

Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee

April 13, 2016

6:30 PM

Golden Hill Community Recreation Center

www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpg

Please see agenda on website listed above for any attached information

Call to Order **6:35

Deletions to Agenda

Stadium and Convention Center Annex, East Village People (William Adams wadams@nmalawfirm.com)

Attendance: Richard Santini, Cheryl Brierton, Sabrina DiMinico, David Swarens, Andrew Zakarian, Richard Baldwin, Mike Burkart, Melissa Serocki, Victoria Curran, Janet Davis, Susan Bugbee

Absent: Joe Coneglio, Melinda Lee

February 10th Minutes approval Brierton Moved, Swarens Seconded

7 – Yes

0 – No

4 – Abstained (Burkart, Serocki, Curran, Bugbee)

March 23rd Special Meeting Minutes approval Brierton moved, Santini seconded

7 - Yes

0 -No

4 – Abstained (Serocki, Zakarian, Curran, Baldwin)

Governmental Officials Absent

Community Police Officer – Kevin Vasquez {619.674.7268 or kvasquez@pd.sandiego.gov}

39th Senate District – Joyce Temporal {619.645.3133 or joyce.temporal@sen.ca.gov}

53rd Congressional District – Mark Zambon {619.280.5353 or Mark.Zambon@mail.house.gov}

Government Officials Present and CPC Report(s)

- Council District 3 – Adrian Granda {619.236.6633 or agranda@sandiego.gov} - Distributed Newsletter, called to attention upcoming FY17 Budget Approval meetings and desire for community feedback; addressed SDPD retention concern raised by Brierton, Addressed Baldwin's question regarding status of 94 expansion and what Todd's position is on it. Granda stated Todd Gloria supports Bus on Shoulder. GGHPC is opposed to 94 expansion on SANDAG ballot measure; Zacarian brought up status of "A" Street parking on F/26th street; Granda asked Zacarian to email him and he'll provide him status.
- Ashley Campbell, Community Aide, distributed Susan Davis Newsletter
- City Planner – Bernard Turgeon {619.533.6575 or bturgeon@sandiego.gov}

Non Agenda Public Comment

Gerry Ray - addressed noise, car vandalism, and fights that result Kindred and the other bars and restaurants on 30th and Beech/Cedar; car crash on Cedar/Dale as a result; she has worked for 20 years to clean this neighborhood up and the bars are bringing in vandalism, graffiti, noise, fights, etc.

DiMinico asked what is the protocol for a community to address these types of concerns other than

Jeff Powers – with Citizens Plan for San Diego

Mike Gruby – noise, parking, and graffiti seem to be the primary issues, can we work with Adrian Granda to get an ongoing list going and start logging the issues so we can identify patterns and trends. Granda agreed that he'd be happy to work with the community on that.

Agenda Items

- Casey Crown (project manager); (Nick Dorner ndorner@rickengineering.com, Nikolas Kennedy nikolas.kennedy@cityworks.biz) presented City of San Diego 30th Street Pipeline Replacement Notification Replacement of pipeline from Polk to Thorn on 30th/Fern
 - Block by block shutdown will occur; construction to begin late 2017 and will be completed by 2019 or early 2020
 - Streets will be resurfaced, water meters will be replaced, ADA ramps will be replaced
 - Trees shouldn't be impacted because the work will be done in the street only
 - Santini – will the City take this opportunity to underground wires at the same time? Crown replied that the departments needed to make those changes aren't connected
 - Swarens – asked more specifics on the exact route, why will the curbs be impacted, can you line any of the pipes? Also encourages that project addresses dust b/c others that have occurred in the neighborhood have not.
 - Can't line because there's a health issue when it's not a waste line
 - Curb ramps are from a city lawsuit and they need to replace them; is an ADA issue
 - Jog happens at Grape and then again at 30th/Ash. 30th North of Grape is where the majority of work will happen
 - Brierton – we are a high risk fire district; can you address that to ensure that's taken into consideration when you do the work
 - Mike Gruby – does the work generally just go up to the meter? Are there occasions when the sidewalks will be impacted? Encourages that the GGHPCC work with Public Works to get priority sidewalks replaced;
 - Serocki – how much block will be replaced at one time? 500 Ft.
 - Design plans will be presented to the Public on 5/18 from 5:30-7:30 pm at Golden Hill Rec Center in the Gymnasium

Consent Agenda

Action Items

1. Community Plan Update, Bernie Turgeon
 - Chair distributed a compilation of feedback from Committee Members Swarens, Zakarian, Brierton, & Bugbee (see attached)
 - Committee member comments
 - Bugbee – is in support of having stronger language to protect historic district and David's comments address that; some information is incorrect (see attached)
 - Serocki – if your home is past a certain age, you have to pay for a historic review if you are doing work, yet we're not in a historic district. Seems contradictory. Also brought up limiting the store fronts; will that be brought up in the plan?
 - Davis – is concerned with Airport Land use compatibility paragraph not being specific enough; on the contrary, page 12 of conservation, the land use language is very explicit; supports downzoning

- Burkart, Baldwin – thanked Bernie for his hard work; no other comments
 - Artisan Food & Beverage is too restrictive; is in favor for less square footage to encourage small boutique venues. 10,000 sq feet is the current and it's very large and encourages larger businesses. If we lowered the square footage of the footprint you might be able to expand the hours. Swarens suggested you even have a sliding scale based on square footage (i.e. the larger the footprint, the shorter the operating hours and the smaller the footprint the longer the operating hours).
 - Brierton – really concerned with removing the PDO and making our community like all other neighborhoods; we're not interconnected to North park and Hillcrest and challenges that language; Doesn't see that we're adequately protected in our community character; Did a great job with protecting canyons and views but protecting the character is lacking; nothing covers multi modal path through the Golf Course that we have asked for; concern about Fire in our neighborhood and why we're supporting the Fire Department on Home Ave.
 - Bernie – PDO – we are losing tailored zoning but many aspects of the zoning code update are equivalent to what was in the PDO; if you look at the bigger picture you're getting quite a bit – for example, there's support for the downzones
 - DiMinico – no additional comments; agreed with other committee member's comments; thanked Bernie for his hard work on the plan.
 - Curran – mobility; bicycling is phrased as protected for trips for less than 5 miles and restricts the possibility of expanding bicycling as a way of life (i.e. commuting to work). Classification of bike lanes is confusing (Bernie provided clarification). Asked about when updated Charts and Graphs would be provided (Bernie confirmed next update)
 - Bernie – historic district will reflect density of 29 units as suggested by Committee
 - Swarens – see attached comments
 - Santini – no comments
 - Brierton made motion to that all comments be submitted to Bernie for consideration; Baldwin seconded. Unanimous approval.
2. Approval of the changes to the planning group bylaws – moved to next month
 3. Appointment of Committee Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary
 - a. Brierton moved that Swarens be the Chair, Curran Seconded – Unanimous Approval
 - b. Brierton moved that Santini be the Vice Chair, Baldwin seconded – Unanimous Approval
 - c. Brierton moved that DiMinico be Secretary; Baldwin seconded – Unanimous Approval

Sub-Committee Updates

Historic* – David Swarens {loscalifornios@aol.com}

Adjournment

*If you are interested in attending the Historic meeting please email the appropriate committee to confirm meeting and agenda.

**All times are estimated – Action Items may also be taken before Information Items.

The City of San Diego distributes agendas via email and can also provide agendas in alternative formats as well as a sign language or oral interpreter for the meeting with advance notice. To request these services, please contact the City at 619.236.6479 or sdplanninggroups@sandiego.gov

Community plan update

David Swarens

Introduction:

1.2 Planning Framework, Page 6, “Key ...Goals”

While edits and additions generally improve clarity in this section, the removal of the phrase “throughout the community” from the second point both weakens and confuses the statement.

This phrase should be restored to the text.

1.3 Legislative Framework, pages 6-7, “SD General Plan”

Material regarding “City of Villages” should include additional language about both the right of the community to define for itself what a village is (as we have been told is City policy) and assurances that community character as well as cultural resources will be respected in any “village”.

Land Use Element:

Introduction/ LU Element Goals:

Page 1, “Historic Character and scale retained within single family and low density neighborhoods”

This has been corrected by the committee previously- It is in conflict with the formally stated “Key Goals” as stated in the plan introduction, and is not consistent with goals stated by the community and planning group throughout the process.

The special character and scale of Golden Hill should be respected and retained in ALL areas of the community, not just the lower density land use designated areas.

Page 8, LU 2.5

Design guidelines should protect character and scale in all zones in GGH.

Remember the calls for “conservation districts”, expansion of a PDO throughout the public hearings and charette process?

Mobility Element:

Page 4, Policies, ME-1.*

Please add to this toolbox ME-1.7

“Preserve tighter traditional corner/curb radius (re “new urbanism” standards) to enhance pedestrian mobility and calm traffic, as well as to maintain traditional/historic character of GGH

community. This design approach shortens the distance curb to curb for walkers, while forcing autos to slow down for turns.

Page 6, Policies, ME-1.7

It should be clear throughout the plan that “B” Street hill by the City Ops site is not recommended as a Bike route.

Mobility Element, Cont.

Page 7, 3.2 Transit

The third bullet point, regarding the planned street car service, should be made clearer.

“from 30th Street” should probably read “from North Park, through Golden Hill along 30th Street, to Downtown San Diego”

Page 8, ME-2.2

Much clearer than in previous draft.

Pages 10-11

Policies

ME-4.*

Also generally improved, especially by the removal of patterned paving as a recommendation (rather than an option).

Perhaps this would be an appropriate section to acknowledge the need for pathway and parkway design to accommodate the encroachment into these areas by diagonal parking (either pull in or back in).

Also, recommend the capacity to specify alternate colors for truncated dome panels at curb ramps, at least for identified “special character” neighborhoods (e.g. historic districts).

The City already does this in Balboa Park, and this was a concept/recommendation introduced early in the plan update process by then City Planning director Bill Anderson.

These should also be echoed in the Urban Design element.

Urban Design Element:

Page 8, UD-2.10

As per earlier comments, these should also be consideration throughout the community, but it is a good thing to call out relationship with Balboa Park as important.

It should be acknowledged in this section that many of these properties are in the current Golden Hill Historic District or the proposed Culverwell & Taggart and South Park Historic Districts.

Page 9. "Villages" again; thank you for including "in a sensitive manner" in the discussion of "Neighborhood Focal Elements." "Need to be" is pretty strong language though.

Page 13. "Sidewalks and Pedestrian Paths"

UD-2.**

Policies should include that infrastructure, wherever possible, should not be above ground in the right of way, but rather in vaults flush with the walkway, or incorporated into the sites served, especially for new construction (utility "closets", panels, etc, designed into the building or landscape).

This had been a specific action/recommendation of the Planning Committee.

This would also be a good place (in the UD Element) to incorporate issues raised in previous comments from Mobility re:

- New Urbanism traditional curb radius
- Expanded palette for truncated dome panels at ramps

Urban Forest/Street Tree Master Plan:

Pages 15-17

Should include references to existing mature trees more explicitly, encouraging their retention and conservation.

They are both "sustainable" in every sense and contribute to community character (a "Key Goal" of the plan draft).

They have proved their viability and hardiness under (usually) conditions of neglect, and their appropriateness to the context of our microclimate and soil.

In many cases these are from the early years of GH's development, and are potential "Heritage Trees" or even "Historic", and should be surveyed and reviewed for such designation.

While such survey is probably beyond the scope of the Plan update, such language should be included under goals and policies in the Plan.

"Policies" (page 17) should add:

- Preserve existing mature trees in the public right of way
- Identify potential "Heritage" and "Historic" trees
- Encourage appropriate cultural practices to maintain these in a healthy condition.
- Refer to these as elements of a historic "cultural landscape" when developing a new street-tree palette and selecting species for new plantings.

Palms, which not generally considered contributors to the “urban forest” do have a role in urban design and streetscapes. They are most commonly used traditionally (including in G.H.) to delineate corridors, rather than, as suggested only at corners etc.

Integrated with canopy trees they contribute aesthetics and scale to street landscapes, and are character defining features of many older communities.

This use/design should not be discouraged in the plan, as it currently is.

What should be discouraged is:

- trees at corners, which block visibility and reduce safety (consistent with UD-2.34, on page 14)
- trees in containers, rather than in the ground- these are not “sustainable” and this design is at best temporary.
- Economic Prosperity Element:
 -
 - Page 3,
 - Policies EP-1.5
 - I was pleased to see “formula retail” concept introduced, per discussion comments at Planning Committee.
 - This is a very important idea both for the residential and merchant communities, and many consider this to be a character defining feature of our Golden Hill community.
 - The paragraph which precedes this section covers this at least a bit too.
 -
 - Page 5, “Historic Districts” and policies EP-2.5
 - Thank you fro including this important concept- It should also be carried forward to the Historic Preservation element of the plan.
 -
 - Public Facilities, Services and Safety.
 - No comments at this time.
 -
 - Recreation Element:
 - Page 11, Policies RE-1.8
 - Earlier comments which have not been incorporated:
 - b) the fountain is not “adjacent” but rather simply “in” the park, and was one of the first generation pre expo “improvements” within Balboa Park.
 -
 - g) the park plantings do not date to , or represent the “Victorian Era” as incorrectly stated here.
 - Victoria had died in the first month of 1901, so the park development is not in the “Era” defined by her reign.

- “Early 20th Century” , “turn of the century” (we all know which century that refers to), or even “Edwardian” would be choices for a description both correct and appropriate, even if an error was made in a previous plan. There is no need to set up a conflict, simply to not continue an error.
- This period represents an important horticultural heritage, which a move away from the unbridled exoticism of the late 19th century to an increasing emphasis on simplicity and appropriateness, even sustainability, and an expansion of the “Mediterranean” metaphor expressed in landscape design and materials.
-
- Noise Element:
- Page 3
- Policies and discussion should include consideration of noise created by residential uses and the impact of that on adjacent properties (of various uses).
- Exterior “infrastructure” and utilities, such as air conditioning units, have the potential to create noise and vibration which may strongly affect the neighbors in the community.
-
- Further comments, especially on Historic Preservation and Implementation Elements to follow.

Historic Preservation Element (more to follow, but this is probably the most important)
Page 10

Draft language reads as follows:

In addition to potentially individually significant resources, the survey identified one potential historic district. A potential South Park Residential Historic District was identified in the 1996 Historical Greater Mid City San Diego Preservation Strategy; however, this district was not brought forward for designation at that time. The present Golden Hill Historical Survey found that the entirety of the area identified in 1996 does not retain sufficient integrity to merit designation and identified a smaller area as a potential historic district.

The language "found that the entirety of the area---- does not retain sufficient integrity to merit designation---." undermines the efforts of the community and the conclusions presented in the plan, including the concurrence/consensus of the Community Planning Committee and City Planning Staff.

One possible and appropriate edit would be:

In addition to potentially individually significant resources, the survey identified one potential historic district.

A potential South Park Historic District was identified in the 1996 Historical Greater Mid City San Diego Preservation Strategy, however, this district was not brought forward for designation at that time.

The present Golden Hill Historical Survey suggested a smaller area as a potential historic district, however staff and the community concurred that the original 1996 boundaries should remain the focus for the South Park Historic District.

The above would represent the findings of the recent survey, but in a manner which does not sabotage the findings and conclusions of the Plan Update and the consensus of City staff and community, and the formal actions and recommendations of the Greater Golden Hill Community Planning Committee.

The phrase "does not retain sufficient integrity to merit designation" does not merit inclusion in the document, and could be a poison pill for the proposed district. Nor does it suggest a good faith effort to implement a plan with integrity itself.

This section should be edited to support the findings and goals of the Plan Update, and any supporting graphics (maps) (e.g. Figure 10-3, page 159 HP Element, July 2015 draft) should be removed.

And the material which follows the above with descriptive specifics "approximately 109 primarily two-story residences---" should also be removed.

They are not relevant to, nor supportive of, the Plan Update, and are, at best, confusing, and at probable worst, destructive to the goals of the Plan.

Language which follows on page 11 does state the conclusions clearly, and should be the focus of this section, rather than the misleading information regarding conclusions which have been not been accepted.

In addition to potentially individually significant resources, the survey identified one potential historic district.

A potential South Park *****Historic District was identified in the 1996 Historical Greater Mid City San Diego Preservation Strategy, however, this district was not brought forward for designation at that time.

The present Golden Hill Historical Survey suggested a smaller area as a potential historic district, however staff and the community concurred that the original 1996 boundaries should remain the focus for the South Park Historic District.

Page 10, HP Element. This is the edit I previously sent- please note that the word "residential" was intentionally removed, as the proposed district includes at least one historic commercial node, characteristic of "street car suburbs", so the district nomenclature should not seem to exclude this type of resource.

Page 11, Policies

HP-2.1 "Provide interim protection----" good policy, but one which the suggested PHDO fails to implement, by, among other failings, what it does and does not cover, as follows.

Table 132-16B.

PHDO does not cover non contributing structures and those under 45 years, exempting review

of infill within the Districts- This leaves the overall context of the Districts at risk- precisely why they would be addressed in an adopted District.

Exempts Non residential uses, such as the historic commercial nodes: both C&T and South Park districts have significant commercial development, and the loss or alteration of these resources could severely compromise the context of both Districts.

Exempts activity which does not require a permit: window replacement and other such changes impact integrity of individual resources as well as the district as a whole.

The "two thirds" rule does not address the impact of alternations on both street facades of corner sites. Many of the earliest and most prominent structures are corner sites, and were designed to have two "principal" facades, and this is true in both districts.

One I noted recently is the SW corner of 22nd and "E"- this home actually started out with an "E" street address which was later changed to a 22nd street one: both sides are the "front of the house".

Another very good example is the Quartermass-Wilde House at 2404 Broadway - while this is already designated, and thus "protected", there are many others (potentially four on each block) that are not.

Accessory structures, such as carriage barns and garages, on these corner parcels can also be important to the district, and would be exempt under the PHDO as proposed.

HP-2.4 "Provide support ---to community members and groups who wish to --submit-- nominations

Waiving of fees, which are quite substantial, would represent a good faith effort to implement this policy

Please include in appropriate sections of the HP Element, language, as per that which already appears in the Economic Prosperity Element, recognizing and encouraging the role historic sites and districts play as economic catalysts, attracting investment/reinvestment to communities. This applies to both residential and commercial uses and activity, and should be acknowledged in this element of the plan.

Current language implies that preservation needs regulation and incentive (which it does) but generally ignores the value (in dollars, as well as attractiveness and livability) which it supplies to a community.

The bungalow/residential court at 30th and Grape NW corner does not seem to be included in the list of potentially historic residential courts (thematic district?) in the community. It has been recently rehabbed, and has a twin development nearby.

The PHDO does not appear to address these Residential Courts, even though the plan language seems to suggest that they are a "potential (thematic) district." See page 10, last para, re "Multiple Property Listing (MPL)."

The community planning group, and historic preservation subcommittee of the GGHCCPC, recommendation re review of the north west "sawtooth" boundary of the South Park District should be incorporated in the plan language.

The boundaries are currently addressed only generally within plan language, with fuller exposition relying on graphics/maps (table 10.5 figure 10.4?) which are not included in this draft.

But the language on page 11 should be revised to reflect this recommendation (which City staff agreed to review, presumably during, or in anticipation of, the survey process)

Land use recommendations, including both density/zoning and "Village" sites are often for more intensive use than the historic developments, and thus create a potential adverse impact on these resources, which should be evaluated.

"The bungalow/residential court at 30th and Grape NW corner does not seem to be included in the list of potentially historic residential courts (thematic district?) in the community. It has been recently rehabbed, and has a twin development nearby."

The address for the above is 2001-2010 30th Street, and its sister is just one block north at 2114-2118(?) 30th Street.

Page 16 and 17 have the list of residential courts, and neither of these appears.

The first is five units, and the second looks like six (so not twins), in classic court form with a "U" shaped alignment framing a shared "courtyard" open-space area. Both, uniquely, provide a single garage per unit at the back, facing the side street.

Andrew Zakarian

I have gone through the update provided to us, and really do not find anything that is terribly troublesome. I was concerned about the restrictiveness of the Artisan Food and Bev Producer issues. I think that it is too restrictive and should allow expanded hours of operation, especially if it is not in a residential zone. (as seen on the March 23, 2016 plan Update).

Cheryl Brierton

The Revised Community Plan Update distributed in March 2016 reflects the years of hard work by City staff and the Community. The respect for our canyons and views is heartening.

The only input I feel I can still provide at at this stage is fairly sweeping. I will continue to review materials, but wish to provide this now, to give Richard Baldwin some lead time.

(1) I disagree that the three communities around Balboa Park are interconnected. (Page 5.) I am

concerned that this is a term reflecting a desire to homogenize our unique Golden Hill/ South Park, along with the imposition of citywide standardized zoning. I do not feel assured that there are adequate safeguards in this plan to protect the character of our community.

The 3 communities do have geographical similarities, but each has a distinct community character, with much more commercial development in Uptown and North Park, and more apartment density. The prior draft emphasis on single family residences seems to be missing in this version.

Golden Hill is completely separated from these communities by canyons and freeways. The need for connection to Balboa Park's center is reflected in multiple Plan references to a bridge from the Central Operations Yard. (Missing from p.8. Land Use 2.8, however.) (see Urban Design pp 11, 15.)

(2) Land Use Table 2.1 should cross-reference Open Space, Hillside Review, Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations.

(3) All abbreviations should be spelled out when first used. E.g. FAR (floor area ratio) (Land Use page 6), du (dwelling unit) (page 7), LOS (loss of safety?) (mobility page 4.)

(4) Definitions in Mobility Box 3-1 (page 4) should be expanded. Present ones do not encompass the multi-modal path on Golf Course Drive.

(5) I am not sure why Public Facilities outside our planning area continue to be listed. Also unsure whether fire station at Fairmont/Home is closer than others outside our planning area. (PF 1.3, page 4.)

(6) Community meeting rooms should list Rec Center and Golf Course Clubhouse. PF

(7) Pages should be continuously numbered for ease of reference.

Susan Bugbee

In table 10-1 the house at 1545 29th St designated as historic site 986 shows it was built in 1943 but was built 1912 according to the historic site report and should be moved up in the Table. Also the Presbyterian church at 3025 Fir in Table 10-2 was permitted in 1911 and definitely finished by 1912 (not 1925); architect Del Harris. Those are two that just jumped out at me. there may be more but I guess as the history continues to be researched it will get corrected. Otherwise, the grammatical corrections seem fine. thanks, Susan