

ENCANTO NEIGHBORHOODS COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: June 5, 2014 at 6:00PM

Seat	Member	Here?	Seat	Member	Here?
Alta Vista	Marry Young		At-Large	Salimisha Logan	
Broadway Heights	Maxine Sherard		At-Large	Alfredo Ybarra	
Chollas View	Ardelle Matthews		At-Large	Patrick Ambrosio	x
Emerald Hills	Gayle Reid		At-Large	Derryl Williams	x
Encanto-North	Vacant		At-Large	Steve Ward	x
Encanto-South	Kenneth Malbrough	x	At-Large	April Flake	
Lincoln Park	Dorothy James		At-Large	Khalada Salaam-Al	
Valencia Park	Monte Jones	x	At-Large	Vacant	
City Dept.	Name	Here?	Dept	Name	Here?
Planning	Karen Bucey	x	Public	Leslie Dudley	x
Planning	Lara Gates	X			
Planning	Tara Lieberman	x			

Number of Visitors: 1

Sign in Sheet on File: Yes

1. Call to Order at 6:15 PM
2. Introductions of Committee Members, City Staff, and Public attendees.
3. Review of Land use/zoning data (City Staff)

The process of determining land use and zoning began 1.5 years ago. Based on existing conditions, the Euclid and Market Land Use Mobility Study, and the Euclid and Market Gateway Master Plan, City staff and consultants developed land use maps. The focus of new growth and development is centered on the three transit stations in the community. Existing low-density neighborhoods will remain as is. The proposed Land Use maps were presented to the Planning Group in June 2013. The Planning group recommended moving forward with traffic modeling. Civic San Diego requested the consideration of a higher density alternative (45 to 74 dwelling units per acre [du/ac]) on certain land parcels including the Hilltop Site at Imperial and Euclid Avenue. Maximum build-out under the current plan is 18,371 units, 21,541 under the proposed community plan update, and 24,713 under the higher density alternative. Providing parking is a serious consideration. Based on standard parking ratios, 4,640 parking spaces are required

ENCANTO NEIGHBORHOODS COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: June 5, 2014 at 6:00PM

under the proposed community plan, and 7,180 are required under the higher density alternative. By law, a ratio of 2.8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents is required. Based on the proposed plan estimate of 67,254 residents, 188 acres of parkland would be required. Based on the higher density alternative estimate of 78,600 people, 220 acres of parkland would be required. Additional park needs drive up the costs of development impact fees (DIF), and DIFs will only cover between 6 to 10 percent of the costs. To allow for additional density in the Village areas, and to increase flexibility for developers, the City is considering allowing for a transfer of development rights (TDR) within ¼ mile radius of the transit stops. For example, this would allow density to be moved from the Hilltop Site to the MTS Site within the ¼ mile radius.

Question: Were these requests for Civic San Diego properties?

Response: The request was for Civic San Diego and Jacobs owned properties.

Question: Will this process be ministerial? I would want the planning group to be able to review these transfers, and not make it an automatic process.

Response: City Staff is advocating for a Process 2 for the village area, or another determined area. The applicant would be subject to the discretionary process, and the community would be notified of the project.

Question: Would the density be reduced on a parcel in order to increase it to 74 in another location?

Response: Yes, due to site constraints, economics, etc. a site may only be able to develop to 44 du/ac. The developer could then sell the difference. The difference between the allowable density and what they actually built becomes a commodity that can be sold to another property owner to offset the costs.

Comment: Is 74 du/ac even viable? There seem to be too many associated problems with parking, parks, etc. to make this work.

Response: Trying to accommodate the potential possibility through the TDR process. In any larger area, there is always the potential to get a viable project that is at or slightly exceeding the density range.

Comment: If we go with the higher density alternative it would give flexibility to developers to move density around, and still service the community.

Response: Density comes in ranges to allow for flexibility (15 to 29, 30 to 44, 45 to 74), and affordable housing and senior housing bonus allow for a density increase of up to 35 percent. Infrastructure is sized according to the established density ranges. The

ENCANTO NEIGHBORHOODS COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: June 5, 2014 at 6:00PM

ranges allow developers the ability to determine what types of units they want to build (larger family units, etc.). Our concern is balancing to allow for flexibility and what is reasonable for an area. Developers can apply for a discretionary permit to do something over the maximum allowable density. None of the development that occurred to date has come even halfway to the maximum allowable density. To go from single family density to east village density is a big jump.

Comment: The TDR may be calculated into economic development plan of developers, but this may not be guaranteed if projects have to go before planning committee.

Response: Projects would go before planning committee because they will likely be exceeding FAR, height limits, setbacks, etc.

Question: What would be the problem with saying 74 units is the max?

Response: The highest allowable density in the proposed plan is 44 du/ac. Developers will use the affordable housing density bonus to get 60 du/ac. The higher density alternative is a significant change in the development concept for the community.

Comment: The discussion should be about what the community members have to live with over the next 10 to 30 years. Want to have discussion with Planning Group so that we can get to a happy medium. Want to present information to the rest of the people on the board who have not yet seen this information.

Response: We want to ensure that a single family house is not located next to a 6 story building. With a density range, you don't have a Hodge-podge of development and you don't overshadow community character.

Comment: It would be nice to include topographical maps for the community in the plans. It is important in order to show what areas are walkable in the community. The green parkland is not accurate on the land use map.

Response: Jacobs owns land designated as park land on the land use map. There is a general development plan in place, and funding to develop this site will be coming in Fiscal Year 2015.

Question: Is this a disincentive to build fewer units in anticipation of selling the units?

Response: There is a value in building units now, and it is uncertain with future speculation that someone is going to buy it for more later.

ENCANTO NEIGHBORHOODS COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: June 5, 2014 at 6:00PM

Comment: TDR is a potential tool, developers may opt to use affordable housing units, or other bonus. The Planning Group needs to be comfortable with one of the designated land uses, and then use TDR as a marketing tool to attract developers.

ACTION: Requesting electronic version of all documents and tables presented at the meeting. A follow up meeting will be scheduled in the next 5 days to discuss further. The subcommittee will present three choices for recommendation to the Planning Group. The three choices are:

1. Proposed density
2. Higher density Alternative
3. Transfer of development rights option

4. Valencia Business Park land use/zoning

Based on community input, the area between Tubman Chavez to the post office has been designated Business Park and zoned IP 3-1 in the community plan update. This designation allows for light industrial, business, Research and Development, with residential. This industrial base zone has been accepted in the Otay Community Plan by City Council on March 11, 2014. Recently received email from community member expressing concern that the rezoning of this area from L-2-1 to IP 3-1 would not allow retail sales. Approaching the planning group to see what land use/zoning designation the community would like to see in this area.

Question: An Industrial land use designation is preferred by community at meetings. The original intent was light industrial and commercial to bring in jobs and other opportunities for residents to shop. Why are we squeezing residential in a small area? Including residential units in this area sounds like a sweatshop type environment.

Response: The original request for change to IP 3-1 came from the community because they wanted maximum flexibility. The Industrial Park designation also allows for light manufacturing, R &D, business and professional offices and regional and corporate headquarters. It also allows for residential units. The Valencia Business Park was designed, graded, and roads were sized based on it being a business park/industrial park. There are far fewer trips associated with this land use, compared to commercial land use. Adding commercial will trigger adding a second egress entry across the street and potentially the need for additional infrastructure.

Comment: Thinking about the long term use of the land, concerned that Jacob's will sell the property they own if it is kept as a business industrial designation.

ENCANTO NEIGHBORHOODS COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: June 5, 2014 at 6:00PM

Comment: Concerned because it has been designated IL but nothing has been developed in this area. Changing the designation to IP is not going to automatically get the area developed.

Response: The area is currently within the Planned District which triggers a discretionary permit. Think it is the primary reason it has not been developed, has also been wrapped up in other redevelopment issues.

Comment: Could we extend the industrial designation to the other side of the trolley tracks to expand the area, encourage walking, and allow people to work and shop in the area? Make it a larger industrial park to attract more development.

Response: Due to the location of the creek, the area is not going to develop with much density.

Comment: The industrial zone in Encanto is not large enough to attract large companies like those that exist in Poway and Rancho Bernardo which include engineering, R&D type jobs. Want to rezone the orange area adjacent to industrial to attract larger industry.

Response: In North County there are numerous requests to re-designate industrial to commercial because development in these areas is stagnant. If we cannot attract industrial development in North County, we are not sure we can in Encanto. In addition, traffic modeling has been completed for the community and we cannot drastically change the land uses because they have already been vetted.

ACTION: Take time to review and discuss the options. A follow up meeting will be scheduled in the next 5 days to discuss further. The subcommittee will present three choices for recommendation to the Planning Group in 5 to 10 days. The three choices are:

1. Do nothing, accept as proposed zoning as IP-3-1
2. Change all of the area to L-2-1
3. Keep a small portion (the Jacob's parcels) as IP3-1, change rest back to L-2-1

5. Additional Items: Architectural Review Board (Steve Ward)

Propose creating an Architectural Review Board in Encanto Neighborhoods in order to ensure excellence in architecture and create a beautiful built environment. Would like to see this included as a requirement in the Community Plan Update.

Comment: The City is currently in discussions regarding creating a City wide Design Review Committee. Uptown has a Design Review Committee that reviews and helps to

ENCANTO NEIGHBORHOODS COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date: June 5, 2014 at 6:00PM

flesh out designs. We can add language in the community plan that supports the creation of a Architectural Review Board in Encanto Neighborhoods.

Action: The Sub-Committee will put together a formal recommendation for an Architectural Review Board to the Planning Group.

6. Next Meetings:

1. EIR Scoping Meeting – June 17th
2. Park and Recreation Work Shop – June 19th
3. Joint Community Workshop – June 21st
4. Planning Commission Workshop – June 26th

7. Adjournment at 8:40