



NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE
Draft Minutes: January 19, 2016 – 6:30 PM

www.northparkplanning.org
info@northparkplanning.org

Like us: NorthParkPlanning Follow us: @NPPlanning

To receive NPPC Agendas & Announcements sign up at (no Facebook account required):

https://www.facebook.com/NorthParkPlanning/app_100265896690345

I. Call to order: 6:32 pm

II. Attendance Report:

Member	Robert Barry	Howard Blackson	Dionne Carlson	Steve Codrato	Daniel Gebreselassie	Vicki Granowitz	Peter Hill	Brandon Hilpert	Rachel Levin	Sarah McAlear	Lucky Morrison	Roger Morrison	Dang Nguyen	Rick Pyles	Rene Vidales
Attendance	1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	14	12	13
Late															
Absences	1	3	2	3					2			2	2	1	1

III. Modifications to and Adoption of the 01/19/16 Agenda

- a. MOTION: Approve consent agenda. McAlear/Blackson 14-0-0

IV. Consent Agenda Items:

- a. 3316 Laurel St. Gerald Home Variance / Neighborhood Development Permit, PTS 437621 to re-construct an entry deck, maintain landscaping within the street side yard setback that homeowners installed over the last 20 yrs. Neighbors and adjacent property owners are in support. Would bring property into compliance & make it consistent with the 2 adjacent prosperities that already have encroachment permits. City can still take the land back for a street at any time. **St. - MOTION: To approve the Variance & Neighborhood Development Permit, PTS 437621 for 3316 Laurel Gerald Home –for an encroachment into Public Right of Way: to re-construct an entry deck, maintain landscaping within the street side yard setback & an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement. McAlear/UDPR 14-0-0**
- b. 4411 Kansas St. Tentative Map Waiver PTS 426399 for 5 residential condominium units currently under construction. Units are separated, scale is consistent with neighborhood. General comments were appreciation of the design. **MOTION: Move denial of the project due to lack of community input on the design of the project prior to construction. McAlear/UDPR 14-0-0**
- c. 3571 Nile St. Voluntary presentation by developer to get community feedback on design alternatives. Between Myrtle & Dwight, includes a flat 14,000 sq ft lot with a steep slope at the rear of the property, adjacent to I 805, RS 1-7 zone. 4 individual units, 2 facing Nile, 2 behind those units. All have single car garages. Process 3 related to the adjacent MSCP lands. Two options presented: Option 1 – would require a height deviation of approximately 11 ft but would allow units to have parking internally. Option 2 – would require parking to be in front of the property (similar to Huffman’s) Member did not the idea of parking in front and found with the existing adjacent 2 story structure a deviation for height was preferable in concept. **MOTION: To support in concept, a height deviation of approximately 11 ft allowing units to be closer to the street (further from the MSCP lands), and to allow for internal parking. McAlear/UDPR 14-0-0**

- d. Request for a letter of support from the North Park Historical Society 2016 Classic Car Show to be held on September 10, 2016 in the parking lot at Morley Field in front of Balboa Tennis Club. Steve Hon makes request on behalf NPHS. **MOTION: to approve letter of letter of support for the NPHS September 10, 2016 Classic Car Show. McAlear/PF&T 14-0-0**
 - e. 4300 Block East Side Arizona St parking conversion from a parallel to angle parking between El Cajon Boulevard and Meade Avenue. This proposed conversion consists of existing 19 parallel parking spaces to 33 angle parking spaces. It will provide for a total gain of 14 spaces on the eastside of Arizona Street. Bernie Chase, representing the neighbors got together to do petition, very strong support from the neighbors. Committee in support. **MOTION: to support of the conversion from parallel to angle (or head in) parking on the east side of Arizona St between El Cajon Blvd and Meade Ave for a gain 14 spaces. McAlear/PF&T 14-0-0**
- V. **Approval of Previous Minutes**
- a. **MOTION: Approve December 7, 2015 minutes with modifications. Hilpert/Hill 13-0-1 (R. Morrison abstains)**
- VI. **Treasurer's Report, Brandon Hilpert**
- a. Current balance \$717.63
- VII. **Non Agenda Public Comment:**
- a. None
- VIII. **Announcements & Event Notices:**
- a. **Pershing Bikeway Project:** Wed, 1/20/16, 6 – 8 p.m. Balboa Park Golf Course – Great Rm 2600 Golf Course Dr, 92102. See below #2
- IX. **Elected Official's Report**
- a. **Jessica Poole, Hon. Susan Davis, US Congressional Dist 53**, 619.208.5353 Jessica.Poole@mail.house.gov
Congress passed Federal budget.
 - b. **Jason Weisz, Hon. Toni Atkins, State Assembly District 76**, 619-645-3090 jason.weisz@asm.ca.gov
New Speaker of the House elected.
 - c. **Sarah Fields, Hon. Marty Block State Senate District 39**, 619-645-3133 hilary.nemchik@sen.ca.gov
Senate and Assembly are back to work. Two bills submitted.
 - d. **Adrian Granda, Hon. Todd Gloria, City Councilmember District 3**, AGranda@sandiego.gov
Excited for City projects upcoming this year. City Council passed Climate Action Plan unanimously. North Park Mini Park update: land is now back to being owned by the City, and we're trying to get a consultant to create an actual construction plan based on the General Plan. The park is funded but the streetscape improvements don't have funding. Leichtling suggested using fees from parking structure to pay for park maintenance. City is moving forward on development of Woolworth building with Civic San Diego.
- X. **Chairs Report/CPC:**
- a. **CPC – Tuesday, January 26, 2016, 7-9 pm.** 9192 Topaz Way, Kearny Mesa Auditorium. (For more info: <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpc/agendas/index.shtml>)
 - b. **Need to appoint Election committee:** Vicki and Rick, plus two members of community. Seven 2-year seats are up for election. Will need to clarify the bylaws with the City to verify if someone who terms out in the middle of a 2-year term can run knowing they can only serve one year of the term. All incumbents indicated intention to run.
- XI. **Social Media Report, Brandon Hilpert.**
- a. Any information we receive from the City we post on our social media as well as including in our monthly emails for committee and subcommittee meetings.
- XII. **Subcommittee Reports:**
- a. **Urban Design/Project Review (UD/PR)**, Peter Hill (chair) Rachel Levin (vice chair) – North Park Rec Center, 6:00pm 1st Monday. February 1st meeting cancelled (updated January 30th)
 - i. All items from previous meeting were on consent agenda. Feb 1st we'll be seeing Nile St project again; March get info on former exotic gardens project on El Cajon Blvd.
 - b. **Public Facilities & Transportation**, Daniel Gebreselassie (chair)– North Park Rec Center, 6:00 pm, 2nd Wednesday. Next meeting February 10th meeting cancelled (time and space being used for additional NPPC full committee meeting).

- i. Action items from meeting were on consent as well. May have presentation about Robinson and Pershing Bikeways in February??

XIII. Liaisons Reports

- a. **Balboa Park Committee, Rob Steppke.**
- b. **Maintenance Assessment District, Peter Hill.** Approved FY17 budget
- c. **North Park Main Street, Dang Nguyen.** Work started on red sidewalks on University. March 2nd there will be a Main Street Business Mixer at the North Park General Store (old F Street).
- d. **NP Mid-City Regional Bike Corridors, Daniel.** Per Carlson, SANDAG provided draft mitigated negative declaration for the Robinson Bikeway project, with public comment open until February 4th.
http://www.keepsandiegomoving.com/RegionalBikeProjects/robinsonbikeway_notices.aspx
- e. **Adams Ave BIA, Dionne Carlson.** Everyone is interested in seeing the implementation for the new zones. There is interest in limiting auto over-saturation in that area. Community outreach will be done on Landis corridor. They are in support of the new CPU proposal portion that will be coming to NPPC in February.
- f. **El Cajon BIA, Vicki Granowitz. Tootie** was in attendance and provided the update: In favor of density on El Cajon Blvd, feeling it makes sense because of placement between freeways and having the rapid bus transit in place. Foodie market is still kicking 3rd Friday of the month at Utah and El Cajon Blvd.

XIV. **Planner's Report**, Lara Gates, 619.236.6006; lgates@sandiego.gov

XV. Information Items:

- a. **Pipeline Project. Claudia Majia presenting.**
 - i. Project started in May 2015, expected completion Spring 2018. Each segment usually takes a few months. Replacing a 100-year old cast iron pipe with new PVC pipe. Replacing pedestrian curb ramps up to ADA standards, restripe and will re-vegetate and re-landscape. Currently at 5th Avenue and Goldfinch. Intend to continue moving west, so North Park isn't scheduled yet (partially due to El Nino).
 - ii. Provide your contact information to the City in order to receive updates when you may be impacted <http://www.sandiego.gov/cip/projectinfo/featuredprojects/usprp.shtml>
 - iii. A 30-day and 5-day notice will update residents when there will be a nighttime water shut off (including door hangers for all residents and businesses).
 - iv. Parking signs 72-hours in advance are placed where there will be construction. They're being color-coded (yellow for day construction, orange for night). Day construction starts around 8am. Equipment may need to be staged on the street to get the project completed more quickly. Public Information Officer: Monica Munoz.
 - v. Public questions: When City opens ground, seems like a great time to underground other utilities and fiber optics. Is that part of this project? Is there any way to incorporate any of that now? There is communication so that they don't break lines, but there is no simultaneous work—that requires too much coordination. This seems like bad planning and a waste of resources. Per Granda: When City installs water they try to also do sewer, but there is definitely room for improvement. There is a City audit that is specifically addressing this coordination issue. The timing of the pipeline replacement near the Georgia bridge was expedited to finish prior to the start of bridge construction. University Mobility is in design stage right now, so shouldn't overlap but if it does, construction would be coordinated.

XVI. Action Items:

- a. **Community Plan Update:** City provided most up-to-date versions today at 3pm. Introduced the new Director of Planning, Jeff Murphy.
 - i. **Proposed Density Bonus Along the Rapid Transit Line** presentation by Lara Gates Ways to accomplish density and accommodate mass transit along that segment, but also meets principals and goals of City of Villages strategy, Climate Action Plan, and General Plan.
 1. Currently under PDO you can get 100 units/ acre on ECB. Allowing developers to go to 145 with this stringent process.
 2. The proposal strives to maintain single-family, while trying to incentivize future improvements to Huffman properties.

3. This is different from Incentive-based zoning, and not understanding that has caused some confusion and concern in the community. Incentive-based zoning is no longer being considered. This density bonus proposal is a Planned Development Permit that is already allowed in the Municipal Code, and including it here is codifying into the North Park Community Plan Update (CPU).
4. Glossary idea is actually going to be incorporated into the General Plan, and then will provide them as an attachment to our community plan as well.
5. The CPU would go into effect Jan 2017 with proposed timeline.
6. Granowitz added
 - a. We've always committed to protect the single-family areas, but have also tried to increase density along these major corridors (transit nodes). It has taken a long time to get the City to get onboard.
 - b. When buildings are built to code, the Planning Committee is not taken into account. This is an opportunity for us to be able to provide input when developers want more than the base code allows.
 - c. Public comment on the CPU isn't closed, please continue to provide feedback to the City or through NPPC until the final draft is closed.
7. **Public comment:**
 - a. **Don Leichtling.** North Park resident. We've always heard "density on the transportation corridors" but people don't UNDERSTAND density by acre. We need to see pictures of what the density will look like. The color of the streets on the maps is pretty awful and we need PDFs so we can zoom in. Believes we should have a step down zone like CN-1-5 between certain areas.
 - b. **Debbie Thorsen.** Ceded time
 - c. **Tom Mullaney.** Uptown resident. This pedestrian-oriented category as a reason for density is nonsensical. A planned development at 301 University was 109 units per acre, and it's HUGE. Current plan gives too much density and height, is overkill and will increase traffic congestion and provides no guarantee that new projects will provide enough public amenities to justify their bonus.
 - d. **Bill Ellig.** University Heights. Transparency of process. Feel that this was sprung on UH in the couple months, and over the holidays. Would like to see further outreach by the Planning Groups to get the community involved. Complained about the timing of the agenda distribution.
 - e. **Randi Vita.** Lives in 1800s Victorians along Howard, and don't believe that the quality of the single-family homes will be maintained because they aren't a priority for saving like the large luxurious homes. She took time to measure all the houses. They are affordable and historic, and the review process should protect them but doesn't. New building at Florida and El Cajon will cause them to not have on-street parking near their house. Asserts that the area doesn't need more neighbors, they need more stores.
 - f. **Omar Passons.** Want other people to be able to afford to live here. Increasing density where it's smart to do so. Would also like to see more from 30th and NP Way to Upas.
 - g. **Kathleen Ferrier.** Support affordable housing, and agree with the benefits that Lara outlined including walkability (included places to walk TO) and effective transit lines.
 - h. **Paul Jameson.** Support what Kathleen and Omar said. Limited on-street parking is not a valid reason not to build desperately needed additional house.
 - i. **David Gatzke.** UH resident and historic homeowner in NP. Think this is critical to supporting the diversity of North Park. These corridors have a spine of infrastructure existing (El Cajon Blvd carries LESS traffic than it did originally). Personally would expand to further than a half block off the \$44m investment

(Rapid Transit). Numbers opponents provide are misleading in terms of height and density.

- j. **Elizabeth Robinson.** Homeowner in North Park. Stunning how quickly this neighborhood has become unaffordable. This is a middle class issue, with people saying no one else needs to live here, but really we need to bring in new businesses and new blood, making it accessible to more people in San Diego.
- k. **Carey Garza.** Grew up in University Heights and real estate developer. Taking the temperature of the reception to developers here. The time it takes to finish a project here can ruin opportunities for affordable housing.
- l. **Walt Pennington.** Thinks the community can definitely handle more density. Allowing more properties to have 2 on 1 would also increase density.
- m. **Nicole Capritz.** Climate Action Plan. You're one of first planning groups to incorporate goals of the action plan. The point of the plan isn't to create fear but embrace change and to protect future generations. We want to be a world-class city that finds new ways to grow, develop and move people around.
- n. **Danny Fitzgerald.** Uptown resident, North Park property owner. This is a long-range plan/vision. If you look at the 1991 plan for downtown, it took 20 years for that plan to really take form and "happen".
- o. **Dennis Stein.** Resident and business owner. Emailed support for density increase.
- p. **Mana Monzavi.** Resident. Emailed support for density increase.
- q. **Dan Wallis.** Emailed support for density increase.
- r. **Broderick Smylie.** University Heights resident. Emailed support for density increase.

8. Board comments:

- a. **Barry.** Like this, it plays into what we've asked for to keep things along transit corridors. Appreciate the Process 4 aspect. The big thing that currently lacks is notification, so at least we know that with that Process we WILL hear it. Understand the discomfort with the density numbers being thrown around, but believe it will reinvigorate El Cajon Blvd. It is HUGE though and intrudes into the single-family areas like resident Randi Vita asserted. Think that the numbers may be too high on the pedestrian-oriented areas. A density bonus in that area may be a natural step to follow AFTER success with El Cajon Blvd. CITY: These areas are intended to incentivize new development where Huffman's stand. Barry thinks that this isn't clear and could cause open-season on the rest of the properties in blue boxes. Asked why, on land use map, many the canyons are zoned RS-1-1 and colored white. Thought that these were "open space" and should be green. Areas are colored green only if owned by City, privately owned open space continues to remain white.
- b. **Pyles.** Concerned about major increase in density. What we have already planned gives lots of affordable housing ability. More units does NOT equate with more AFFORDABLE units. Would appreciate better maps (colors still an issue). Feel that this proposal was given too quickly to make an educated decision.
- c. **Levin.** What bump to we get in affordable house with the jump from 109-145? CITY: This isn't just for affordable housing. You either build affordable units in your mix or you pay the fee. It's project by project. Levin asserts that it's unfortunate that we didn't hear much from residents on this draft.
- d. **L. Morrison.** Hard to envision what this size units these will look like. We don't know what the affordable units formula is. What Council District had the most affordable housing? At least a few years ago it was North Park. Feel North Park

is being singled out for additional density/affordable housing. The presumption of how many people will use public transportation in the future seems wrong.

- e. **Gebreselassie.** Knowing what the density and height is now versus what it can become would be helpful. Development doesn't actually provide affordable housing, and if that is our intent we should see if there is a way to allocate that. Concerned we haven't been given enough time to analyze final result of the 6+ years of talking.
 - f. **Vidales.** Working on for so many years. Views this as consistent with our other policies. In favor of all seen today.
 - g. **R. Morrison.** Also happy to see Process 4 put in. We do need better language for targeting Huffman's (per Barry's comments). Conceptually on board.
 - h. **Hill.** The UDE had some transition language for when we jump density and height. There's actually more design criteria in the Planned Development process. We really need to SEE things, too. CITY: Can bring images back, but can post even faster, and can come back and discuss. Introducing you to the idea and try to get the environmental document going. Pedestrian incentive areas have been "math-tested" for development cash flow.
 - i. **Carlson.** Historic preservation is vital. But everything is a trade-off. If we "do" sustainability in North Park, this density needs to happen. Granny flats and in-fill for aging population is a good idea we should revisit. Agrees with Barry in targeting Huffman's.
 - j. **Blackson.** For 30 years the only economically feasible buildings on El Cajon Blvd have been drive-thrus. The best projects we've approved have been a half block plus off the corridors because it has better zoning. With more new neighbors come developer impact fees that help fix our aging infrastructure. We've already invested in the Bus Rapid Transit, now we need to use it. We need to demand this density in a Process 3. If you make this a Process 4, it makes it even more arduous to *maybe* get what a developer wants.
 - k. **Nguyen.** Whether or not we want the density, the development will keep coming. With the way this is written we will at least have participation.
 - l. **McAlear.** Since this type of density bonus is in the Municipal Code already, can the City provide us some examples of the successful implementation of density bonus projects around San Diego? Examples were provided. What is the different in the length of time in Process 3 versus Process 4? The length at least doubles (example was that it would go from 6 months to over 12).
 - m. **Granowitz.** Confusing affordable house through the SD Housing Commission and the idea of market-rate projects that are affordable may add more housing, helping regulate prices by adding inventory in our neighborhood. During the course of this process we've seen many pictures and what different densities look like, but it's taken so long that many of us have forgotten. With appropriate design you can get good projects..
 - n. **MOTION: To approve the transit-oriented density bonus as presented in concept Blackson/Carlson 11-2-0 L. Morrison, Pyles oppose.**
- b. **Former Haggen/Smart & Final Extra site.** Discuss possibility of writing a letter requesting information on plans and action on the Code Compliance order. Hill and Granowitz went to soft opening of concept in Carlsbad. It is a true market, not just in bulk. There's no timeline on the North Park opening, they are aware of code compliance problem. They have a security guard, cleaning team, and all sorts of other workers coming by. They are giving SDPD permission to go on property to deal with issues. No vote.

XVII. **Unfinished and Future Agenda Items:**

- a. Work Plan for 2016
- b. Community Plan Update: Implementation Element
- c. NPCPU EIR

XVIII. **Next Meeting Date:** February 16, 2016, 6:30pm

XIX. **Adjourn: 9:08pm**

Minutes submitted by Sarah McAlear