REPORT TO THE HEARING OFFICER

HEARING DATE: December 18, 2013
REPORT NO. HO 13-108

ATTENTION: Hearing Officer

SUBJECT: Sprint – University Avenue
PTS PROJECT NUMBER: 242203

LOCATION: 3810 Bancroft Street

APPLICANT: Sprint (Permittee)/North Park Baptist Church (Owner)

SUMMARY

Issue: Should the Hearing Officer approve a Site Development Permit (SDP) for a Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) in the Greater North Park community plan area?

Staff Recommendation: APPROVE Site Development Permit No. 1222858.

Community Planning Group Recommendation: The North Park Planning Committee voted 13-0-0 to approve this project at their August 21, 2012 meeting. (Attachment 8)

Environmental Review: The project was determined to be exempt pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). This project is not pending an appeal of the environmental determination. The environmental exemption determination for this project was made on October 23, 2013, and the opportunity to appeal that determination ended November 15, 2013. (Attachment 7)

BACKGROUND & DISCUSSION

Sprint – University Avenue is an application for a Site Development Permit (SDP) for a Wireless Communication Facility (WCF). The project is located in the Greater North Park community plan area in the MCCPD-CL-1 zone. The project is located at 3810 Bancroft Street. (Attachments 1, 2, and 3)
WCFs are permitted in commercial zones with a limited use approval. In this case, the development exceeds the allowed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for the zone, and a Mid-City Communities Development Permit, processed as a Site Development Permit, is required to allow this deviation, pursuant to Land Development Code (LDC) section 1512.0203(b)(4). The FAR allowed for the MCCPD-CL-1 zone is 0.25. The existing FAR for the building is 1.703 and the proposed FAR will be 1.711.

Sprint operates an existing WCF on the building, with a permit which has now expired. The current application is for a new permit, to continue operating the WCF, with some modifications. Eleven Sprint panel antennas are located on the roof of the North Park Baptist Church building. Two are located behind radio-frequency (RF) transparent screening at the north edge of the building and nine panel antennas are concealed behind RF transparent screening at the southwest corner of the building. Equipment associated with the antennas is located on a mezzanine level of the building.

The WCF Design Requirements, LDC section 141.0420, identify that the applicant “shall use all reasonable means to conceal or minimize the visual impacts of WCFs through integration.” In this case, the antennas are concealed behind RF transparent screening, located on the roof of the existing church building. For the screening located at the southwest of the building, additional architectural details were initially proposed, but after review by the City’s Historic Resources section, these details were removed. Instead, a metal band has been provided to delineate the RF screening from the existing building. In this way, the RF screening will not present a false sense of history by replicating too many features present on the existing building. The RF screening will be painted and textured to be compatible with the existing building and the construction plans will be reviewed by the Historic Resources section prior to building permit issuance.

The City's General Plan addresses Wireless Facilities in UD-A.15. The visual impact of WCF should be minimized by concealing WCF in existing structures, or utilizing camouflage and screening techniques to hide or blend them into the surrounding area. Facilities should be designed to be aesthetically pleasing and respectful of the neighborhood context. Equipment associated with the WCF should be located in underground vaults or unobtrusive structures. This project complies with the General Plan recommendations by locating the antennas on an existing building, behind RF transparent screening, that is integrated with the existing building. Equipment associated with the antennas is located in a mezzanine enclosure, at the rear of the building. The WCF is able to integrate with an existing building, which allows it to respect the neighborhood context.

Based on the proposed design, the project complies with the WCF Regulations (LDC 141.0420). The project has received support from the community planning group, and draft findings have been made in the affirmative to approve the SDP. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of SDP No. 1222858.

---

1 The building is not a designated historic resource, but is considered potentially historic.
ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve Site Development Permit No. 1222858, with modifications.

2. Deny Site Development Permit No. 1222858, if the Hearing Officer makes written findings based on substantial evidence that the approval is not authorized by state or local zoning law.

Respectfully submitted,

Alex Hempton, AICP
Development Project Manager

Attachments:
1. Aerial Photo
2. Community Plan Land Use Map
3. Project Location Map
4. Project Data Sheet
5. Draft Permit Resolution with Findings
6. Draft Permit with Conditions
7. Notice of Right to Appeal Environmental Exemption
8. Community Planning Group Recommendation
9. Ownership Disclosure Statement (ODS)
10. Photo Simulation
11. Photo Survey
12. Site Justification/Coverage Maps
13. Hearing Officer Hearing Public Notice
14. Project Plans
Community Plan Land Use Map

Designated as Commercial

Sprint – University Avenue, Project No. 242203
3810 Bancroft Street
## PROJECT DATA SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME:</th>
<th>Sprint – University Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>Site Development Permit (SDP) for a Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) consisting of eleven (11) panel antennas mounted on an existing building behind radio-frequency (RF) transparent screens. Equipment is located in an equipment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY PLAN:</td>
<td>Greater North Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS:</td>
<td>Site Development Permit, Process 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION:</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING INFORMATION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONE:</td>
<td>MCCPD-CL-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT LIMIT:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOR AREA RATIO:</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT SETBACK:</td>
<td>6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDE SETBACK:</td>
<td>0’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET SIDE SETBACK:</td>
<td>4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR SETBACK:</td>
<td>4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJACENT PROPERTIES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH:</td>
<td>Commercial, MCCPD-CL-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH:</td>
<td>Residential, MCCPD-MR-800B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST:</td>
<td>Commercial, MCCPD-CL-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST:</td>
<td>Commercial, MCCPD-CL-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVIATIONS OR VARIANCES REQUESTED:</td>
<td>Deviation to Floor Area Ratio (FAR): Existing FAR is 1.703 and proposed FAR will be 1.711.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP RECOMMENDATION:</td>
<td>The North Park Planning Committee recommended approval of this project, 13-0-0, at their August 21, 2012 meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, the NORTH PARK BAPTIST CHURCH, Owner, and SPRINT, Permittee, filed an application with the City of San Diego for a permit to construct, operate, and maintain a Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) (as described in and by reference to the approved Exhibits “A” and corresponding conditions of approval for the associated Permit No. 1222858);

WHEREAS, the project site is located at 3810 Bancroft Street in the Mid-City Communities Planned District CL-1 zone of the Greater North Park community plan area;

WHEREAS, the project site is legally described as Lots 44 and 45, in Block 44, of Park Villas, according to Map thereof No. 438, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, October 14, 1887;

WHEREAS, on December 18, 2013, the Hearing Officer of the City of San Diego considered SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 1222858 pursuant to the Land Development Code of the City of San Diego;

WHEREAS, on October 23, 2013, the City of San Diego, as Lead Agency, through the Development Services Department, made and issued an Environmental Determination that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code section 21000 et. seq.) under CEQA Guideline Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) and there was no appeal of the Environmental Determination filed within the time period provided by San Diego Municipal Code Section 112.0520;

BE IT RESOLVED by the Hearing Officer of the City of San Diego as follows:

That the Hearing Officer adopts the following written Findings, dated December 18, 2013.

FINDINGS:

Site Development Permit - Section 126.0504

A. Findings for all Site Development Permits

1. The proposed development will not adversely affect the applicable land use plan;

   The City of San Diego’s General Plan (UD-15) requires that the visual impact of wireless facilities be minimized by concealing wireless facilities in existing structures or using screening techniques to hide or blend them into the surrounding area. The plan also calls for these facilities to be designed to be aesthetically pleasing and respectful of the neighborhood context. Furthermore, the plan states that equipment associated with wireless facilities be concealed from view. This project consists of panel antennas, concealed behind two radio-frequency (RF) transparent screening elements on the roof of an existing church building. Equipment associated with the antennas is located on the back side of the building and is screened from view. The RF screening structures have been designed to be compatible with the building in terms of texture and color, while at the same time maintaining a clear
separation between the historic structure and the RF screening. In order to not portray a false sense of history, architectural embellishments on the RF screening have been minimized and a metal band applied to clearly indicate the new structure from the older structure. The height of the RF screening is compatible with the existing building and is slightly lower than an existing building penthouse.

The project conforms with the Greater North Park Community Plan which summarizes some of the recommendations contained in the North Park Commercial Center Design Study, as follows:

**Colors and Materials - Design Objectives**

1. Select a color palette for building in North Park.
2. Building materials should be compatible with the architectural styles of the buildings.

The colors utilized in this project match the color scheme of the existing church building. Building materials are compatible with the existing building on-site.

**Character - Design Objectives**

1. Preserve, restore and enhance historic buildings.
2. Encourage architectural detailing on new buildings that is compatible with the historic character of the commercial area.
3. Suggest design features which will unify the commercial area.

Due to the historic nature of the existing building, plans were reviewed by Historic Resources staff. Initially, faux windows and other architectural elements were proposed on portions of the RF screening, to mimic the existing building. However, issues were raised that these architectural elements could portray a false sense of history relating to the original building, so they were subsequently removed from the project. Instead, a metal band will be installed to delineate the existing building from the RF screening, which will ensure that the historic integrity of the existing building is maintained. The RF screening will be compatible with the existing buildings on site by incorporating a similar color and texture.

Based on the design of this project as described above, the project will not adversely affect the applicable land use plans.

2. **The proposed development will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare; and**

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 preempts local governments from regulating the "placement, construction and modification of wireless communication facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of Radio Frequency (RF) emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Federal Communication Commission's (FCC) standards for such emissions." The proposed project would be consistent with the FCC's regulations for wireless facilities. To insure that the FCC standards are being met, a condition has been added to the permit to require that Sprint perform a cumulative model RF test and submit the finding in a report to the City of San Diego prior to the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, based on the above, the project would not result in any significant health or safety risks to the surrounding area within the jurisdiction of the city.
3. **The proposed development will comply with the applicable regulations of the Land Development Code, including any allowable deviations pursuant to the Land Development Code.**

The Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) Regulations, Land Development Code Section 141.0420, require that WCFs utilize the smallest, least visually intrusive antennas, components, and other necessary equipment. The applicant is required to use all reasonable means to conceal or minimize the visual impact of the WCF through integration utilizing architecture, landscape, and siting. WCFs are permitted in commercial zones with the processing of a Limited Use, Process 1 approval. While the project complies with WCF Regulations, the project requests a deviation from the FAR development regulations of the MCCPD-CL-1 zone. The allowable FAR for this zone is 0.25. The existing church facility has an FAR of 1.703. With the proposed project, the FAR will be 1.711. The deviation to the FAR is permitted through the processing of this Site Development Permit/Mid-City Communities Development Permit. Therefore, the project complies with the regulations of the Land Development Code.

**Mid-City Communities Development Permit – Section 1512.0204**

1. **Conformance With Community Plan and Design Manuals.** The proposed use and project design meet the purpose and intent of the Mid-City Communities Planned District (Section 1512.0101), and the following documents, as applicable to the site: the Mid-City Community Plan, the Greater North Park Community Plan, the State University Community Plan, the Uptown Community Plan, the Mid-City Design Plan (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; Graduate studies in Landscape Architecture; June, 1983), Design Manual for the Normal Heights Demonstration Area and the City Heights Demonstration Area (ICH Associates and Gary Coah; April, 1984), The Design Study for the Commercial Revitalization of El Cajon Boulevard (Land Studio, Rob Quigley, Kathleen McCormick), The North Park Design Study, Volume 1, Design Concept and Volume 2, Design Manual (The Jerde Partnership, Inc. and Lawrence Reed Moline, Ltd.), Sears Site Development Program (Gerald Gast and Williams-Kuebelbeck and Assoc.; 1987) and will not adversely affect the Greater North Park Community Plan, the Uptown Community Plan or the General Plan of the City of San Diego;

The City of San Diego’s General Plan (UD-15) requires that the visual impact of wireless facilities be minimized by concealing wireless facilities in existing structures or using screening techniques to hide or blend them into the surrounding area. The plan also calls for these facilities to be designed to be aesthetically pleasing and respectful of the neighborhood context. Furthermore, the plan states that equipment associated with wireless facilities be concealed from view. This project consists of panel antennas, concealed behind two radio-frequency (RF) transparent screening elements on the roof of an existing church building. Equipment associated with the antennas is located on the back side of the building and is screened from view. The RF screening structures have been designed to be compatible with the building in terms of texture and color, while at the same time maintaining a clear separation between the historic structure and the RF screening. In order to not portray a false sense of history, architectural embellishments on the RF screening have been minimized and a
metal band applied to clearly indicate the new structure from the older structure. The height of the RF screening is compatible with the existing building and is slightly lower than an existing building penthouse.

The project conforms with the Greater North Park Community Plan which summarizes some of the recommendations contained in the North Park Commercial Center Design Study, as follows:

**Colors and Materials - Design Objectives**
1. Select a color palette for building in North Park.
2. Building materials should be compatible with the architectural styles of the buildings.

The colors utilized in this project match the color scheme of the existing church building. Building materials are compatible with the existing building on-site.

**Character - Design Objectives**
1. Preserve, restore and enhance historic buildings.
2. Encourage architectural detailing on new buildings that is compatible with the historic character of the commercial area.
3. Suggest design features which will unify the commercial area.

Due to the historic nature of the existing building, plans were reviewed by Historic Resources staff. Initially, faux windows and other architectural elements were proposed on portions of the RF screening, to mimic the existing building. However, issues were raised that these architectural elements could portray a false sense of history relating to the original building, so they were subsequently removed from the project. Instead, a metal band will be installed to delineate the existing building from the RF screening, which will ensure that the historic integrity of the existing building is maintained. The RF screening will be compatible with the existing buildings on site by incorporating a similar color and texture.

2. **Compatibility with surrounding development.** The proposed development will be compatible with existing and planned land use on adjoining properties and will not constitute a disruptive element to the neighborhood and community. In addition, architectural harmony with the surrounding neighborhood and community will be achieved as far as practicable;

This WCF consists of panel antennas located behind two radio-frequency (RF) transparent screening elements on the roof of an existing church building. Equipment is screened on the side of the building. The rooftop elements are designed to be compatible with the existing building, by using similar textures and coloring. Various architectural details and design elements were proposed on the tower element screening, however after review by the Historic Resources staff, these elements were removed as they could have resulted in the project portraying a false sense of history. Metal banding has been applied between the existing building and the RF screening to clearly indicate where the original building ends and RF screening begins. While there is no height limit in the MCCPD-CL-1 zone, the height of the screening elements is compatible with the building and is lower than an existing tower element on the building. The proposed project will not constitute a disruptive element to the
neighborhood and community and architectural harmony with the surrounding neighborhood and community will be achieved as far as practicable.

3. **No Detriment to Health, Safety and Welfare.** The proposed use, because of conditions that have been applied to it, will not be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of persons residing or working in the area, and will not adversely affect other property in the vicinity;

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 preempts local governments from regulating the "placement, construction and modification of wireless communication facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of Radio Frequency (RF) emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Federal Communication Commission's (FCC) standards for such emissions." The proposed project would be consistent with the FCC's regulations for wireless facilities. To insure that the FCC standards are being met, a condition has been added to the permit to require that Sprint perform a cumulative model RF test and submit the finding in a report to the City of San Diego prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Therefore, based on the above, the project would not result in any significant health or safety risks to the surrounding area within the jurisdiction of the city.

4. **Adequate Public Facilities.** For residential and mixed residential/commercial projects within the park-deficient neighborhoods shown on Map Number B-4104 that are not exempted by Section 1512.0203(b)(1)(A) or (B), the proposed development provides a minimum of 750 square feet of on-site usable recreational open space area per dwelling unit. The on-site usable recreational open space area shall not be located within any area of the site used for vehicle parking, or ingress and egress, and shall be configured to have a minimum of 10 feet in each dimension. The area will be landscaped and may also include hardscape and recreational facilities;

This project consists of a Wireless Communication Facility, which does not involve a residential use. Therefore, as this finding applies to residential and mixed residential/commercial projects, this permit finding is not applicable to this project.

5. **Adequate Lighting.** In the absence of a street light within 150 feet of the property, adequate neighborhood-serving security lighting consistent with the Municipal Code is provided on-site; and

A street light, affixed to a utility pole, is located within 150 feet of the property. No security lighting is proposed with this project.

6. **The proposed use will comply with the relevant regulations in the San Diego Municipal Code.**

The project complies with the regulations of the Wireless Communication Facility Regulations, Land Development Code Section 141.0420, and with the zone development requirements of the MCCPD-CL-1 zone, with the exception of the FAR requirements. The allowable FAR for this zone is 0.25. The existing church facility has an FAR of 1.703. With the proposed project, the FAR will be 1.711. The deviation to the FAR is permitted through the processing of this Site Development Permit/Mid-City Communities Development Permit.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, based on the findings hereinbefore adopted by the Hearing Officer, SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 1222858 is hereby GRANTED by the Hearing Officer to the referenced Owner/Permittee, in the form, exhibits, terms and conditions as set forth in Permit No. 1222858, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Alex Hempton, AICP
Development Project Manager
Development Services

Adopted on: December 18, 2013

Internal Order No. 24001891
This SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 1222858 is granted by the HEARING OFFICER of the City of San Diego to NORTH PARK BAPTIST CHURCH, Owner, and SPRINT, Permittee, pursuant to San Diego Municipal Code [SDMC] sections 141.0420, 126.0501, and 1512.0204. The site is located at 3510 Bancroft Street in the Mid-City Communities Planned District CL-1 zone of the Greater North Park community plan area. The project site is legally described as: Lots 44 and 45, in Block 44, of Palm Villas, according to Map thereof No. 438, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, October 14, 1887.

Subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit, permission is granted to Owner/Permittee to construct, operate, and maintain a Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) described and identified by size, dimension, quantity, type, and location on the approved exhibits [Exhibit “A”] dated December 12, 2013, on file in the Development Services Department.

The project shall include:

a. Eleven (11) panel antennas, with the following dimensions: 53” by 14” by 3.15”, concealed behind radio-frequency (RF) screening, painted and textured to match the existing building;

b. Equipment, located in a 12’ by 27’9” mezzanine area;

c. With the processing of this Site Development Permit, the project is allowed to deviate from the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) permitted by the MCCPD-CL-1 zone of 0.25. The existing FAR is 1.703 and the proposed FAR is 1.711;
d. Public and private accessory improvements determined by the Development Services Department to be consistent with the land use and development standards for this site in accordance with the adopted community plan, the California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] and the CEQA Guidelines, the City Engineer’s requirements, zoning regulations, conditions of this Permit, and any other applicable regulations of the SDMC.

STANDARD REQUIREMENTS:

1. This permit must be utilized within thirty-six (36) months after the date on which all rights of appeal have expired. If this permit is not utilized in accordance with Chapter 12, Article 6, Division 1 of the SDMC within the 36 month period, this permit shall be void unless an Extension of Time has been granted. Any such Extension of Time must meet all SDMC requirements and applicable guidelines in effect at the time the extension is considered by the appropriate decision maker.

2. This Site Development Permit and corresponding use of this site shall expire on January 6, 2024. Upon expiration of this Permit, the facilities and improvements described herein shall be removed from this site and the property shall be restored to its original condition preceding approval of this Permit.

3. No later than ninety (90) days prior to the expiration of this permit, the Owner/Permittee may submit a new application to the City Manager for consideration with review and a decision by the appropriate decision maker at that time. Failure to submit prior to the deadline will be cause for enforcement for noncompliance, which may include penalties and fines.

4. Under no circumstances does approval of this permit authorize the Owner/Permittee to utilize this site for wireless communication purposes beyond the permit expiration date. Use of this permit beyond the expiration date of this permit is prohibited.

5. No permit for the construction, occupancy, or operation of any facility or improvement described herein shall be granted, nor shall any activity authorized by this Permit be conducted on the premises until:
   a. The Owner/Permittee signs and returns the Permit to the Development Services Department, and
   b. The Permit is recorded in the Office of the San Diego County Recorder.

6. While this Permit is in effect, the subject property shall be used only for the purposes and under the terms and conditions set forth in this Permit unless otherwise authorized by the appropriate City decision maker.

7. This Permit is a covenant running with the subject property and all of the requirements and conditions of this Permit and related documents shall be binding upon the Owner/Permittee and any successor(s) in interest.
8. The continued use of this Permit shall be subject to the regulations of this and any other applicable governmental agency.

9. Issuance of this Permit by the City of San Diego does not authorize the Owner/Permittee for this Permit to violate any Federal, State or City laws, ordinances, regulations or policies including, but not limited to, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) and any amendments thereto (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.).

10. The Permittee shall secure all necessary building permits. The Permittee is informed that to secure these permits, substantial building modifications and site improvements may be required to comply with applicable building, fire, mechanical, and plumbing codes, and State and Federal disability access laws.

11. Construction plans shall be in substantial conformity to Exhibit “A.” Changes, modifications, or alterations to the construction plans are prohibited unless appropriate application(s) or amendment(s) to this Permit have been granted.

12. All of the conditions contained in this Permit have been considered and were determined necessary to make the findings required for approval of this Permit. The Permit holder is required to comply with each and every condition in order to maintain the entitlements that are granted by this Permit.

If any condition of this Permit, by a legal challenge to the Permittee of this Permit, is found or held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, unenforceable, or unreasonable, this Permit shall be void. However, in such an event, the Permittee shall have the right, by paying applicable processing fees, to bring a request for a new permit without the "invalid" condition(s) back to the discretionary body which approved the Permit for a determination by that body as to whether all of the findings necessary for the issuance of the proposed permit can still be made in the absence of the "invalid" condition(s). Such hearing shall be a hearing de novo, and the discretionary body shall have the absolute right to approve, disapprove, or modify the proposed permit and the condition(s) contained therein.

13. The Permittee shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City, its agents, officers, and employees from any and all claims, actions, proceedings, damages, judgments, or costs, including attorney’s fees, against the City or its agents, officers, or employees, relating to the issuance of this permit including, but not limited to, any action to attack, set aside, void, challenge, or annul this development approval and any environmental document or decision. The City will promptly notify Permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and, if the City should fail to cooperate fully in the defense, the Permittee shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City or its agents, officers, and employees. The City may elect to conduct its own defense, participate in its own defense, or obtain independent legal counsel in defense of any claim related to this indemnification. In the event of such election, Permittee shall pay all of the costs related thereto, including without limitation reasonable attorney’s fees and costs. In the event of a disagreement between the City and Permittee regarding litigation issues, the City shall have the authority to control the litigation and make
litigation related decisions, including, but not limited to, settlement or other disposition of the matter. However, the Permittee shall not be required to pay or perform any settlement unless such settlement is approved by Permittee.

**ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS:**

14. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Permittee shall incorporate any construction Best Management Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the San Diego Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications.

15. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit the Permittee shall submit a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). The WPCP shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix E of the City’s Storm Water Standards.

**HISTORIC REQUIREMENTS:**

16. Prior to Issuance of any construction permit(s) for current and future improvements to the existing potentially historic structure(s) on the property, the Owner/Permittee shall submit construction documents to the Historical Resources Section within the Development Services Department for review. The construction documents shall show all proposed improvements and shall be consistent with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department due to the historic nature of the structure(s).

**PLANNING/DESIGN REQUIREMENTS:**

17. A topographical survey conforming to the provisions of the SDMC may be required if it is determined during construction that there may be a conflict between the building(s) under construction and a condition of the Permit or a regulation of the underlying zone. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the Owner/Permittee.

18. All private outdoor lighting shall be shaded and adjusted to fall on the same premises where such lights are located and in accordance with the applicable regulations in the SDMC.

19. All facilities and related equipment shall be maintained in good working order; free from trash, debris, graffiti; and designed to discourage vandalism. Any damaged equipment shall be repaired or replaced within thirty (30) calendar days of notification by the City of San Diego.

20. The Permittee shall notify the City within 30 days of the sale or transfer of this site to any other provider or if the site is no longer operational requiring the removal and the restoration of this site to its original condition.

21. The photosimulation(s) for the proposed project shall be printed (not stapled) on the building plans. This is to ensure the construction team building the project is in compliance with approved the Exhibit “A.”
22. No overhead cabling is allowed for this project.

23. The final WCF shall conform to Exhibit “A,” which includes plans and photo simulations, prior to final telecom planning inspection approval.

24. Prior to the issuance of a construction permit, the Permittee shall provide a certified cumulative radio frequency model study demonstrating compliance with the Federal Communications Commission’s Radio Frequency Guidelines. All significant contributors to the ambient RF environment should be considered in the radio frequency model study.

25. All equipment, including transformers, emergency generators and air conditioners belonging to the Permittee shall be designed and operated consistent with the City noise ordinance. Ventilation openings shall be baffled and directed away from residential areas. Vibration resonance of operating equipment in the equipment enclosures shall be eliminated.

26. The Permittee shall place appropriate signage on the WCF as required by CAL-OSHA/FCC to the satisfaction of the Development Services Department.

27. Within 90 days, or no later than April 7, 2014 (whichever is earlier), the Owner/Permittee shall submit construction documents to the Development Service Departments, for review and approval, implementing the proposed improvements to the WCF as identified on Exhibit “A”.

28. Within 180 days of no later than July 7, 2014 (whichever is earlier), the Owner/Permittee shall obtain a final Telecom Planning Inspection, which incorporates the proposed improvements to the RF screening as identified on Exhibit “A”.

INFORMATION ONLY:

• The issuance of this discretionary use permit alone does not allow the immediate commencement or continued operation of the proposed use on site. The operation allowed by this discretionary use permit may only begin or recommence after all conditions listed on this permit are fully completed and all required ministerial permits have been issued and received final inspection.

• Any party on whom fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions have been imposed as conditions of approval of this Permit, may protest the imposition within ninety days of the approval of this development permit by filing a written protest with the City Clerk pursuant to California Government Code section 66020.

• This development may be subject to impact fees at the time of construction permit issuance.

APPROVED by the Hearing Officer of the City of San Diego on December 18, 2013 and HO-XXXX.
AUTHENTICATED BY THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Alex Hempton, AJCP
Development Project Manager

NOTE: Notary acknowledgment must be attached per Civil Code section 1189 et seq.

The undersigned Owner/Permittee, by execution hereof, agrees to each and every condition of this Permit and promises to perform each and every obligation of Owner/Permittee hereunder.

NORTH PARK BAPTIST CHURCH
Owner
By
JANET CAGE STEWART
CLERK

PRINT
Permittee
By
GLORI JAMES-SUAREZ
NETWORK MANAGER

NOTE: Notary acknowledgments must be attached per Civil Code section 1189 et seq.
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
SAP No. 24001891

PROJECT NAME/NUMBER:  Sprint Nextel University Avenue/242203
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA:  Greater North Park Community
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3
LOCATION:  3810 Bancroft Street, San Diego, CA 92104

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:  The project proposes a Site Development Permit (SDP) to allow for the continuing operation of an existing Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) consisting of eleven antennas mounted on the roof of an existing building behind radio-frequency transparent screening. Associated equipment cabinets are located on the roof in a lease area of approximately 12'-0" by 27'-9".

ENTITY CONSIDERING PROJECT APPROVAL:  City of San Diego Hearing Officer

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:  CEQA Exemption 15301-(Existing Facilities)

ENTITY MAKING ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:  City of San Diego

STATEMENT SUPPORTING REASON FOR ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:  The proposed project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15301, which allows for the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing facilities (public or private) involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the determination. The proposed project, a SDP, to allow an existing WCF consisting of 11 antennas on an existing facility, and associated existing equipment cabinets is not an expansion of use. No environmental impacts were identified for the proposed project. Additionally, none of the exceptions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 apply.

DEVELOPMENT PROJECT MANAGER:  Alexander Hempton
MAILING ADDRESS:  1222 First Avenue, MS 501
                     San Diego, CA 92101
PHONE NUMBER:  (619) 446-5349

On October 23, 2013, the City of San Diego made the above-referenced environmental determination
pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This determination is appealable to the City Council. If you have any questions about this determination, contact the City Development Project Manager listed above.

Applications to appeal CEQA determination made by staff (including the City Manager) to the City Council must be filed in the office of the City Clerk within 10 business days from the date of the posting of this Notice (November 15, 2013). The appeal application can be obtained from the City Clerk, 202 'C' Street, Second Floor, San Diego, CA 92101.

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request.
NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE
Draft Minutes: August 21, 2012 – 6:30 PM
www.northparkplanning.org
info@northparkplanning.org

Like us: NorthParkPlanning Follow us: @NPPlanning

I. Call to order: 6:34pm


III. Absent (2): David Cohen, Steven Williamson

IV. Modifications to and Adoption of the 7/17/12 Agenda.
Motion to adopt: Lewis/Dye 13-0-0

V. Consent Agenda:
   a. Aug 6, 2012 UDPR In attendance: Dye, Barry, Steppke, Bonn, Callen, Pyles, Hill)

Sprint Nextel University Ave /3810 Bancroft St (NP Baptist Church) Project No. 242203. Process 3 SDP. Proposed modification/expansion of an existing Wireless Communication Facility in the CL-1 Project proposes to add 12 radio transmitters and 4 combiners to the existing 11 antennas, 1 GPA antenna, and 6 equipment cabinets. The existing WCF permit has expired. Motion: To approve as presented. Hill/UDPR 13-0-0 on consent

VI. SDPD – Mid-City Community Relations Officer Jenny Hall
   a. Social Cycles- vehicle is not a pedicab. Schedule a meeting to review the business and appropriate ordinances. Not regulated by ABC, PUC. Stance for NPPC is premature.
   b. Brawl at U31 turned into a stabbing – no one in custody as of today, ongoing investigation. Probably an incident between known parties. Other incidents at U31 have sparked interest from multiple regulatory bodies.
   c. Trends: decrease in stolen vehicles in North Park over the last 3 months. Also have a lot of vehicles recovered. Break-ins to vehicles decreased in August. Residential burglarized – a few recent arrests.
   d. Stonewall citizen’s patrol- attended first meeting, supports the group.
   e. Contact – jmason@pd.sandiego.gov (email is best), desk number 619-516-3009

VII. Approval of Previous NPPC Minutes: July 17, 2012
   a. Vidales/Pyles 10-0-3 (Passons, Moczydowsky, Nguyen)

VIII. Treasurer’s Report: David Cohen No report

IX. Chair’s Report/CPC
   a. CPC
      i. Mayoral candidates to possible speak at CPC on land use issues important to cpg’s
      ii. CIP developing potential process for CPC/CPG public input. PPP attached
   b. North Park – Mid-City Regional Bike Corridor Project, a SANDAG Project, Public Outreach to start this fall.
   c. Uptown Planners vote on UHCA boundary adjustment & next steps
      i. Vote taken to support UHCA requested boundary adjust of portions of NP to Uptown Planners
      ii. There is still no City process in place
      iii. A number of inaccuracies about the NPPC where stated by Uptown Planners Board with no ability for the NPPC to correct the record.
   d. SOHO filed suit challenging Plaza de Panama Project 8/13/12 see Press Release below

X. Announcements & Non Agenda Public Comment (2 min. max each) Please fill out a Public Comment Sheet and give to Secretary prior to the meeting
   a. Ross Lopez on Uptown Planners vote on the UHCA boundary adjustment proposal– UHCA petition was not seen by Uptown Planners, but sided as justification to support. Minor changes require 75% petitioning. 476 signatures not significant enough number to qualify in 4000+ district. UHCA is a paid dues organization. Hopes that NPPC will continue to fight for the area.
   b. NPMS – Cheryl Dye: NPMS is contracting with Elite security for a bicycle patrol. NPMS board openings, looking for new members. NPMS Board reached an informal consensus in opposition to the Jack In the Box project. Letter has been sent to the planning commission and Angela will be presenting to the planning commission.
ATTACHMENT 8

c. Jack in the Box – Planning Commission August 23, 2012 9 AM, SD Concourse 202 C St, 2nd Floor Silver Rm. See SD Concourse layout below.
d. SD Regional Walk Scorecard Sept 15-30 WalkSanDiego: http://www.walksandiego.org/ Further info will be presented at the meeting is attached & below
e. Communication for Pedestrian Safety, free training & lunch workshop. Sept 19, 9am-2pm for more info or to register http://communications-for-pedestriansafety.eventbrite.com or call Leah at 619-544-9255 see flier below
f. 3rd Annual NP Historical Society Car Show – Sat, Sept 8, 2012 10am-2pm, Balboa Tennis Club 2221 Morley Field Dr. Flier attached/below or northparkhistory.org. Still welcoming entries.
i. Toyland Parade December 1, 2012 needs financial assistance & sponsorship, forms attached for more info Debra Fuentes, Victoria House Non-Profit: mkmtrust2@yahoo.com. Back to the Past theme...

XI. Planner’s Report - Marlon Pangilinan, 619.235.5293; mpangilinan@sandiego.gov
a. Community Plan Update – See Agenda Item V.E. below

XII. Elected Official’s Report
a. Katherine Fortner, Hon. Susan Davis, US Congressional District 53, Katherine.Fortner@mail.house.gov - New federal courthouse is almost completed. Attended Stand-Down to provide homeless vets services. Accepting internship applications for the fall for DC and San Diego now being accepted.
b. Lindsey Masukawa, Hon. Toni Atkins, State Assembly District 76, Lindsey.Masukawa@asm.ca.gov - No report.
c. Anthony Bernal, Hon. Todd Gloria, City Councilmember District 3, ABernal@sandiego.gov - Chair of budget and finance committee: parking district revenue has been accumulating in NP - $243K. Looking to expedite projects with those funds. Opened 47 new parking spaces on Idaho. CIP mechanism for community input. Veteran’s transitional housing in previous Thomas Jefferson law building – approved CUP. Repaved 23 additional streets. Bike Corrals are being installed in front of the Linkery in mid-September. Community Cook on September 15 10:30-11:30. McKinley joint use is ready to progress again. Juniper Street improvements are going out to bid in September.

XIII. Subcommittee Reports
a. Urban Design/Project Review, Robert Barry, Cheryl Dye - NP Adult Community Center, 6:00 pm 1st Monday. Next meeting, Sept TBD or Oct 2012
   i. Nextel on consent. AT&T tower on boundary was continued for a new redesign in October.
   ii. Next meeting in October, no meeting in September.
b. Public Facilities/Public Art, Dionne Carlson, Rene Vidales – NP Adult Community Center, 6:00 pm, 2nd Wednesday. Next meeting, Sept 12, 2012
   i. No meeting this month. Next month discussing infrastructure projects and traffic calming projects.
c. Utility Boxes, Cheryl Dye, Dang Nguyen - meetings on an as needed basis
   i. CPC recommendation was denied, workshop at CPC showed progress, needs additional focus.
   ii. Councilmember Gloria’s office is taking the lead on setting up a series of workshops starting in late September.
   iii. Council audit committee has added utility undergrounding program to their scope.
   iv. Letter sent out regarding undergrounding on Lincoln, property owner to give “right of entry permit” by August 25th or the homeowner is responsible for connecting to the undergrounded utility.
d. Bylaws Ad Hoc Committee, Vicki Granowitz – meetings TBD
   1. First meeting, agreed on a scope of work and started review. Will have the first set of recommendations next month.

XIV. Liaisons Report
a. Balboa Park Committee - Rob Steppke
   i. No meeting. September meeting will address the lily pond vandalism.
b. Maintenance Assessment District - Lucky Morrison
   i. Discussion on opinion from the City Attorney on special assessment districts and additional benefits.
   ii. Differentiation of level of services that qualify for funding on services and MAD scope.
   iii. Next meeting on September 10.
c. NPMS Sustainability Committee - Rene Vidales
   i. Sustainability in the community plan and making progress on the goals of the conservation element. Recently awarded grant from SHPO.
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XV. Action & Discussion Items
   a. WalkSanDiego: SD Regional Walk Scorecard [link]
      i. Steve Codraro – volunteer opportunity to score neighborhoods on walkability. Translate to map for funding requests. Walk 1-2 hours in the second half of September.
   b. Water Tower/Storage & Pumping Station District: NPPC letter of support for designation
      i. Proposed Water Tower historic designation, Alexis Bevil, Steve/Katherine Hon presented. Would like a letter of support for the nomination to be sent to SHPO. 10 contributing elements to the district
         ii. MOTION TO APPROVE LETTER OF SUPPORT: Lewis/Passons 13-0-0
   c. Jack in the Box Potential Appeal of Planning Commission (PC) Action. (Passons Recused do to potential conflict of interest)
      i. PC hears item on Thursday, Aug 23, with a 10 day window to appeal to City Council. Should NPPC want to appeal, board needs to take action today.
      ii. MOTION: For the NPPC to Appeal the Planning Commission Approval of the Jack in the Box Project # 213093 (only to be used in the event the PC approves the project on 8/23) Lewis/Barry 12-0-0
   d. Social Cycles – request Councilmember Gloria for assistance in obtaining more specific information & clarification on operating rules for Social Cycles. DSD has said SD Muni Code §83.0101 - §83.0133 on Pedicabs also covers Social Cycles. To read the Code: [link]
      i. MOTION (Failed): To submit the request with the following changes: Page 1, Paragraph 2 – strike the phrase: “is a "Party on Wheels". More specifically, it"; Municipal code review section 2 - §83.0125 Prohibitions on the Manner of Operating Pedicabs, section (g), bullet 1 – strike the phrase: there is a high degree of likelihood that occupants will be intoxicated; Strike all of section 7: Process for Managing Inebriated Customers; Remove Attachment 2: Social Cycle Continuing Impacts on North Park Area from effected residents
         Moczydlowsky/Hilpert 5-8-0 (Passons, Lewis, Hilpert, Nguyen, Moczydlowsky voting for the motion)
      ii. MOTION: The NPPC Requests Councilmember Gloria’s obtain clarification from the Development Services Dept & the City Attorney on issues related to Social Cycles that are not clearly covered in SD Muni Code §83.0101 on Pedicabs. 8-5-0 (Passons, Lewis, Hilpert, Nguyen, Moczydlowsky voting no)
   e. Oversight Board Letter (Dye recuses do to potential conflict of interest)
      i. Lewis – propose letter to the “oversight board” to continue to support the ROPS projects for development within the community.
      ii. MOTION TO APPROVE LETTER with minor amendments Moczydlowsky/Nguyen 12-0-0

XVI. Unfinished & Future Agenda Items
   a. None

XVII. Next Meeting Date: August 21, 2012

XVIII. Motion to Adjourn: Vidales/Carlson 13/0/0
August 21, 2012

Mr. Milford Wayne Donaldson  
State Historic Preservation Officer  
Office of Historic Preservation  
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95816-7100

Dear Mr. Donaldson:

The North Park Planning Committee supports the North Park Historical Society’s application for placing the University Heights Water Storage and Pumping Station Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places. The water tower is one of the most visible landmarks of the Greater North Park community and the structures that make up the proposed Historic District, including those that are no longer in existence, were absolutely critical components for the development of North Park and the surrounding “streetcar communities” during the early 20th century.

The history of the development of San Diego and its historic streetcar communities is inextricably linked to the development of water infrastructure. The placement of the proposed Historic District on to the National Register would officially recognize and hopefully protect an important component of that infrastructure.

Sincerely,

Vicki Granowitz  
Chair  
North Park Planning Committee  
619-584-1203  
NPPC-Info@cox.net
August 21, 2012

Honorable Oversight Board Members:

The North Park Planning Committee (NPCC) would like to express its firm support for the North Park public projects listed in the redevelopment disposition ROPS III (Attachment 1). These projects remain critical improvements the community has long anticipated and worked for.

Foremost is the $1.4M allocated for the Mini-park and associated streetscape improvements (139). Essential as well are the $300K allocated for the Boundary St Streetscape Improvements (366) and the $195K for the 31st Streetscape Public Improvements (369) associated with the Woolworth/Gateway project. These projects are all funded with tax exempt bond proceeds, funds which by law must be within the former project area. The lighting replacement project along El Cajon Boulevard (336) is the remaining important use of $124K of these bond funds.

The community also strongly continues to support two additional long awaited public projects which were to be paid for with proceeds from taxable bond issue. The community would benefit from going forward with the $50K for the North Park Arts Master Plan which, approved by the agency, and does not appear in these ROPS. The tenant improvements to the Renaissance Community Space (249) promised and funded a decade ago remains the "community benefit" tenants for funding of this long completed housing project.

The proposed expenditure for the surface parking lot fencing (366) is no longer relevant and can be eliminated.

These projects were prioritized originally through a detailed public assessment review by the former North Park PAC and represent the best use of public bond proceeds for the collective better good of the North Park Community (Attachment 2). The NPCC has reviewed and concurs still with these projects as a valuable use of original redevelopment funds directed towards the benefit and improvement of North Park.

Sincerely,

Vicki Grammett Chair NPCC

Attachment 1 - Redevelopment Disposition ROPS III
Attachment 2 - North Park PAC Project Funding Prioritization

cc: Councilmember Todd Gloria
    State Assemblymember Toni Atkins
Councilmember Todd Gloria  
202 C St  
San Diego, CA 92101  

August 21, 2012  

Re: Social Cycles  

Honorable Councilmember Todd Gloria:  

Recently, the North Park Planning Committee (NPPC) has received a number of inquiries and complaints regarding Social Cycles operation in North Park. Specifically with regard to their noise and other impacts when parking in residential areas, and concerns about their safety, licensing, etc.  

A Social Cycle “is a 16 person manually powered bicycle, with a maximum speed of 5 to 8 miles an hour, with navigation provided by an employee. Passengers must be 21 yr. old and sign a waiver. There is no safety equipment required by the operators and no drinking is allowed while on the cycle.  

The NPPC believes that, like pedicabs, social cycles will become a very popular activity and tourist attraction which could add to the ambience of a commercial district. While Social Cycles look like a lot of fun, without regulations specific to these vehicles, along with appropriate City processing, regulating and enforcement, they have the potential to become one more battleground between business and residents, particularly those living in the CN1-2 Transitional Zone. We hope to avoid this scenario with early intervention.  

While Social Cycles have run in Amsterdam as well as locations in the United States, they are new to San Diego, which was recently the site of their West Coast launch. According to the Social Cycle’s website: http://socialcyclesd.com/ they are currently “hosting tours throughout San Diego”. However, the only defined routes on the website are in Council District Three (see addendum below). They are:  

- North Park  
- South Park  
- Bankers Hill  
- Hillcrest  
- University Heights  

*Downtown, while not a defined route is prominently featured on the website.  

If you review the routes listed on the Social Cycles website, you will note they only list restaurants and bars. There also appear to be plans to expand into other council districts, so this will likely become a citywide issue at some point. From North Park’s past experience with party buses, we feel it is important to pre-empt or at least mitigate potential problems with these vehicles, rather than waiting for the obvious to occur.  

DSD has referred us to the Pedicabs ordinance for guidance. Municipal Code 83.0101 which states:
"The Council finds that pedicabs are a popular form of non-motorized transportation in San Diego. This Division is enacted in response to concerns due to the increasing prevalence of pedicabs. It is necessary to enact regulations governing pedicabs, operators, and owners to protect the health, safety and welfare of the general public, and passengers using pedicabs. It is further the intent of this Division to facilitate the safe, orderly flow of traffic and to relieve congestion and traffic hazards associated with pedicab use."

The NPPC finds much to be consistent with the purpose and rules for operation of pedicabs and the social cycles. However, there are several unanswered questions and some possible discrepancies. These include but are not limited to:

1) §83.0103-§83.0104  The Application and Permitting Process
   a) Are the cycles going through the application process defined as in §83.0103-§83.0107 & §83.0115
   b) Are they being issued a Decal, so the public knows they are legitimate, are insured and have agreed to comply with all City rules & regulations?
   c) Is proof of insurance being checked?

2) §83.0125 Prohibitions on the Manner of Operating Pedicabs
   (a) It is unlawful to operate, or for any owner to allow to be operated, a pedicab during the hours of darkness, without using battery-operated taillights mounted on the right and left, respectively, at the same level on the rear exterior of the passenger compartment. Taillights shall be red in color and plainly visible from all distances within 500 feet to the rear of the pedicab.
   • Has the City made sure these public safety rules are in place and functional for Social Cycles?
   (b) It is unlawful to operate a pedicab on a City street with a posted speed limit in excess of 25 miles per hour unless the pedicab is operated within a class II bike lane.
   • 30th street between South and North Park will have a stretch of posted 30 miles an hour. (Change has been approved and publicly noticed we are just waiting for installation). How will this be handled?
   (g) It is unlawful to operate a pedicab unless all passengers are restrained by seatbelt. (*See also §83.0125 Equipment Regulations for Pedicabs)
   • Social Cycles do not have seat belts or any other type of restraining device. Given the fact the current focus is on providing a "bar/restaurant crawl" (See Attachment 1 for tour stops taken from the website) there is a high degree of likelihood that occupants will become intoxicated.
   • On the Social Cycles FAQ, in answer to the question, "Have there been problems in the past with people falling off?" the response was, "To our knowledge, in the 11 years that now more than 20 bikes have been in operation across multiple cities and growing, only 1 significant injury has been reported. The person decided to jump off while the bike was moving, fell, and broke an ankle. Hence, our strict rule: Do NOT attempt to get off the bike while it's moving!"
   It is difficult to know what would be "best practices" to insure the safety of Social Cycles' customers. We ask that some study of this issue be conducted by the appropriate City Departments.

3) §83.0110 Pedicab Parking
   (a) To provide drop off and pick up areas for pedicabs, the City Manager may locate and designate Pedicab Parking Zones within the Restricted Pedicab Zones.
   • North Park does not have designated parking spaces for pedicabs; this section needs to be amended to more specifically deal with parking issues related to social cycles.
   (d) It is unlawful to park a pedicab in a metered parking space.
   • The ordinance prohibits pedicabs from parking at meter spots. This should be reevaluated for social cycles since their operations are scheduled in advance and do not set idle waiting for a fare.

4) Allowable Pedicab Permits
   i) Will cycles be included in the pedicabs lottery process?
ii) Do they fall within the pedicab maximum number of allowable permits per year?

iii) Does this mean there will be fewer permits available for pedicabs?

iv) If there are no more permits available this year, how can any social cycles be permitted under the pedicab ordinance?

v) This section of the ordinance needs review and amending to establish permit limits based on DSD’s ruling that social cycles fall under the Pedicab Ordinance.

5) The Drop Off and Loading Issues for Social Cycles are substantially different from pedicabs.
   - This topic should be studied, and the ordinance amended to address those differences.
   - Currently the cycles are being loaded and unloaded in residential areas, creating unsafe conditions as well as annoyance when, for example, the operators block a resident’s driveway. We ask that this practice be studied and considered for prohibition.

6) Music: The Social Cycle is equipped with a radio, CD player and iPod jack or passengers can bring their own items to play.
   a) How loud is the music allowed to be?
   b) Can customers bring and use their own equipment?

7) Process for Managing Inebriated Customers
   a) What kind of training will the Captains have in dealing with issues related to excessive alcohol usage? How would excessive usage be defined for the operator?
   b) What kind of authority will the Captains have? If there are disruptive passengers on the cycle would there be some kind of clause required by the City and to be included in the rental agreement between the social cycle company and the passengers that says something like, “the Captain will call a taxi and have any offending parties returned to the social cycle rental site at the offender’s expense?”
   c) What responsibility will the operator have when he notices a customer has become dangerously drunk? This is a complex issue, since the cycles themselves do not serve alcohol but in a sense they could be seen as facilitating alcohol consumption.
      i) Do the operators receive specialized training to deal with the kinds of public safety issues that arise when you have alcohol as a factor? For example will the owners of the company require operators to attend training on hospitality issues, as many bar owners require of their employees currently?
      ii) Will these operators be held legally liable, much as bars are if they allow a customer who is clearly inebriated to get in a car drunk and cause an accident?
      iii) Do DUI laws apply and if so how? While, there is a 'captain' that steers the vehicle, the 'power' of the vehicle is provided by passengers peddling, it seems that alcohol influence would certainly apply somehow. Please clarify.
      iv) We realize there are differences between bars which serve alcohol and the cycles which convey customers between bars/restaurants, but these factors need clarification to insure the safety of the social cycle’s customers and the communities with in which they operate.

For all these reasons, the NPPC asks that Development Services Department, the City Attorney and the San Diego Police Department clarify and provide direction on the topics covered above. We further recommend the Pedicabs Ordinance be amended to address specific issues related to social cycles. Our goal is to have the Social Cycles business operate successfully and safely, while protecting our citizens and mitigating impacts to residential areas. The NPPC is available to assist in these goals. Thank you for your attention to this business, tourism, quality of life and public safety matter.

Sincerely,
Vicki Granowitz Chair NPPC

Attachment 1: Information & picture taken from social Cycle website
Attachment 2: Social Cycle Continuing impacts on North Park Area from effected residents

cc Jan Goldsmith, City Attorney
    Chief William Landsdowne, San Diego Chief of Police
    Kelly Broughton, Director of Development Services
    San Diego CRO Jenny Hall
    Angela Landsberg, Executive Director NPMS
    Joe LaCava, Chair CPC
    Beth Jaworski, Chair Uptown Planners
    Pat Shields, Chair Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee
    Ernie Bonn, University Heights CDC
Routes

With 2 bikes in operation in San Diego, the Social Cycle currently offers tours in North/South Park; Bankers Hill/Hillcrest and Hillcrest/University Heights.

**North/South Park Route:** Starts and Ends near 29th and University (behind West Coast Tavern). Some stops include (but are not limited to): Bluefoot, Mosaic, True North, Bar Pink, West Coast Tavern, URBN, U-31, Toronado, The Office, Ritual, Tiger Tiger, Station Tavern, Whistlestop, Rose's Wine Bar and Stone Brewery Tasting Room.

**Bankers Hill/Hillcrest:** Starts and Ends near 5th and Laurel and heads North and West of 5th Ave. Some stops include (but are not limited to): Cucina Urbana, Avenue 5, Barrio Star, Jimmy Carters, The Caliph, Nunu's, The Loft, Tractor Room, R Gang Eatery, Busalacchi's, Babycakes, Fiesta Cantina and Mo's.

**Hillcrest/University Heights:** Starts and Ends near Vermont and Richmond. Some stops include (but are not limited to): Wine Steals, Eden, Baja Betty's, Ruby Room, The Alibi, Gossip Grill, Bourbon Street, Small Bar, Lei Lounge, Lancers and Cheers.

Pending traffic and parking, the Social Cycle can pretty much make stop at all of the above places along these routes.

**Custom routes in other areas are available!** Please call us at 619.846.9436 or e-mail info@socialcyclesd.com for customized route information and rates.

(619) 846-9436
Social Cycle continuing impact on North Park area        April 14, 2012

April 14  3:03 P.M. Officers at 3417 T, fatality occurred (Officer Rodriguez in car 40).
Officers left and Social Cycle vehicle continued on its way throughout the community about 3:30 PM.

Cycle vehicle parked on 63rd St near North Park Way while clean-up was continued (Officer 3:20 - 3:40 PM)

Cycle vehicle recovered on Kansas St at Park St, while preparing to respond with Officer Tovar (April 14  3:50 - 4:00 PM)

Social vehicle being used to load truck on 32nd St. Social Cycle continues throughout area, including on 30th (depicted)

Social vehicle being used to load truck on 32nd St. Social Cycle continues throughout area, including on 30th (depicted)
Ownership Disclosure Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Type:</th>
<th>Neighbhood Use Permit</th>
<th>Concept Development Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Development Permit</td>
<td>Site Development Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tentative Map</td>
<td>Vesting Tentative Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Title: Sprat Nextel University Ave.

Project No.: For City Use Only

3810 Banker

Part I - To be completed when property is held by individual(s)

By signing the Ownership Disclosure Statement, the owner(s) acknowledge that an application for a permit, lease or other realty at an identified location will be filed with the City of San Diego on the subject property. The applicant or owner shall be responsible for any consequences of the application. Please list below the owner(s) and tenant(s) (if applicable) of the above-referenced property. The list must include the names and addresses of all persons who have an interest in the property, whether personal or otherwise, and state the type of property interest (e.g., owner, lessee who will benefit from the permit, all individuals who own the property). A signature is required of at least one of the property owners. Attach additional pages if needed. A signature from the Assistant Executive Director of the San Diego Redevelopment Agency shall be required for all project parcels for which a Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) has been approved or executed by the City Council. Note: The applicant is responsible for notifying the Project Manager of any changes in ownership during the time the application is being processed or considered. Changes in ownership due to be given to the Project Manager at least thirty days prior to any public hearing on the subject property. Failure to provide accurate and current ownership information could result in a delay in the hearing process.

Additional pages attached: [ ] Yes [ ] No

Name of Individual (Type or Print):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Tenant/Lessee</th>
<th>Redevelopment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No:</td>
<td>Fax No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Individual (Type or Print):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Tenant/Lessee</th>
<th>Redevelopment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No:</td>
<td>Fax No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Individual (Type or Print):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Tenant/Lessee</th>
<th>Redevelopment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No:</td>
<td>Fax No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of Individual (Type or Print):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Tenant/Lessee</th>
<th>Redevelopment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone No:</td>
<td>Fax No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


53-918 (6-06)
### ATTACHMENT 9

**Part II - To be completed when property is held by a corporation or partnership**

#### Legal Status (please check):
- [ ] Corporation
- [ ] Limited Liability
- [ ] General

#### Corporate/Partnership Name (type or print):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate/Partnership Name (type or print):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What State?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By signing the Ownership Disclosure Statement, the owner(s) acknowledge that an application for a permit, map or other matter, as identified above, will be filed with the City of San Diego on the subject property with the intent to record an encumbrance against the property. Please list below the names, titles and addresses of all persons who have an interest in the property, recorded or otherwise, and state the type of property interest (e.g., tenants who will benefit from the permit, all corporate officers, and all partners in a partnership who own the property). A signature is required of at least one of the corporate officers or partners who own the property. Attach additional pages if needed. Note: The applicant is responsible for notifying the Project Manager of any changes in ownership during the time the application is being processed or considered. Changes in ownership are to be given to the Project Manager at least thirty days prior to any public hearing on the subject property. Failure to provide accurate and current ownership information could result in a delay in the hearing process. Additional pages attached: [Yes / No]

---

#### Corporate/Partnership Name (type or print):

1. **Owner**
   - Tenants/Lessees
   - Street Address: 2810 Bankers St.
   - City/State/Zip: San Diego CA 92104
   - Phone No.: 442-383-5471
   - Name of Corporate Officer/Partner: Stuart Cogdell
   - Title: Manager
   - Signature: Date: 7/3/2002

2. **Owner**
   - Tenants/Lessees
   - Street Address: 2810 Bankers St.
   - City/State/Zip: San Diego CA 92104
   - Phone No.: 442-383-5471
   - Name of Corporate Officer/Partner: Stuart Cogdell
   - Title: Manager
   - Signature: Date: 7/3/2002

3. **Owner**
   - Tenants/Lessees
   - Street Address: 2810 Bankers St.
   - City/State/Zip: San Diego CA 92104
   - Phone No.: 442-383-5471
   - Name of Corporate Officer/Partner: Stuart Cogdell
   - Title: Manager
   - Signature: Date: 7/3/2002
SPRINT EXECUTIVES

- Dan Hesse, Chief Executive Officer
- Joseph J. Euteneuer, Chief Financial Officer
- Matt Carter, President, Sprint Enterprise Solutions
- Michael Schwartz, Senior Vice President, Corporate and Business Development
- Steve Elfman, President of Network, Technology and Operations
- Bob Johnson, President-Sprint Retail and Chief Service and Information Technology Officer
- Bill Malloy, Chief Marketing Officer
- Sandra J. Price, Senior Vice President, Human Resources
- Bill White, Senior Vice President, Corporate Communications and Corporate Social Responsibility
- Charles Wunsch, Senior Vice President, General Counsel, Corporate Secretary and Chief Ethics Officer
- Dow Draper, President, Prepaid
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Sprint Nextel
SD35XC067 – University Ave, North Park Baptist Church
Photo Survey
Key Map
1. View of North Elevation of site.
2. View of South Elevation of site.
3. View of East Elevation of site.
4. View of West Elevation of site.
5. View looking North from site.
6. View looking East from site.
7. View looking South from site.
8. View looking West from site.
1. Description of the location, type, capacity, field strength or power density and calculated geographic service area of the proposed antenna or antenna array.

**LOCATION AND TYPE**
Sprint Nextel is renewing an existing WCF consisting of 11 antennas, 6 equipment cabinets at mezzanine level and 1 GPS. This existing facility is unmanned, operating 24 hours a day. The only visits to the site will consist of any emergency calls as well as regular maintenance visits once every four to six weeks.

**FREQUENCY AND POWER SPECIFICATIONS**
The transmitting frequency is 1990-1995 MHz and the receiving frequency is 1910-1915 MHz.

**COVERAGE AND CAPACITY**
The objective of this existing site is to provide coverage to the residential areas surrounding University Ave. and Bancroft. Please refer to the coverage map for existing coverage gap.

2. Location of all existing, proposed and anticipated wireless telecommunications facilities in the Applicant/Permittee's network located within a 1 mile radius from proposed site.

Please refer to justification and coverage maps.

3. A description of how the proposed facility fits into, and is a necessary part of the Applicant/Permittee's network.

The objective of this existing site is to provide coverage to the residential areas surrounding University Ave. and Bancroft. Please refer to the coverage maps for an illustration of the existing coverage gap.

4. If the proposal does not include collocation, written documentation of all efforts made to collocate at another site, and a justification for the decision not to collocate.

This site is an existing WCF. Sprint will not be collocating with any other carrier.

5. Discuss alternative sites and why they were not selected.

No alternative sites were selected due to this site being an existing site.
Sprint Nextel University Ave Site Justification Map

No collocations or alternative sites due to this being an existing site.
Coverage with SD35XC067

LEGEND
- In Building Coverage
- In Vehicle Coverage
- On Street Coverage
DATE OF NOTICE: December 4, 2013

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

HEARING OFFICER

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

DATE OF HEARING: December 18, 2013
TIME OF HEARING: 8:30 A.M.
LOCATION OF HEARING: Council Chambers, 12th Floor, City Administration Building, 202 C Street, San Diego, California 92101
PROJECT TYPE: SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, PROCESS 3
PROJECT NO: 242203
PROJECT NAME: SPRINT – UNIVERSITY AVENUE
APPLICANT: CAITLYN KES, DEPRATI, INC., AGENTS REPRESENTING SPRINT
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: GREATER NORTH PARK
COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 3
CITY PROJECT MANAGER: Alex Hempton, Development Project Manager
PHONE NUMBER/E-MAIL: (619) 446-5349 / ahempton@sandiego.gov

As a property owner, tenant, or person who has requested notice, please be advised that the Hearing Officer will hold a public hearing to approve, conditionally approve, or deny an application for a Site Development Permit (SDP) for a Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) consisting of panel antennas located on the roof of an existing building, concealed behind radio-frequency transparent screening. Equipment associated with the antennas is located in an equipment area integrated with the existing building. The project is located at 3810 Bancroft Street, on the North Park Baptist Church.

The decision of the Hearing Officer is final unless appealed to the Planning Commission. In order to appeal the decision you must be present at the public hearing and file a speaker slip concerning the application or have expressed interest by writing to the Hearing Officer before the close of the public hearing. The appeal must be made within 10 working days of the Hearing Officer’s decision. Please do not e-mail appeals as they will not be accepted. See Information Bulletin 505 “Appeal Procedure”, available at www.sandiego.gov/development-services or in person at the Development Services Department, located at 1222 First Avenue, 3rd Floor, San Diego, CA 92101. The decision made by the Planning Commission is the final decision by the City.
This project was determined to be categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act on October 23, 2013 and the opportunity to appeal that determination ended November 15, 2013.

If you wish to challenge the City's action on the above proceedings in court, you may be limited to addressing only those issues you or someone else have raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or written in correspondence to the City at or before the public hearing. If you have any questions after reviewing this notice, you can call the City Project Manager listed above.

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request. To request an agenda in alternative format or to request a sign language or oral interpreter for the meeting, call Support Services at (619) 321-3208 at least five working days prior to the meeting to insure availability. Assistive Listening Devices (ALD's) are also available for the meeting upon request.

Internal Order Number: 24001891
Revised 04/08/10 HRD
Product Description:

This 3G Transport Antenna is a result of extensive design and advanced engineering to provide unmatched performance. It is designed to provide exceptional performance over a wide range of applications.

Specifications:

- Variable unobstructed down - provides enhanced performance in controlling inter-site interference. This feature is adjustable 0-18 degrees.
- High separation of all upper side lobes (Option N = 1001)
- Low profile for low visual impact
- Dual polarization
- Broadband design
- Optional 2G, 3G, 4G, and/or compatible antenna control unit - add -0412 suffix

Technical Specifications:

- Antenna Type: Dual Band
- Frequency Range: 1700/2100 MHz
- Operating Band: 1700/2100 MHz
- Gain: 8 dBi
- Polarization: Dual Polarity
- Azimuth: ± 10°
- Elevation: ± 5°
- Maximum Power: 1000 Watts
- Operating Temperature: -40°C to +55°C
- Environmental Conditions: IP67

External Document Links:

- APXV9013-C
- FRS The Clear Choice
- APXV9013-C Series P1
- Product Bulletin
- Antenna & RRH's Specifications
- Issue Status:
- No. 1
- No. 2
- No. 3
- No. 4
- No. 5

Antenna & RRH's Specifications:

- Antenna Type: Dual Band
- Frequency Range: 1700/2100 MHz
- Operating Band: 1700/2100 MHz
- Gain: 8 dBi
- Polarization: Dual Polarity
- Azimuth: ± 10°
- Elevation: ± 5°
- Maximum Power: 1000 Watts
- Operating Temperature: -40°C to +55°C
- Environmental Conditions: IP67

Alcatel-Lucent
PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT, THE PERMITTEE SHALL INCORPORATE ANY CONSTRUCTION BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES الجو) 10 COMPLY WITH SECTION 14, ARTICLE 2, ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES OF THE CITY'S STORM WATER CODE, INTO THE CONSTRUCTION PLAN AS SUBMITTED.

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT, THE PERMITTEE SHALL SUBMIT A WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN (WQCP). THE WQCP SHALL BE PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES IN APPENDIX E OF THE CITY'S STORM WATER CODE.

ANY PARTY ON WHOM EQC CATJONS, RESERVATIONS, OR OTHER EXACTIOnS HAVE BEEN IMPOSED AS CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN MAY BE REQUESTED TO PREPARE A SYSTEM PLAN WITH THE CITY CLARK PERMIT TO COMPLY WITH THE CITY'S STORM WATER CODE.

APPROVALS:

ISSUE STATUS:

A2 ROOF PLAN