



J U L Y 2 0 1 0

### HALL PARK LIGHTS

I attended the show and tell put on by Musco lighting regarding the Hall Park. It is worthwhile to note that the Musco presentation does NOT include trail lighting, roadway lighting, other activity lighting, or parking lighting. I was struck by a few things as I listened to the unfortunate Musco employee addressing the hostile crowd.

1. This is a nearly identical lighting plan (if not identical) to the original plan that raised so much local controversy that it was not included in the original EIR which was approved by the Coastal Commission.

2. By showing the citizens of Encinitas the same plan, the City has indicated it does not intend to compromise. Department of Parks and Recreation head, Chris Hazeltine, could not entertain any questions as far as "policy" was concerned and he put that off on the City Council.

3. Hazeltine said that the City Planning Department's Pat Murphy has indicated the lighting plan can be approved by a 3 to 2 vote of the City Council, not a 4 to 1 vote.

4. Later in the presentation an overhead representation of the sports lights was shown and it looked amazingly like the landing field in "Close Encounters of the Third Kind". Those that live below this extraordinary display will be "treated" to an aerial show every night these lights are on.

5. The EIR for the Hall Park indicates the Park will be open from 5–10 pm, seven days a week with the skate park, dog park, and fields opening at 8 am. The dog park closes at 9 pm and the sports field lighting, up to 90 feet in the sky, is proposed till 10 pm.

6. In the summer, with daylight savings time, the lights would only provide a benefit for about three hours and in the winter,

approximately five hours. Are the citizens of Encinitas willing to pay for the alleged "benefits" of these lights, bearing in mind that the total available funds for the Hall park are \$9.5 mil currently?

7. The current estimated cost of the lighting for the sports fields is, according to the Coast News, between \$500,000 and \$700,000. I believe that figure is without installation. Total cost installed could be around \$1.2 million for just the five sports fields. The pool and lighting are still in the plans even though the possible funding has fallen through.

8. Hazeltine indicated that, in the initial phase of this project, conduit for the lights will be laid as a cost saving measure (i.e. no additional tear out). Does this sound to you like the City wants anything other than THEIR PLAN?

9. If the current lighting plan is put in a "take it or leave it" mode, with the City Council sure to have three votes for it, what hope does the Encinitas citizen have? What hope do people have who feel it is wrong to spend public money to provide free lighting for the exclusive use of the privately run soccer and baseball leagues. What hope do others have who have been opposed to the excessive lighting plan, on so many other grounds, since it was first announced? You tell me.

*~Herb Patterson*

And now, please tell them...

**Send an email to City Council** and politely let them know you don't want the public paying for obnoxious lighting for private use of public property.

### WHERE HAVE WE BEEN?

This is the first issue of Hoodlink since the fall of 2008, just before the last General Elections. To anyone who has missed reading Hoodlink, we apologize for our absence.

There are myriad reasons why Hoodlink has been on hiatus. Primarily, we've all been affected in some way or another by the recalibration of the economy. So, individually, we have been more focused on paying our bills.

Secondarily, some of us have been wondering just how much effort we can afford to put into helping to inform the public when there are professionals making a living doing nothing but working to keep the public misinformed.

This issue of truthful information should not be about one's ideologic perspective on specific topics such as park lighting, roundabouts, development, or cutting down trees. It is all about the foundations of representational democracy, communicating the will of the people, and, in turn, having a clear understanding of what future our representatives envision for us.

### WHY ARE WE BACK?

Simply put, because we think Hoodlink can help all of us make things better...

Herb's piece on the Hall Park Sports Field lights in this issue is yet another episode of his on-going examination of the sometimes flawed planning processes here in Encinitas.

While plenty of things do get done properly, some of our city employees, certainly including

*Please see WHY ARE WE BACK? on the other side.*

To receive Hoodlink via email, send a message with the subject "subscribe" to [stoprezoning@yahoo.com](mailto:stoprezoning@yahoo.com)



**Informed neighbors help City government make better choices for everyone**

**J U L Y 2 0 1 0**

**WHY ARE WE BACK?**

*Continued from other side.*

the current Council's three man majority, have shown that they will selectively, and willfully, ignore the rules as well as the desires of the people.

Out of many examples, a relevant case in point is the Cardiff Specific Plan. During the past decade there have been two significant and lengthy rounds of public meetings and workshops on the plan. CA State law requires cities to legally gather input from the public. And it happened.

Everyone and anyone was encouraged to participate. At the end of the first round of public forums, there was an overwhelming consensus of the public: the Planning Department's Draft Specific Plan for Cardiff would serve to engender a future for Cardiff that the collective public did not envision. Council directed the Planning Department to address the specific concerns of the people.

More than five years after being sent back to their drawing boards, our city employees presented the Final Draft of the Cardiff Specific Plan. It was fundamentally unchanged. This time it was nicely packaged by development planning consultants who characterized it as being the fruitful result of blending the public's valuable input with the best 21st century development practices for a Southern California urban beach city.

Following the public release of this plan, there was an overwhelming cry of foul from the citizens. In response, the City Council handpicked and empowered a representational public panel to go over the plan, item by item, one more time.

Many people were encouraged by the newly formed committee. They were feeling that the system was working. Those who have seen the same tactics many times before were not so optimistic.

After another year of weekly meetings, and thousands of volunteer-hours, there was, once again, a consensus. The committee recommended specific changes be made to the Draft Plan so that the future development it guides would better serve the entire community.

The person who was paid by the City to facilitate the meetings, when questioned by the Council, curiously reported that no consensus had been reached. Certainly, to be fair to Peder Norby, the consensus was not *unanimous*. But the official report prepared by the committee does accurately represent the consensus and the will of the public is clear.

The Planning Department also made it quite clear that they did not agree with the committee's recommendations. As it turns out, public desires are not in sync with SANDAG guidelines which call for a significant increase in the development density of the region, including both the coastal and El Camino corridors.

For what it's worth, not one property owner's existing rights to develop were abridged by the consensus. The consensus objections were primarily against making changes to existing city code which would entitle a few property owners to significantly increase density.

Many months and public hearings later, it would seem that the Council has voted to accept the Plan, substantially as the public wanted it modified ten years ago.

Professionals are often paid to push for things in spite of what communities need and want. Hoodlink has served to help shine light on similar issues. It has helped to educate.

So the goal, that all of us will be better informed as we consider the candidates for City Council, is the reason Hoodlink is back.

*~the editors*

**DISCOVERING BEAUTY...**

It is easy to believe all claims that the majority of the residents of Encinitas like the way things are getting along here. Regardless of whether someone is part of a multiple-generation family or one who moved in yesterday, most people live here because they like it.

For some it is simply the weather. Others value our miles of intimate sandy beaches which are washed by the relatively warm waters of the Pacific Ocean. Many are attracted by our two beautiful lagoons which provide for varied wildlife and serve to define our northern and southern city limits. We would like to start making it a point, in each issue of Hoodlink, to highlight something wonderful to share with your neighbors. Something which helps to make this region so special that it should be enjoyed, not just for the lucky few in the past, but by and for many generations yet to come.

**GOOD THINGS TO SEE...**

Since the previous issue of Hoodlink, the new San Elijo Lagoon Visitor Center had its grand opening. A bit further up the watershed, the new Visitor Center at Escondido Creek in Elfin Forest also had its grand opening. Get out there!

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS**

The Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/ EIS) for the I-5 expansion is now available for public review.

**Five meetings are scheduled.**

Click the link above for some details.

The Encinitas open house will be held Tuesday July 27, 2010, 5–8 pm in Room 142, the Banquet Hall, at the Encinitas Community and Senior Center located at 1140 Oakcrest Park Dr.