



California

# CITY OF OCEANSIDE

## MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

AUGUST 30, 2006

ADJOURNED MEETING                      5:00 PM                      COUNCIL CHAMBERS

**Mayor**

Jim Wood

**Deputy Mayor**

Shari Mackin

**Councilmembers**

Rocky Chavez  
Jack Feller  
Esther Sanchez

**City Clerk**

Barbara Riegel Wayne

**Treasurer**

Rosemary Jones

-----  
**Interim:**

**City Manager**

Barry E. Martin

**City Attorney**

John Mullen

This adjourned meeting of the Oceanside City Council (Council) was called to order at 5:02 PM, August 30, 2006 by Mayor Wood.

**ROLL CALL**

Present were Mayor Wood, Deputy Mayor Mackin and Councilmembers Chavez and Sanchez. Councilmember Feller arrived at 5:03 PM Also present were City Clerk Wayne, City Treasurer Jones, Interim City Manager Martin and City Attorney Mullen. The pledge of allegiance was led by Jane McVey.

**WORKSHOP ITEMS:**

1. **Center City Golf Course Land Use Options**

**JANE McVEY**, Economic Development and Redevelopment Director, would facilitate the discussion on this item. There is no information being provided to Council tonight that would be adequate for any decisions. She requested to stay in possibility regarding tonight's discussion. She gave a computer presentation depicting the location of the property [along I-5] and the surrounding uses. An issue that may impact the golf course, which staff has little knowledge of at this time, is discussion at CalTrans of an HOV [High Occupancy Vehicle] lane off Oceanside Boulevard. that could clip the edge of the golf course. That could be a huge impact on the golf course.

The site is about 75.5 acres of City-owned property, and 71.7 acres of that is leased. Pictures of the routes to the course and the entrance were shown. The golf course does have a lot of mature trees, is lovely, and has significant topography.

Some of the constraints depicted included the following:

- It is believed to be dedicated parkland, and if the use changed, it would need a majority vote of the people
- There is significant habitat on the west side next to the freeway.
- It has significant topography issues.
- Some inconsistent land uses surround the site.

**NOT OFFICIAL**  
UNTIL APPROVED AT SUBSEQUENT  
MEETING BY CITY COUNCIL

Some of the opportunities include:

- It is a large site with freeway visibility.
- It has close access to light rail.
- It is close to the beach

Ms. McVey reviewed various hypothetical uses: leave the golf course as it is, which is a cheap and convenient recreation; enhance the golf course, perhaps adding a clubhouse, restaurant, or a small hotel; an action sports park (such as a carve board park); residential; mixed-use project; office/industrial park; hotels; convention center; retail; entertainment, etc. Each has pros and cons.

The process Council might want to take after this evening is to do some visioning, studying and planning, and conducting community workshops, etc. The most important thing is to get agreement on the goal and then continue through the development and processing phases.

The lease on the golf course expires in November 2012. It is a minimum lease of about \$3,000 per month. The total rent paid in 2005 was \$88,000, and the total rounds of golf were about 26,000.

It was suggested that Council stay in possibility mode, think about all the various options and influences, and then schedule another workshop in a couple of months or so to gauge how Council is thinking.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELLER** questioned whether it is parkland.

**MIKE BLESSING**, Deputy City Manager, does not have the absolute answer. The question will ultimately have the City Attorney's opinion and the Council's concurrence, but the 1972 ordinance reads that its use is as a recreation area, which leads staff to believe it may require a vote. How the City acquired the property has not yet been fully researched. Staff will provide that definitive answer before this matter goes too much further.

**CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN** does not have the answer, but they will certainly look into that. With that comprehensive research and just looking at the plain language of the City Code, he felt that if an alternate use was proposed that was not a public recreation/park use, it would need a majority vote of the people. Some uses could fall under the umbrella as a parks and recreation use. For instance, there is case law that says a hotel that attracts people to a park could be a park-related use. An example is in San Diego, with hotels all over Mission Bay, where they have opined that hotel-related uses are park related. There is case law to support that all the way back to 1904. Therefore, it really will depend on what use is proposed. However, if the change is to commercial or some other clearly non-park related use, a vote of the people will be required.

**DEPUTY MAYOR MACKIN** is surprised that they are discussing parkland and have no representation from the Parks and Recreation Division. She referenced propositions put to voters in 1970 and 1973. In 1973 the argument for Proposition O references this land, stating it is a dedicated 59-acre parcel, known as goat hill. I would assume that would definitely make this property parkland.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** was provided information that originally it was a 9-hole executive golf course, and it was later expanded to 18.

**DOUG EDDOW**, Real Property Manager, confirmed that is correct. In 1982 it was leased to Ludwig Keene, and he converted it into an 18-hole golf course.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** then questioned if a 9-hole course would still be considered park use.

**CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN** responded it does not depend on the nature of the course. It was not an executive course but rather a semi-regulation 9-hole course that was then transferred into an 18-hole quasi-executive course. It would not change the determination.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** then questioned if a hotel proposed along with a 9-hole executive golf course would be in keeping with the parkland use.

**CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN** responded that it arguably would.

PUBLIC INPUT

**JACK ANDERSON**, 4871 Baroque Terrace, is a member of the Parks & Recreation Commission golf subcommittee and is very much interested in this. He had previously indicated to Council that he would favor selling the property, provided the funds stayed in the park system, with some set aside for skate parks. Changing the use would have a significant effect on the Oceanside Municipal golf course, which concerns him since they are presently working on an RFP for a new lease agreement for the course starting in July 2007. They are looking at a long-term lease (perhaps 20 years) in which the lessee would contribute big money for some capital improvements. If 3-4 years down the road the Center City use changed, it would destroy the Municipal lease. He suggested delaying implementing the new Municipal lease and instead do an extension of the current lease in order to see what happens. Economically it could change the Municipal lease arrangements considerably.

**RICK KRATCOSKI**, 2110 Foster Street, lives next to this area where the goat hill golf course is located. He displayed computer pictures of the area and wanted the neighborhood tranquility protected. He referenced the old dump site in this area, which is tacky. He would like improvements to the area but wanted to keep the traffic off the Maxson Street area.

**NADINE SCOTT**, 550 Hoover Street, stated many would never agree to have this property taken away from dedicated parkland, so anything the City does would have to be improvements. Getting a hotel for a substandard golf course is laughable. Oceanside Boulevard is hideous, and the City keeps putting more density in the Loma Alta neighborhood. It has to stop. She asked Council to think about the cumulative effect on their neighborhood. If this issue goes that far, they will call it an environmental justice issue since the property is surrounded by low-income and highly dense housing. The gateway needs improvement along with the traffic. They are not giving up this parkland.

**GEORGE BRITTON**, 1920 Maxson Street, discussed the high density in their area. They want their neighborhood the way it is. It would be fine if improvements are made to the golf course and a restaurant is added, but he opposed hotels, etc., due to the high density and traffic.

**CAROLYN KRAMMER**, 904 Leonard Street, Chair for Citizens for the Preservation of Parks and Beaches (CPPB), stated this property represents open space, which is rapidly disappearing with all the development occurring in Oceanside. Parkland cannot be replaced. Even with El Corazon, the City is behind in its parkland uses. CPPB cannot and will not support a change of the land use designation. It should stay parkland.

**GEORGEO KERPANI**, 315 South Nevada Street, is a visionary and feels the City has been a failure the last 30 years as far as maximizing its full potential. To achieve the City's full potential, they must consider relocating the high school to this Center City site. The comments that they cannot because it is parkland are hogwash. The present high school site could be one of the top tourist attractions of the state if the high school was relocated.

**VICTORIA OLSEN**, 753 Los Arbolitos Boulevard, wished to request that, in the event this site changes land use, Council consider transferring the parkland zoning for the

entire goat hill parcel to the open space acreage bordered by the San Luis Rey River and Hunter, Los Arbolitos and Redwood Streets. The City currently has a pending RFP for the development of this property. This one of the few natural parcels left in the City as well as along the river. It would make sense to preserve it for the City.

**JOE GERLOCH**, 2722 West Loker Avenue, Carlsbad, is president of a new company planning to develop a new sport, which is already spreading in 25 countries [Carveboard Sports, Inc.]. He sees goat hill as a world-class carveboard park that would attract people from all over the world. He owns a company in Australia that has sold \$6,000,000 worth of boards. It is a sport for adults; 80% of are sales are to adults. He sees Oceanside as a hub for this sport. There would be a draw of anywhere between 1,000-2,000 people per day, with about 80% bringing money into Oceanside. He brought this up 2 years ago. This sport would leave this area as a park, and riding this board is totally silent. A hotel would be part of this project.

**DEPUTY MAYOR MACKIN** reported that what has been discussed on the HOV lane would be a shoot-off of State Tree, and it would be going wide and impact the area quite a bit from her understanding. That needs to be considered. One of her concerns with parkland in discussions with Doug Eddow is the possibility of cataloging all the parkland.

**DOUG EDDOW**, Real Property Manager, responded that it would probably take around \$200,000 to research in depth every piece of property the City owns to determine the conditions imposed on each of those parcels. The City has over 400 parcels of land, and it would be an in-depth study.

**DEPUTY MAYOR MACKIN** feels they really need to have a catalog of their dedicated parkland and what they are using as parkland, and to actually dedicate it as such so that it would have the provision of 7226. She has concerns about this, and would not like to set a precedent that it is okay to have hotel uses on parkland. That is most certainly a voter's decision. She supplied Council with ballot measures from 1970 and 1973, and noted that promises were made to the citizens. Before they look at any other land use, they need to see if past Councils kept their promises to the citizens. She and Harriet Bledsoe had a long talk about the propositions, which did not win by much. One is related to Recreation Park, and the other is related to about 42 acres with the promise to put the money in a fund to build additional recreational facilities. They need to look at this closely and determine where the money went on these past propositions.

She thinks this discussion is very premature, and it is not appropriate to have this discussion without the Director of Parks and Recreation to discuss parkland needs with the Council. She would like this item to go to Parks and Recreation to consider. It is owed to them.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** felt it was important, as Ms. McVey pointed out, that Council not emphatically say they want one thing, because they have not been given all the information. They know that there are 75 acres of prime land right off of I-5. The lease will be up so the City has to do something. She is excited about looking at the alternatives. It would be remiss of city leaders to say they do not want to look at anything, but blindly go forward. She would like to see what is out there and what the visions are. Tonight is a small gathering, but it sounds like most are at least willing to look at alternatives and potential uses. This would be a public process to gain buy-in by the community and a consensus by the Council. This piece of land has a lot of potential.

Regarding the concerns dealing with the current condition of Oceanside Boulevard,, money has been set aside for gateway improvements, and the City is hoping to work with the North County Transit District (NCTD). The gateway improvement is from I-5 to El Camino Real. She disagrees with the Deputy Mayor that they have to do certain things before they consider this. This is something the leadership should look at first to give direction to commissions. The Council did not, for example, have a commission decide the issue of a hotel, and the RFP did not come through any commission. It came from the

Council. These are important decisions, and they should listen to the public and staff to see what their alternatives are. She is enlightened by the information received tonight that, in fact, a hotel could be included and still be considered parkland, which is an interesting piece.

She looks forward to having a very thorough discussion on this issue, which is her direction to staff. She likes that staff suggested that Council not say what they want at this point but rather look at the alternatives and get input from the public. If they plan this well, they could come up with a great project to include parkland and a 9-hole course, but she knows there are many other ideas out there to consider.

**COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ** has a very open mind on this. It is appropriate for Council to understand that one of the real issues they deal with is zoning. Right now the Circulation Element study is in progress, and zoning ties in with circulation. This is a very positive process. It is important to follow the guidance of staff to stay within the possibilities, think about all the options and keep an open mind.

There are 6 years to work through this [since the lease expires in 2012]. He hears the issues about single family homes and traffic in the area. This is a large site with good freeway visibility, light rail access and close to the beach. Council needs to make the best decision for the citizens of the whole city, while respecting the quality of life for people in this area. He asked for citizen input. He is intrigued by the carveboards, a boutique hotel, office, etc. He will keep an open mind. Once they go through this process, it would be appropriate for the people to vote on it.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELLER** stated this golf course has some safety issues. He is not interested in residential or mixed-use residential at this site; nor does it appear to be the right place for an industrial park. He likes the idea of a sports park as mentioned. He asked how many rounds of golf Oceanside Municipal has in a year.

**MR. EDDOW** reported that last year Municipal had over 75,000 rounds

**COUNCILMEMBER FELLER** stated that for Center City's average per day, there is not much room to do many improvements on the course in that dollar volume. The old dump site proposition mentions mostly changes prior to 1973 to parkland that is now Ortega Park and the Senior Center area and not much on the Center City piece they are discussing. Any proposed project there will be conditioned for road improvements, etc. The bus/rapid transit planned for I-5 would be in the area of the northern terminal for southbound travel, so the on and off-ramps and carpooling lane is proposed to go behind State Tree Drive and the parking behind the shopping center. That makes this location fairly ideal for office/professional, a hotel, convention center, etc.

El Corazon involves converting 450 acres of industrial land to parkland, so this is a drop in the bucket for that kind of swap. There is great potential at the Center City site. 70+ rounds of golf per day could easily be absorbed by Oceanside Municipal. He agrees this is just a beginning. They have done many workshops where items start with Council and then go through the process. He wanted clarification on the landfill.

**PETER WEISS**, Public Works Director, responded that the Center City property as a whole is not encumbered by the landfill itself. The landfill area is from the Brooks Street pool and goes into a portion of what was the K-mart back parking lot. It goes through Ron Ortega Park, and the southern end of the landfill is on the south end of Division Street. Staff monitors that and has the area all mapped out.

**DEPUTY MAYOR MACKIN** retorted that she does not recall having a workshop about a change in use in parkland. Also, only 150 acres of the 450 acres of El Corazon would be rezoned to parkland as per the approved plan. Her direction would be to take this to Parks and Recreation (P & R). They have been discussing the issue of the lease coming up, and she would hate to yank that away from them. This would be a first rezone

of parkland that has not gone to P & R first, which is very odd. Her direction would be to take this to the P & R Commission first.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELLER** explained he was talking about the many kinds of workshops that have started with Council, from story poles to height reductions, etc. This is only a beginning of discussions. They are talking months/years for this process so there is time for staff to bring it back and then send it to P & R.

**COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ** stated there seems to be a consensus to go forward and look at the alternatives. Therefore, she **moved** to give direction to staff to take the next step, which would be to continue looking at the alternatives for the Center City Golf Course, and to come back to the Council via a workshop or whatever vehicle staff feels is needed. There needs to be a lot of public input and enough notice so the public can become aware and come to the next workshop.

**COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ** **seconded** the motion, understanding that one of the options is to have it remain a park.

**MAYOR WOOD** stated this is a valuable piece of property and has heard some feedback that this property could help finance El Corazon. This is only for a workshop and nothing more.

**DEPUTY MAYOR MACKIN** would not support this motion since, instead of just the Director of Economic Development, they also need to have the P & R Department's input. She feels Council is bypassing a process.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELLER** responded that the P & R Director would have input into this.

**MS. McVEY** stated she was only the facilitator of this workshop, and she would welcome all staff input.

**COUNCILMEMBER FELLER** emphasized that he would want to keep a very good buffer between the houses already on Maxson, Cadillac, Greenbrier, etc., to keep that area buffered away from whatever might go there.

Motion was **approved 4-1**, with Deputy Mayor Mackin voting no.

**2. Public Communication on City Council Matters (Off-Agenda Items) - None**

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Mayor adjourned this adjourned Council meeting at 6:20 PM, August 30, 2006.

APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL:

---

Barbara Riegel Wayne, City Clerk  
City of Oceanside