

0:05: City Attorney:

We are here to talk about the proposed Lifetime Fitness project at The Farm.

4:15: City Attorney:

30,500 square feet of indoor space, 15,000 square feet of outdoor fitness area and another 12,000 square feet of outdoor courts, 2,500 square foot outdoor spa, a pool, dining area and parking.

5:51: City Attorney:

There is no question that this type of use is permitted---the.... The real question is the intensity of that use. The reason it's here is they cap for all the non- residential square footage for all 3 OS-R areas is 30,000 they are requesting the total non-residential square footage increase from 30,000 to 42,450.

6:47: City Attorney:

In the EIR when talking about traffic impact the assumption was that the club would be 6,000 square feet so that is a big change.

Formatted: Not Highlight

7:37: City Attorney:

Lifetime's argument is certainly a colorful one

8:00: City Attorney:

In addition to or perhaps instead of the pure cap on square footage there is also a cap on total trips generated by the project and that is assumed by the EIR in the total project wide. We have a traffic report from Lifetime that says that the average daily trips from The Farm is actually below this cap because the mix of uses has changedtheir biggest change is they are assuming more internal capture.

8:51 City Attorney:

In the EIR they assumed a 15% internal capture rate with SANDAG. Lifetime using a different methodology their internal capture was 28% . Increased square footage is a gross increase traffic increase obviously.

11:54 John Collings Traffic Consultant:

Originally they assumed a 10% reduction , Lifetime is taking 23% of the mixed used credit that is really the crux of the difference in why they are saying the car trips are basically net zero. Their/There is 5% transportation credit regardless.Its whether or not we want them to take the credit and using the CAPCOA rates or not.

15:00 Councilman Mullin

Staying out of the weeds where I prefer to be, we have 225 parking spots in this plan, how does that compareto the layman does that number of parking spots going to be an indicator of more traffic.

16:14 Mayor Vaus

Let's try to stick to the traffic aspects of this.

16:20 Councilman Leonard

Jon, when you say they, who initial came up with this traffic plan?

16:30 Jon Collins Traffic Consultant

LLG did the original for the EIR and they also did the supplemental

16:34 Councilman Leonard

So they made assumptions and Lifetime said whether they agreed with them or not?

16:46 Jon Collins Traffic Consultant

They took the information Lifetime provided them and said ok we are going to be over what is allotted per the EIR, what are we going to do to potentially get a reduction to get us back in line. Let's look at the CAPCOA rate to get that reduction. They didn't assume that before.

Formatted: Not Highlight

17:34 Council Leonard

Did Lifetime give any indication on how many members they need to be whole?

Jon Traffic Consultant

No

Councilman Leonard

So, does that have no bearing on the traffic?

Jon Traffic Consultant

Traffic is based on building square footage

18:15 City Attorney

They switched from SANDAG to CAPCOA which is gives more of a net reduction.

19:23 Councilman Leonard

Is there any bifurcation of math, this thing got 6 times larger under the roof. It just seems like creative math.

Jon Traffic Consultant

The math works out, there are increases, it is just the matter of reductions and whether we want to allow them to take that credit.

Councilman Leonard

What is the differential on that ?

Jon Traffic Consultant

Approximately 500 trips

19:53 Councilman Grousch

I just think that folks are going to go ballistic on this. Why didn't they take that credit way back when.So they are going from 6k to over 30k and ~~their~~there is no increase in ADT?

Bob Manis Director of Development Services

There are overall reductions in The Farm, the vivarium, the social and the barn are smaller now.

22:05 Councilman Grousch

When people voted on this, what did they think they were voting on?

City Attorney

We will get into that, lets stick to the traffic so we can let Jon go. This is just one piece of the complicated puzzle.

24:04 City Attorney

It's a bit of a judgement call, it is low hanging fruit. (referencing the traffic count and litigation)

24:40 Mayor Vaus

Any more questions on traffic and we will let Jon go.

Traffic Consultant Jon Collins leaves

37:25 Councilman Mullin –Negative comment about a Poway resident

I lean towards not requiring the citizen vote.

Formatted: Not Highlight

----I do not see the downside to this unless Jim Bunner moves to [Stoneridge](#)Stoneridge

Formatted: Not Highlight

37: 46 Councilman Grousch

No way would this get passed....30% increase in building and no more traffic...I wouldn't want to be up and I think it would be very difficult.

39:52 Councilman Jon Mullin

If this goes to a city vote I don't think there is a snow balls in hell chance they will stick around.

40:10 Councilman Grousch

With the problems with the elevations of the homes, I think this will be just one more thing

40:16 Vaus

I do think it will pass. People in South Poway will say screw em, build it 80k square feet..(then LAUGHTERlaughter).

Formatted: Not Highlight

40:50 Frank

I do think it would be a shame to lose this amenity. I think when we are looking at the intent I think that the minor modification fits. In terms of traffic, the traffic would primarily affect the future residents of The Farm right? Like, where would the traffic impact be?

Formatted: Not Highlight

Bob Manis and City Attorney

Everywhere, it would be dispersed in a circular fashion

Formatted: Not Highlight

42:04 Frank

If the primarily affected would be in The Farm, they don't live there yet so they can't yell at us. LAUGHTER

Formatted: Not Highlight

I am trying to figure out who is going to be complaining about the extra traffic, the neighbors that don't live their yet?

Formatted: Not Highlight

46:40 Bob Manis

The infamous slope that has been built

Mayor Vaus

It's called the **Matahorn**Matterhorn! ...~~Laughing~~LAUGHTER

Formatted: Not Highlight

50: 59 Leonard

They didn't do this upfront.....I said look specific plan specific. This is more like 60, 000 square feet.The traffic is smoke and mirrors to me. I can't look someone in the eye and tell them a building 10 times larger than proposed has less traffic. How many people think they can fit in that thing? I like it, but I don't think what I had in mind when I told people to vote. It is so big, and it is going to suck up the resources. How do we explain to people how the pictures that were shown that this is what was proposed. We can't. As much as I like it, I don't think it's proper to tell the voters that this is the same.

I would be really nervous if any of this leaked out.

Formatted: Not Highlight

I think we need to think long and hard. Do we want to portray ourselves of baiting and switching people? I just don't know what you under 30k square feet that would make a solid argument that this is what the people voted for.

58:15 Vaus

.....I kind of like that this is up against the ~~matchorn~~Matterhorn.

Does minor mean less than 50%...? What does it mean?

1:03: 56 Someone says ...What about Amy Romaker?

Vaus-Negative comment about Poway resident

I don't give a shit about Amy Romaker ~~laughing~~(LAUGHING)

Formatted: Not Highlight

