

GREATER GOLDEN HILL PLANNING COMMITTEE (GGHPC)  
Draft --Minutes of Special Meeting September 23, 2015

Present: Ruchell Alvarez (Chair), David Strickland (Vice-Chair), Cheryl Brierton, Victoria Curran, Janice Davis, Richard Santini, David Swarens, Dr Andrew Zakarian

Absent: Richard Baldwin, Mike Burart, Sabrina DiMinico, Melissa Serocki, Pastor Thomas Sims

Staff Present: Nancy Bragado (Deputy Planning Director), Howard Greenstein (Paks Planner), Bernie Turgeon (Senior Planner)

I. Special Meeting called to order by Chair at 6:30 p.m.

a. Chair Alvarez stated:

- City had granted an extension for GGHPC input to December 2015.
- If review is finished by November, GGHPC would be dark in December.
- October agenda will cover Economic Prosperity, Public Facilities and Conservation Elements.
- November agenda will address the Introduction, Noise, Historic and Implementation sections.

b. Deputy Planning Director Bragado indicated she was there to support staff efforts to address community concerns and input, to ensure that Community Plan Updates are completed in a timely way.

A. LAND USE ELEMENT OF DRAFT GGH PLAN UPDATE

1. Public Comment-continued from prior meeting 9/9/15

a. Ben Anderson, owner of property at 32nd/C proposed for GGH park in Draft Plan Update

- Objects to land use proposed change from 15-29 units to 10-14 units
- May try to develop a project with surrounding owners, for a total of 3.86 acres. This could result in over 100 units.
- Not interested in City park on his property at this time

After GGHPC members expressed concerns about view and wildlife corridors, traffic, and benefit of park to community, Turgeon stated he would get the traffic analysis for east of 31st Street

b. Gregg Rudenberg, neighbor of Anderson's

- Stated that Anderson had covered his concerns.

B. RECREATION ELEMENT OF COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

a. Overview by staff:

--Greenstein: The concept of park equivalencies was established 5 years ago in the General Plan. Equivalencies are to serve the local population versus a citywide population (such as Balboa Park); may be joint use of facilities (such as public use of school facilities after hours/weekends); nontraditional (such as rooftops of buildings open to the public in perpetuity via easements); or expansion of current uses. A survey showed residents interested in walking, parks and trails.

- Bragado: stated it is easier to obtain funding for smaller projects.

b. Strickland:

--GGHPC spent several meetings ranking areas to be potential park sites, but this is not shown anywhere in the proposed Update. (See pp. 56, 112). The importance of this is evident based on the representation by Anderson that he does not want to sell his land for a park. No other priorities are shown. The ranking should be shown and linked to other elements in the Update.

--The trails are counted as 24-foot wide, the size of a City street. Trails are normally 3 ft to a maximum of 20 feet in very high use areas. 10 ft is wide enough for a truck. This needs to be changed.

--New communities are given Rec Centers of 17,000 square feet. The proposed one is not this size. Also, the center is not available to Golden Hill residents; it is booked County-wide.

c. Curran.

--P. 14. Environmental justice is a key consideration. There should be a circle of green, available to residents at the south end of Golden Hill as well.

d. Brierton

Greenstein provided responses in writing to Brierton's written comments submitted previously. Specifically, he indicated that trash receptacles would be provided at trailheads, and trash collected. However, Brierton indicated that her concerns remain as follows:

--Some of the proposed park equivalencies are not appropriate, since they do not afford any special use to Golden Hill residents. E.g., community garden, recreation center, City Ops site reconstruction, proposed skate park.

--Some of the park equivalencies are appropriate, such as a multi-modal trail on Golf Course Drive, the playground on 28th Street, and the dog park. These can be used by Golden Hill residents.

--Brierton moved, Lee seconded: That the 32nd Street Canyon be designated as MHPA. The Chair indicated this would not be voted on until the next GGHPC meeting.

e. Lee

--It would be better to know what the City is actually prepared to spend, then vote on how to spend it.

Bragado indicated that smaller projects, such as trails, are more easily funded, but it is also important to have a vision.

f. Davis.

--Tershia D'Elgin's information about the Developer Impact Fees (DIF) was eye-opening. Although she no longer lives in Golden Hill, she has been grateful to use Balboa Park over the years.

g. Zakarian.

--The City should better define what is really a Golden Hill park, versus a regional park. Does it count the regional park square footage for the more distant communities who use it as well? Is there double counting?

--The community garden is not open to the public, and should not be counted as an equivalency.

--P. 118 E. This should reference a bicycle lane as well as a sidewalk.

h. Swarens.

--It is dangerous for bicyclists on Gold Course Drive. GGHPC has expressed its commitment to seeing a multimodal path here by allocating the majority of DIF fees last year for this purpose.

--The pool in Balboa Park should not be an equivalency, nor should other resources which have wider uses.

--p. 117 The referenced fountain is in Balboa Park, not adjacent to the park.

--p. 118G. The reference to the Victorian era is factually inaccurate.

--p. 118H. the Bennington Memorial Oak Grove commemorates the deaths of sixty (60), in 1905 and was designed to have sixty oak trees. Conservation and replacement should maintain the focus of this memorial, with that specific number of trees.

p.121: Integrate pedestrian/bike--multimodal.

Commented that the language in this section needed to be revised to reflect this concept- current language presents bike, pedestrian, and auto routes, but needs to explicitly acknowledge the goal of an integrated design multi-modal Golf Course Drive linking our community.

i. Santini

--p. 115, 28th Street park. Needs some kind of permitting, as it is very crowded. Trash pickup is also needed.

--City yards surrounded by chain link fences should not be counted as park equivalencies. City trucks should not be allowed to use parks for parking City trucks.

--Golden Hill residents should be able to walk to anything that counts for Golden Hill's equivalency.

--The plan needs to establish a cool zone for the elderly.

## C. LAND USE ELEMENT OF COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

a. Davis

--p. 117, 32nd Street, 1-1. Noise/air pollution should be considered in connection with any high density project near the freeway. (Turgeon indicated that buffering is addressed at p. 134 of the Conservation Element.)

--p.21, 2.5: It should be specified that the design guidelines in Section 11 apply to multi-family as well as single family

b. Brierton

--Brierton's comments were noticed as part of the 9/9/15 meeting agenda.

\*p. 14: GOALS: Add

--Historic District

--Views preserved in east/west and north/south corridors  
--support small scale, locally-owned businesses

P.15, Table 2-1 Add:

--Historic District  
--Multiple species conservation/habitat

P. 17, Policies

\*LU 1.1: add "small scale" residential community  
\* LU 1.2: Add: protection of canyons/open space/multiple species/conservation areas

P. 18

--Open space, utilities: Add species/habitat protection  
--"Semi public": Define further. Does this include community-based organizations, prison reentry, drug.rehab, group homes?

P. 20

--City Ops Yard. Pedestrian bridge Golden Hill/Balboa Park?  
--Delevan Drive: Possible pedestrian link between 32nd St canyon & 34th St canyon? See page 37, ME 1.9  
(Q: Re semis problem: prohibit overnight parking? prohibit turns exiting Hwy 94 from Broadway to 30th Street?)

P. 21: Add policy: Protect canyons/open space/hillsides/views from residential encroachment

P.23: Why do commercial areas in Figure 2-2 differ from those in Figure 4-1 (Urban Design Concept Map, p. 56)

P. 24: Based on discussion here, change Figure 4-1 (page 56, Urban Design Concept Map)

P. 25: Any error in Open Space zoning?

P. 29: Add to LU 2.21--Promote disabled mobility

c. Swarens.

--p. 21, 2.5. Agrees with Davis.

--p. 19, LU 2.1,

Questioned the appropriateness of this recommendation, as follows. I agree with the change from commercial for these parcels, however do not concur with the suggestion that "duplex" zoning should be the replacement for that.

1) to promote historic preservation and preserve community character (stated goals of the plan update) zoning should match (at least an approximation of) existing density/use.

While there is at least one block with "duplex" equivalent development in these corridors, there are a number with single family development as the majority and defining pattern, and there is no capacity to expand infrastructure, especially parking, to support additional density while preserving the historic homes (and businesses).

This is especially true at the 30th and Beech node, where the AEA school adds to the demands on the street.

2)The single family homes south of Beech on Dale and 30th St. (two parcels deep on each street) should share the single family zone of their neighbors: they are well kept single family homes, and in the (proposed) South Park historic district. (one of these is our own home).

3) Concern that the "City of Villages" program targets homes (and businesses) in this area, as well as other areas (e.g. Juniper and Fern/30th, Grape Street area, etc.). These are attractive and successful activity nodes which do not need intervention, but rather protection. There should be language in the plan recognizing these as "Villages" consistent with general plan goals, rather than as sites for destructive urban renewal to create higher density.

d. Curran

p. 14: Just read multi-family that "enhances" vs "does not detract"

p.15. Freeways as "fixed barriers with limited permeability" fails to recognize creative uses (such as bike paths, overhead parks).

p.19 The difference between "community commercial" and "neighborhood commercial" should be spelled out. (Turgeon explained the former provides for broader uses, while the latter is generally small scale, with limited hours of operation).

p.20 Delevan Drive should be shown on Fig. 2.1

p.22 Noise complaints should be addressed (such as at The Whistlestop).

p.26 The "City of Villages" strategy (carried over from the General Plan) should be better defined. (Turgeon explained that it strives for mixed use, a pedestrian focus, community centers). PP 9, 17). The definition should make clear that it does not require density increases.

e. Strickland.

--Requests a better way to understand the Planned Development Ordinance (PDO) and nexus to the Land Use section, and to Section 11 (the Implementation section). (Turgeon indicated he would provide further explanation. He reminded GGHPC members that Citywide zoning regulations are also separate.)

Meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.