

CLAIREMONT COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP (CCPG)

January 15, 2013

6:30 p.m.

Clairemont Friendship Senior Center

4425 Bannock Avenue, South of Clairemont Mesa Boulevard off Genesee Avenue

PUBLIC NOTICE AND AGENDA

***NOTE:** Times assigned for each item are approximate for allocating agenda time. Order of agenda items may be modified at the beginning of the meeting at the discretion of the chair.

Item 1 - 6:30 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Item 2 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT - Issues that are not on the agenda and are within the jurisdiction of the Clairemont Community Planning Group. NOTE: 3-minute time limit per speaker.

Item 3 MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA - Requires 2/3 approval.

Item 4 APPROVAL OF OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER 2012 MINUTES

Item 5 District 6 – Council Representative Report (Ernie Navarro, Community Liaison, enavarro@sandiego.gov)

Item 6 INFORMATION ITEM:

101. Mid-Coast Transit Corridor Project Update (Kristen Byrne, SANDAG)

Item 7 WORKSHOP ITEM:

None.

Item 8 ACTION ITEMS:

301. Balboa Mesa Shopping Center Expansion (John Ziebarth, Ziebarth & Associates)

302. CCPG Vision Task Force Update (Jack Carpenter, CCPG Task Force Chair)

Item 9 REPORTS TO COMMITTEE:

City Department:	Staff Contact:
Development Services Department	Brian Schoenfisch: (619) 533-6457 BSchoenfisch@sandiego.gov

Community Organizations Reports	
Clairemont Town Council – Delanah Hardacre	North Bay Redevelopment Committee – Jeff Barfield
BACAC - Billy Paul	Transportation – Billy Paul

Officer and Committee Reports	
Chair - Brooke Peterson	Secretary - Jeff Barfield
Vice Chair - Fiona Theseira	Treasurer - Susan Mournian
CPC Report - Jeff Barfield	Parking - Susan Mournian
Vision Task Force - Jack Carpenter	Airports - Vacant
Project Review - Jack Carpenter	

8:00 ADJOURNMENT (Approximate Time)

NEXT MEETING: February 19, 2013

Sub-Committee Meetings may be held and are open to the public.

Agendas and meeting minutes can be found at

<http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/clairmontmesa/agendas.shtml>

For further information regarding agenda items or sub-committee meetings, please contact the Chair at (858) 336-0938 or send e-mail to thepetes@hotmail.com.

Clairemont Community Planning Committee

Taskforce for a New Community Planning Vision

Amended 2 December 2012

The following is a summary of comments and suggestions developed by the members of the Visioning Task Force. The Task Force composed of several Committee members who met several times in open meetings to develop a strategy that the CCPC could consider for adoption as guidelines in the absence of a badly needed updated Clairemont Community Plan. The ideas are strictly suggestions to the CCPC and are not intended to be adopted without thorough discussion and Committee Vote. Further any ideas should be reviewed by our City Planning Representatives before they are implemented.

Changes and additions

New changes and additions are highlighted in red italics for Committee review

Preamble

Over the years, the most controversial subject we have faced has been the ability to control density and height. The Community has in the past and still wants to retain the residential character of our neighborhoods. The idea of having apartments mixed into our single family areas is unacceptable to the community. ~~That said our planner, Brian Schoenfisch, tells us that the R-1 neighborhoods are protected from economic pressure to build up. Non-the-less~~ We are going to continue to see development pressure and increased traffic. This increased traffic has resulted in the neighborhoods demanding added stop signs to keep arterial traffic off their residential streets.

The more we can encourage folks to use public transportation the better the quality of life for our community. To be efficient, public transportation needs frequent, accessible routes supported by lots of riders close to each stop. With few exceptions, this is something we don't have in Clairemont. Allowing denser development along transportation corridors will solve our transportation issue and defend ourselves from the economic pressure that will come as San Diego's population continues to grow. If there is an advantage for Clairemont in the Mid Coast Trolley extension it is to get some of the traffic from other communities including UTC off the freeways we share with them.

We need to be pro-active and not reactive on the growth issue or without a plan we will be victims of mounting economic pressure for growth in areas where we don't want it.

Transportation/Mobility

Major transportation corridors including Clairemont Drive, Clairemont Mesa Blvd, Balboa Avenue and Mt. Acadia were not intended to receive the high volume of traffic they are experiencing. Clairemont Drive passes in front of housing duplexes and single-family residences. This creates a safety hazard for the children associated with those homes. Balboa doubles as an artillery highway and a high traffic-shopping street. Mt Acadia, a two-lane street is a major collector that passes several pedestrian sensitive activities including churches, schools, ball fields, retail and single-family residences. Several stop signs have been added to this street to act as a Band-Aid to the traffic problem. Alternate routes to collector streets have been used to avoid congestion. An example is Cowley Way, which parallels the, rush hour, congested Clairemont Drive. Several of these alternative routes have added speed bumps and stop signs. This was a desperate means to control the intrusion of increased traffic.

The collectors were intended to be in canyons. Fortunately the canyons have been protected but this has impacted many of the major streets.

Public transportation is crippled since the frequency and destinations do not efficiently serve the community. Jobs have moved away from the Cities' concentrated old industrial/commercial core. The new centers of employment are scattered across the North City/County with very fragmented bus service.

Most existing routes run North and South intending to serve the major employment/education centers.

Traffic along Balboa is both community and non-community based. The through traffic was intended to be diverted to Highway 52 for non-community vehicles. This has not happened. The associated strip commercial development further erodes the ability to promote neighborhood and community identity. See the Balboa Ave Plan for specifics of the needed changes.

We recommend the CCPC consider an inner community shuttle loop using the major collector streets to provide access to neighborhood resources for community members including students and the elderly. This could also serve as a collector for the future Trolley stations at the foot of Balboa Ave. and Clairemont Drive *as well as express bus service to downtown, UCSD and UTC*. Further this would allow the relocation of housing along those shuttle routes to accommodate the residents that are dependent on public transportation and promote future high frequency public transportation. See the housing portion of the report for details on recommended restrictions on multifamily housing.

Pedestrian/Bicycle access and circulation

With increased vehicle traffic bicycle safety, especially for children, becomes a major concern. The City's bicycle map of Clairemont is very limited as are the mapping services such as Google. The Community Plan's bicycle plan should be updated.

Finding safe routes is of major importance.

Pedestrian access is tied to available public transportation and access to community services. With improved public transportation and the development of live/work environments pedestrian access could be dramatically improved. With the potential for people to be able to work at home via the internet the need for a car will decline. Neighborhood shopping centers such as the one on Mt Acadia could be reenergized for this purpose. This will allow residents to get access to essential services without the use of an automobile.

Urban Design

There needs to be better community identity. A better "sense of place". Participation in the Cities Fine Arts Master Plan should be encouraged. Walkable neighborhoods as defined in the current Community Plan should continue to be a priority.

Public facilities

The communities' infrastructure needs significant repair and improvements. Aging fire stations and libraries are a case in point. Some of these improvements could be tied to future development. An example was the potential of trading an on-site library at Clairemont Village for the residential developable land at the current adjacent library site.

Future growth must be tied to adequate utility infrastructure.

Better coordination needs to be encouraged between the City and the City Schools Planning.

Recreation/Open Space

Clairemont's System, of Canyons including Rose, Marian Bear and Tecolote Canyons are important community assets that must continue to be protected. While the potential to relocate the utilities out of the canyon is probably a long way off due to the attended cost, we need to minimize the impact on the canyons due to continuing repairs. We should defer our comments regarding Tecolote Canyon to the Canyon's Planning Committee. Nonetheless they should be encouraged to review and incorporate the award winning Canyon Lands proposal. Balancing access and public safety is a major canyon concern

Conservation

Not Discussed except as identified above

Noise

Not discussed

Historic Preservation

Clairemont needs to celebrate its past to encourage community identity. This includes the historic churches such as Pioneer, St Marks and others. *Other examples include* the old dairy and the revenue's station in Bay Park. Plaques, monuments and descriptions help to build pride in the community.

Housing

The City's goal of community growth over the next twenty years appears to be easily accommodated by the current community accepted plans, specifically along Morena Boulevard and adjacent to Clairemont Village.

The City of Villages outlined in the Specific Framework Plan is a worthy goal but without adequate infrastructure it is impractical in Clairemont for the foreseeable future. Specific areas of concern include the lack of effective public transportation, poor collector streets and adequate public utilities.

Higher Density housing could be accommodated adjacent to major Freeways where access, public transportation and utilities are more available. If such sites were large enough, a Village concept could be accommodated.

An example of a potential small viable village would be the shopping area along Morena Boulevard in Bay Park.

There is a large area of duplex development *adjacent to Clairemont Drive* that could be redeveloped at a slightly higher density but affording more open space at a decreased floor area ratio.

Senior housing, especially along transportation corridors, should be encouraged. Special regulations regarding reduced area per unit and parking will work only if the City can maintain the senior-only occupancy.

Tandem parking should not be allowed until such time that public transportation is adequate enough to insure the occupants will not, out of frustration, park one car on the street further exacerbating street parking congestion.

Higher density mixed-use conversion of existing shopping centers should be encouraged if provisions are made for adequate onsite parking, shade and noise protection *provided* for adjacent housing. *Such projects should include amenities that would benefit the residents and the community such as parks/open space and children's play areas.* By allowing increase height at these locations the single family character of the existing community could be maintained without external pressure for uncontrolled growth in the community.

Companion Units (Granny Flats), if structured properly, could be a great asset to Clairemont. It would allow seniors to remain in their homes by subletting the primary or secondary residence. It would allow seniors or children to live with their families in a semi independent environment. It could be a simple way to create affordable housing and help to relieve pressure on demand for increased density. That said. There needs to be restrictions as to the size of the units and onsite parking. The current City of San Diego requirements are too restrictive, requiring oversized lots to consider a companion unit.

In general, Clairemont should maintain its single family, low density character but allow growth along major corridors where seniors, the disabled and youth could access public facilities via improved public transportation. By allowing controlled growth along these corridors, we can resist external pressure for growth in undesirable areas while accommodating the needs of our citizens.

Land Use

Both commercial office and industrial uses should be encouraged in Clairemont. The more people who live and work in our community the lesser the impact on our infrastructure particularly *the streets*. That said there are considerable industrial areas at the north and north east portion of our community. Heavy industry is unlikely and should be discouraged as the citizenry wishes to protect its bedroom community environment. Light industry and in particular research (R and D) related industry should be encouraged. Several corridors are suitable for office and or research. Of particular note is the Morena Boulevard corridor adjacent to Interstate 5. Any office or research facility should be located near freeways to preclude out of community employees from having to traverse our already congested streets.

As Clairemont becomes more diverse, the neighborhood school concept should be reinforced. As the City meets its integration mandates magnet schools should return to neighborhood schools to reduce bussing cost and to reinforce the children's sense of community.

Where possible, closed school property should be returned to public use such as parks and recreation centers.

Future schools should include adequate parking and loading zones for student pick up and drop off.

The Community Planning Committee should be more vigilant and coordinate planning with the School District.

With the establishment of the Mid-coast Trolley, the area adjacent to the Seaworld Drive stop is a particular opportunity for new mixed use development.