

Special Meeting of August 26, 2015--Urban Design and Implementation Elements of the Community Plan Update

Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Present: Ruchell Alvarez (Chair), David Strickland (Vice Chair), Cheryl Brierton, Mike Burkhart (Elections), Janice Davis, Sabrina DiMinico, Richard Santini, Melissa Sierocki, David Swarens

Absent: Pastor Thomas Sims

Staff: Tait Galloway (Principal Planner), Bernie Turgeon (Senior City Planner)

GGHPC Members Elect: Dr Andrew Zakarian, Victoria Curran, Melinda Lee,

Members of the Public

1. Burkhart announced the election results: Azakarian, Richard Baldwin, Curran, Lee

2. Action by the Chair: There will be further discussion of the issues from the 8/12/15 and 8/26/15 Special Meetings (relating to Urban Design and Implementation) at the September 9, 2015 meeting (as well as action on the Recreation, Land Use and Mobility Elements.

Issues for further discussion: Urban Forestry, section 3.53 (noise control in residential/commercial zone overlaps Parking, Discretionary triggers, Setbacks, Billboards)

3. Action by GGHPC:

A. Comments of members on the Urban Design Element, as they appear in the draft minutes of August 12, 2015, are adopted as comments of this Committee. Motion by Strickland, second by DiMinico. Motion carried, unanimous.

(Note: The referenced comments are reproduced at the end of these minutes.)

B. Motion by Alvarez to add Swarens' additional comments withdrawn, to give GGHPC members time to review them further, prior to adoption

3. Urban Design Element--Additional comments by:

****GGHPC member Swarens:**

--Page 54, UD-2.8 Some vintage commercial, such as the mission revival "mall" on 25th street and the Safeway on Fern (Target Express site) are potentially historic and have an architectural character which should be appreciated and restored, rather than "redesigned"

--Page 55, UD-2 Perhaps this would be an appropriate spot to include street light design as an element in streetscape standards. The traditional "acorn" style pedestrian oriented design should be specified for much of the community (per previous discussions). This appears in the HP element, for proposed districts, but would be appropriate to include here also.**

**--Page 56, Figure 4-1, UD Concept Map
Additional View Corridors and Park Interfaces should be noted, to include 25th street, Ash, Beech, Cedar, north to at least Grape. Most of these are both Park Interface and View corridors.**

**--Page 57, UD -2.19,
suggests "truncated" or otherwise short or shortened; another approach is to raise canopies above sight lines, and allow these features to frame views, this is a traditional design concept in both Euro-American and Asian traditions, which may be worth considering.**

**--Page 60, UD-2.29, A.)This supports my comments on page 56, above.
UD-2.34 This WPA building deserves consideration as an historic structure, bad stucco could be redone in a restoration/rehab.
Perhaps there may be other structures in the complex worthy of consideration for designation and adaptive reuse.**

--Page 61, UD-2.37, the illustration is of fairly recent "contemporary" design, perhaps a more "historic" example could be used to represent "authenticity."

--Page 62, Line 22, states "...as the community develops"--- Most of the Greater Golden Hill community is what would be referred to as a "already developed" community- Plan language should reflect this.

--Page 63. Refers to "above ground"- This should be minimized- flush vault installations should be defined as the community standard.

--Page 65. Add UD2.54- Preserve and require traditional "tighter"

radius at street corner/curbs. this maintains the visual character of our historic area, while providing a low cost/ low tech approach to traffic calming and walkability.

--Page 66, column 2, reconsider recommendations for "accent trees" at street corners, because of various safety considerations.

--Page 68, UD-2.55 revise street tree palate to include trees with higher canopies, in light of undergrounding programs which will eliminate future possible conflicts - this will also minimize current conflicts with refuse collection and other large scale vehicles.

--Page 72, Development Design.

The language should be value neutral to development, balancing conservation and quality appropriate new infill in a very healthy and successful community.

--Page 74, UD-3.17. Add "F". Encourage water wise sustainable design which can provide programmable activity areas (e.g. outdoor dining, play areas, etc.). These areas should be designed, consistent with point "C", so as not to create "heat sinks" which negatively impact the livability of the site (and the surrounding community).

--Page 79. Reconsider the (important) design standards re awnings- the text suggests a limit of 20' max, while the historic illustration show an appropriately 49' long overhang. I did not have a specific recommendation, and twenty feet does seem to relate to the module many of the historic store fronts observe. Perhaps is should relate to the transparency requirement for commercial?

--Page 83. Figure 4.4, Storefront Design Guidelines: Please ad language similar to that on page 80, UD-3.31, "..respect the integrity of style", as many of the storefronts are well designed and historic (or at least vintage).

--Page 86, UD-3.56, good! This should be incorporated in, and should incorporate, issues raised for page 74, UD-3.17

--Page 89. UD-3.70, question re status of existing billboards

**GGHPC member Santini: Nothing to add

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC:

*Matt Settles: Require people to clean their yards or pay to have it donw;

*Tershia D'Elgin: Confirming that her comments of 8/12/15 had been considered by GGHPC

***Susan Swisher: Concerned that single family, low density would be respected in new plan**

***Ron Fritz: South Park Business Committee wants to become involved, especially in zoning-related matters**

4. Implementation Element--

A. STAFF BERNIE TURGEON

***Presented the following considerations on Discretionary Project Review Thresholds**

- **Conversion of the Golden Hill Planned District (PDO) by a combination of application of citywide zones and the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone should address the project review thresholds in the PDO.**

- **The PDO contains a series of thresholds that generally can be categorized into ministerial review (city staff decision) and discretionary review (hearing body decisions with GGHPC recommendation).**

- **Current regulations related to building demolition and project deviations/findings are proposed to be addressed with the interim regulations for historic districts that will be incorporated into the draft community plan Implementation Section with a subsequent draft.**

- **The PDO has two main thresholds for discretionary review:**

- o **Projects where the gross commercial floor area of existing and proposed structures exceeds a floor area ratio of 1.0.**

- o **Residential and mixed residential/ commercial projects which exceed the number of threshold dwelling units in the table below.**

Threshold Dwelling Units

Zone Threshold Units

GH-600 12

GH-1000 7 (7000sf)*

GH-1250 6 (7500)*

GH-1500 3 (5000sf)*

GH-2500 2

GH-3000 2 (6000sf)*

GH-CN and GH-CC 2

*** Standard lot size where threshold kicks-in**

- **Staff proposes that thresholds based upon the number of dwelling units should be converted to measurements for lot size (square feet) or building size (floor area ratio) to relate to the development guidelines in the draft Urban Design Element which are based upon building form not residential density.**

- **A threshold based upon lot size should be in increments of ~7000 square feet as this is the typical lot size in the multi-family zones.**
- **Alternatively, a percentage of maximum floor area ratio can be used to capture the overall building size of a project.**

COMMENTS BY GGHPC MEMBERS:

****Davis: Concerned about street parking. Disagrees with Brierton that Urban Design Streetscape should address streets/parking, as Davis feels it is adequately addressed elsewhere.**

[Principal Planner Galloway indicated staff would look at transit overlay.]

****Swarens: 3 main comments: lower discretionary review trigger; concerns about incentive zone density, need to correct Map p. 172 to show Historic District. Detailed comments:**

-page 166, 11.2-2 Concern about appropriateness and/or desirability of "Incentive Zone Program"

-page 172, Figure 11-1 Concern that the "Curvier well and Taggart" and "South Park" historic districts are not included in the CPIOZ overlay map, as indicated in the HP element on page 150.

-Desire that the threshold for discretionary review should be lower, rather than higher, to encourage the best quality new development/infill in the greater Golden Hill Community.

****Strickland: Parking is a key issue**

****Brierton: Discretionary review needs lower trigger; canyon and hillside protections should extend to landscaping, not just principal residence. Detailed comments:**

Page 166 (11.2-1(d)). City Operations Yard. Pedestrian bridge to Balboa Park?

***Page 167: Add: Lots adjacent to hillsides and canyons shall not be elevated above existing grades for non-drought friendly purposes (such as pools);**

***Page 168: Add; 2nd stories must be angled to avoid eliminating**

neighbors' views of canyons, ocean, bay, Balboa Park as feasible;

***P 169: (11.320(6). Add: Lots abutting on canyons shall not be graded solely for parking purposes;**

***Add (7) Utilities shall minimize grading of canyons/hillsides for access**

***Page 171 (5) Add: Fire Hazard defensible space must be considered (for landscaping as well)**

***Page 174(c) Add: and pedestrian/bikeway on Golf Course Drive, to mitigate impact of increased traffic from anticipated expansion (Should Golf Course Fund be added to chart after this month's California Supreme Court action requiring funding to mitigate traffic?)**

****Serocki:**

***P. 169, 170, facade transparency: correct confusing language re facade transparency/minimum square footage of window space**

****DiMinico:**

***Language is challenging overall.**

***Discretionary review standard should be lower for both residential and commercial**

***Setbacks are too small--need more space.**

***P.166 Does not want added density rewards**

***P. 169 Billboards should be removed**

(Comment by Staff Galloway: Will check with City Attorney re grandfathered billboards.

(Comment by Turgeon: Will research other possible discretionary review triggers.)

****Santini:**

***P. 170 # 11 vs P.167: consideration for double driveways in residential areas next to commercial areas;**

***New businesses should be required to add parking.**

****Alvarez: Possible consideration of residential parking permits?**

Adjourned at 8:30 pm