makeup of the committee, the hard fought discussions and the thousands of hours spent on the review, not including staff time. He is hopes the City will see the come to fruition in the near future.

Commissioner Herron said she thinks the Committee did a fabulous job on a very complex project. She hopes that the Planning Commission and City Council can understand it well enough to recite it the way Mr. Strickland did.

Commissioner Zeller said that all the comments he would make have been said two or three times. He gave his compliments to Mr. Strickland and the Committee.

Mayor Smisek called for City Council comments.

Councilmember Monroe commented that he thinks there has been great body of work on this and offered his congratulations. He was happy that the nonconformity issue was explained. He said there have been a few letters to the editor commenting on insurance values, etc., which have been incorrect. His though is that it all boils down to a simple phrase – if you want a big house, have a big lot. He would prefer to keep Coronado a village and agrees with Ms. Wilson that if the City keeps the village atmosphere property values will stay high and maybe higher than in some other places. The proposal brings more certainty to the process. Some definitions have been cleared up; some have been added, and there are some good facts provided. Clearly the carriage house approach is really unique. The idea of tandem and uncovered off street parking on those lots that require it is a very important issue.

Councilmember Tanaka thinks that anyone who loves Coronado can't help but feel lucky to live here. The work of the RSIP Committee is an example of why Coronadoans are lucky. He wants to make it clear that he is very happy with the product. Overall he thinks these recommendations are very sound and very solid. The challenges he sees are some tinkering at the Council and Planning level. There is the challenge of getting this complicated and technical document accessible to the public and in a way the public can digest it.

Councilmember Tierney would like to commend the Committee for all the hours and sacrifices they made to bring this to fruition. He asked that, in the other code amendments, it be made mandatory in Coronado to have surveying done of all properties so that eventually all properties will be surveyed. This eliminates disputes, problems, issues and it is very appropriate that when someone goes to build that they have a competent surveyor survey the land to make sure that where they are building is indeed correct. There are too many properties that are off by any number of inches and in some cases feet.

Councilmember Downey said she thinks the document was explained very well. She said she had five small tweaks that she will talk about when it comes back to the City Council. She agrees more than 100% that the City needs to do something to keep the village, but she is also a huge

property rights proponent. She said she doesn't mind the sliding scale but it makes a difference to a homeowner if they are not able, with the smaller lots, to get to 2000 square feet. If the City can find a way, with a little bit of tweaking on the sliding scale, to increase just a little from 1980 to 2000 square feet would make a big difference. People want to be able to buy a house that is 2000 square feet. Even though those 20 square feet are really no more than a closet, it might have a psychological effect in terms of the sellable value. Short of that, she thinks the report is stupendous and she is looking forward to getting it done.

Mayor Smisek commented that 68.572% would allow 2000 square feet on a 3500 square foot lot. He said he thinks that the comments from the public reflect that there is always a concern when the City is changing something. His opinion was that this is something that has been long overdue. The City has gone through this evolution in the past where there was a ballot measure as a referendum after the Council took action to decrease. One of the problems with that issue was that it was one-size-fits-all. RSIP has tailored their recommendations to the circumstance of a small lot versus a large lot versus a medium size lot. It is very innovative. He said the City Council will look forward to seeing this come before it.

4. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Approved:

Tom Smisek
Chair

Attest:

Linda K. Hascup
City Clerk