





NORTH PARK PLANNING COMMITTEE

Draft Minutes: September 6, 2016 – 6:30 PM

****SPECIAL MEETING: Community Plan Update** at Lafayette Hotel**

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:** 6:35 pm

II. **Attendance Report:**

Member	Robert Barry	Howard Blackson	Dionne Carlson	Steve Codraro	Daniel Gebreselassie	Robert Gettinger	Vicki Granowitz	Peter Hill	Brandon Hilpert	Sarah McAlear	Roger Morrison	Dang Nguyen	Rick Pyles	Melissa Stayner	Rene Vidales
Attendance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		9	10	11	12	13	14
Late															
Absences	Attendance at special meetings do not count towards totals per CP600-24														

III. **Non-Agenda Public Comment:**

- a. **David Richardson.** Historic properties.
- b. **Don Leichtling.** Scheduling meetings right after 3-day weekend prevents participation.
- c. **Lucky Morrison.** Launching South Park North Park Neighborhood Alliance (501 (c)(3)) because felt that residents don't have representation in the neighborhood. 501c(3). First meeting on October 11th, Tuesday, 6-8:30pm at the Lafayette; Donna Frye keynote speaker.
- d. **Lara Gates.** Planning Commission to hear NPCPU September 22nd at 9am at City Hall

IV. **Action Items:**

- a. **2016 Draft North Park Community Plan Update.**
 - i. City presentation by Lara Gates providing overview of CPU; then Alyssa Muto Climate Action Plan Overview;
Upcoming dates:
 1. **Final PEIR and response to comments 9/9**
 2. **Historic Resources Board 9/14 @ 1pm**
 3. **Infrastructure Committee for IFS 9/22 @ 2pm**
 4. **Planning Commission 9/22 @ 9am**
 - ii. NPPC overview of issues by Dionne Carlson & Vicki Granowitz,
 1. Historic Preservation
 2. CAP
 3. Pedestrian-Oriented Infill development program
- b. **PUBLIC COMMENT (by topic):**
 - i. Support:
 1. **Steve Russell.** San Diego Housing Federation. San Diego doesn't have enough housing.

2. **Steven Hon & Kathryn Hon.** NPHS. EIR for project failed to disclose major impacts (CEQA).
3. **Tera Vessels.** With modifications NPPC presented.
4. **Kevin Wood.**
5. **Pat Callen.** This is a compromise, but believe it's a great plan that was built by smart people over many years.
6. **Scott Kessler.** Adams Ave BID. Density is coming, and we need it in the commercial corridors.
7. **Brian Walsh.** The people moving here are all at the bars and restaurants, and they're not here at this meeting. Without density they won't have a place for them and their kids to live.
8. **Angela Landsberg.** NPMS. Density is good for the district.
9. **Philip Auchetti.**
10. **Jeff Gilbert.**
11. **Andrew Malick.**
12. **Dave Gatzke.** The best chance for housing diversity is to support the infill program.
13. **Chester Yamaga & Jean Samuels.**
14. **Paul Jameson.** Support with modifications, especially bike ways.
15. **Danny Fitzgerald.** ECB BIA. Studied that projects aren't getting developed without higher density on commercial nodes.

ii. Oppose:

1. **Don Leichtling.** Traffic mitigation hasn't happened even with the current development, and public transportation doesn't get people where they need to go. This additional housing needs to go to other communities in San Diego.
2. **Tom Mullaney (Uptown Planners).** Lack of mobility, park deficits, excessive height, language doesn't make guidelines mandatory (see letter for details).
3. **Carol Neidenberg.** UH Community Association. UH divided by two community associations. Do not pass the plan tonight.
4. **Alan Bennett.** Plan is deficient as it increases population too much and doesn't have police or street infrastructure to accommodate.
5. **Mary Beth Crudin.** UHCA. Original community input wasn't considered in final plan.
6. **Cia Barron.** No protection for historic character. Final revisions to Historic Element that were sent on Friday are not good.
7. **Kate Callen.** Densifying North Park doesn't mean that you will force people to use public transportation. NPPC is representing constituents that need cars.
8. **Lucky Morrison.** Land Use element is where the City gets revenue from projects being developed. City took forever to get the element to NPPC.
9. **Lavonne Harms.** Population increase issues. Narrowing Pershing for a bikeway.
10. **Sharon Turner, Louis Draper, Jenny Hill, George Frank.**

iii. Other/Major Concerns:

1. **Kristin Harms & Bill Ellig.** Eliminate density bonus in Pedestrian-Oriented Infill Development Enhancement Program Area.
2. **David Mackinnon.** Density is bound to happen. Hillcrest has density and has parking and traffic nightmares. Why is density pushed to Park.
3. **Vernita Gutierrez.** Potential displacement of current residents of color.
4. **Judy Aboud.** City of Villages will not work without transit. Infrastructure should be built before density.
5. **Nicole Capretz.** Climate Action Campaign. EIR was not sufficient, please ensure that the right analysis is done.

c. BOARD COMMENT:

- i. **Morrison.** 2/3 of proposed density already exists in current plan.

- ii. **Stayner.** Height limits in transition areas? Per Blackson the 60' height still works with the width of street and alley. Gates: Height is dictated by Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Height is limited by the FAR. There is no height limit on ECB since 1986, and we still don't see tall buildings.
- iii. **Gebreselassie.** Final PEIR is coming out this week, do we comment before City Council? The comment period is over and the City is preparing responses (posted at the end of this week).
- iv. **Hill.** Plan indicates limit on redevelopment of Huffman's. Is it legal to limit development like that during a testing period? Gates: A PDP process you can track easily what is coming along, the City Attorney would have to answer if the number can be capped.
- v. **Vidales.** What happens if the Pedestrian Infill is no longer part of the plan? Can we still meet the Climate Action Plan? Gates: The quantitative and Qualitative would have to be reassessed.
- vi. **Carlson.** Clarification of level of permit (ministerial versus discretionary development). These projects (Huffman's) are all discretionary and will all likely go before City Council, taking about 8-12 months and costing an extra \$50-100k.
- vii. **Blackson.** Discusses Circulate San Diego white paper findings from Kathleen Ferrier examining regional transport plan from SANDAG, finding the plan didn't meet transit ridership goals.
- viii. **Barry.** Does this continue to the Planning Commission with a negative vote tonight? Gates: Yes. Barry provides brief explanation about getting the coming growth in the right places, and getting mitigation. Feels Pedestrian Oriented Infill is premature.
- ix. **Stayner.** Housing prices are increasing and there's a supply shortage. If we don't redevelop then there will be neglected run-down areas.
- x. **Codraro.** Growth isn't waiting.
- xi. **Gebreselassie.** Land Use Element doesn't specifically address affordable housing by providing minimum requirements.
- xii. **Hill.** This is a "remodel" of the 30-year old plan. We're getting 7% more density, but getting some mitigation and improvements.
- xiii. **Carlson.** The old plan was progressive and ahead of its time, with amazing Urban Design Element. New plan plugs some holes where we lost historic properties under the old plan.
- xiv. **Blackson.** Discusses focus on resolving conflicts between residential and commercial areas, drive-thrus, auto-orientation, housing crisis and lack of transit. We need development standards in addition to the density, and love the changes we've made. Not going to get much redevelopment of Huffman's anyway due to the cost. EIR missing analysis to make mitigation measures for already planned future transit!
- xv. **Pyles.** Sees us losing ground if we approve conditionally. Committee has worked on CPU for 8 years, what's a few more months to get it right?
- xvi. **Barry.** Our only leverage is at this point, and we lose it if we approve.
- xvii. **Vidales.** The affordable housing issue is City policy, not addressable by the community plan. We need to comply with the Climate Action Plan. Proud of our sustainability element.
- xviii. **Granowitz.** Perfection cannot be attained upon on a document like this. We've worked hard to reach this recommendation. Draft motion tries to address some of the issues we still have. Ultimately there are people who are anti-density, and don't want change. But change comes whether we like it or not. This gives us input on how we want it and what we want to protect.

MOTION:

Whereas the Community of Greater North Park and the North Park Planning Committee are committed to the ideal of Sustainability: Sustainability through Preservation of our intact unique Historic Fabric & Community Character; Sustainability via Multimodal mobility in service to the goals of the City's Climate Action Plan; Sustainability via innovative Urban Design, following best practices allowing for Transit Oriented Development and encouraging Affordable Housing; Sustainability via encouraging social & economic justice;

Whereas the Draft PEIR (Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the North Park and Golden Hill Community Plan Updates – Project No. 380611- Sch.No.2013121076) as circulated insufficiently identifies, insufficiently analyzes and insufficiently mitigates potentially significant impacts in the areas

of Land Use, Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character, Transportation and Circulation, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Public Services and Facilities, Population and Housing, , and most particularly impacts to Historical Resources;

Whereas implementation of the mitigation measures suggested below by the NPPC may reduce unidentified significant impacts to a less than significant level;

Therefore, The North Park Planning Committee recommends implementation of all the following mitigations, and recommends Approval of the June 2016 Draft of the North Park Community Plan (NPCPU) Update and Errata Sheet (Attachment 15) ONLY on the Condition that the City of San Diego implements the following edits, recommendations and mitigations in the areas of Historic Preservation and the Climate Action Plan necessary to meet the required findings for approval by:

- The Historic Resource Board,
- The Planning Commission
- The Smart Growth and Land Use Committee
- San Diego City Council

I. Required NPPC Historic Preservation Mitigation Conditions:

- 1) Require implementation of all (9) City & Community identified Potential Historic Districts within 3 years.
Appropriate additional funding to increase staff and Historic Resource Board capacity to meet this accelerated implementation timeline
City to implement a minimum of two (2) North Park Historic Districts within the first year
- 2) Provide the same protections to non-individually significant historic Commercial contributors to the 30th & University Potential Commercial District to the same protections as outlined for residential contributors to potential residential historic districts.
- 3) Require a Construction Permit/Process One decision process for Replacement windows that do comply with Section 132.1603. Require a Process 1 Building Permit for replacement windows for potentially contributing & non-contributing resources in Potential Historic Districts.

Amend the “Draft Amendments to Historic Resource Regulations: 143.0210 When Historical Resources Regulation Apply” to include these provisions.

- 4) DSD shall create & routinely distribute an information bulletin explaining that if a property owner changes out their windows/door with inappropriate replacements they will not be able to get historic designation as a stand-alone or part of a district, including the inability to receive Mills Act benefits.
- 5) Remove the “1/3 option”, section 143.0255(b)(1), in the proposed Draft Amendments to Historical Resources Regulations (8/23/2016 draft) in the Land Development Code (LDC) for Potential Districts & replace with protections consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Preservation. Do not exempt Non-residential (commercial) Buildings in section 143.0255. Implement the corrected Draft Amendments to Historical Resources Regulations including protections for Potential Historic Districts in the next LDC update.
- 6) Do not exempt Non-residential (commercial) development in section 143.0255

- 7) Amend the NPCPU/the Land Development Code (LDC) and include the following provisions in the 11th Update to the LDC to incentivize the retention of historic resources in situ:
 - a. Exclude historic resources from development calculations for floor area ratio (FAR), to allow additional density when retaining a historic resource in situ.
 - b. Exclude historic resources from parking calculations to provide a reduced requirement when retaining a historic building in situ.
 - c. Consider all identified Historic Resources as eligible for Transferred Development Rights (TDR) within the North Park Community Plan Area. Limit the TDR from Commercial properties to Commercial Properties and the TDR from Residential Properties to Residential Properties.

- 8) In order to effectively protect potential districts from incompatible change for parcels that do not include a historic resource, but are located within a potential district;
 - a. City will create a short duration (2 – 6 months), small stakeholder working group to come up with infill guidelines for potential historic districts.
 - b. Develop these guidelines so they can be used in the future for other areas determined potentially historic at a later date. Add these guidelines into the next Land Development Code update

- 9) Survey and implement the Multiple Property Listing for Bungalow Courts as a stand-alone district and add to the Community Identified List of Potential Historic Districts.

- 10) Provide adequate enforceable protections for the City & community identified potential historic districts.
 - a. Code Compliance complaints within potential historic districts shall be made a Level 2 Violation.
 - b. Establish higher monetary penalties significant enough to stop the violations.
 - c. Residents of potential districts to be provided a direct number to contact officials when work occurs on weekends, evenings, and holidays to ensure against loss of historic fabric by illegal demolition.

- 11) City to offer rehabilitation loans and grants, including low- and moderate-income housing loans and grants, and commercial façade improvements grants for both documented and potential historic resources.

II. Suggested Mobility Mitigations:

- a. Implement all the mitigations listed in the NPPC PEIR Letter.
- b. Provide a Traffic Plan/Solution (to include the level of intensity that gets people out of their cars)

III. Required Climate Action Plan Mitigations:

- a. Conduct quantitative Climate Action Plan Analysis
- b. Conduct analysis of how the future buildout of the NPCPU will shift mode share for biking/walking/transit as we as reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- c. Provide mitigation based on analysis for the increased Greenhouse Gases.

IV. NPPC further recommends that the NPCPU be amended to include the following provisions and Policies:

1. Incentivize the majority of new development to be built on El Cajon Boulevard first, and the other corridors second, with explicit design tools to ‘transition’ new development in adjacent residential neighborhoods.

2. Support the inclusion of Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Apartments, also known as Studio apartments and other similar types of units as affordable housing to LU-4-15 (pg 26).
3. PEDESTRIAN ORIENTED INFILL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
 - a. **Huffman Retrofit and Design Standards: Develop an additional policy to encourage a program to Retrofit Huffman Six-Packs”, including design standards to include:**
 - i. Individual Unit Frontages Shall Be Oriented Towards Streets/Alleys Only All Parking Spaces Shall Be Located in the Rear 40-feet of Each Lot;
 - ii. Tandem and Tuck-Under Configurations Are Allowed.
 - iii. Implement a Parking Management Program in this Program Area.
 - iv. **Make the above the minimum standard for conversion of existing “Huffman” rental properties to Condominiums.**
 - b. **Develop a program to limit the number of “Huffman’s” for redevelopment to between 10 and 20 per year.** Track how many units are being built through the PDP process to assess losses and gains of affordable housing. Do this for 3 years from the time of the first project to take advantage of the POIDP program, and then re-assess if the program should continue.
 - c. **Include and refine an easily accessible definition of “Huffman” in the NPCPU and the POIDP;** Definition to include but not be limited to: Multi Story, multi-family structures, with Parking in the Front Setback, the date range “Huffman” buildings were built between, Clearly exclude “bungalow courts” & other historic well-designed multi-family structures.
 - d. **Create a policy to assist low income North Park residents who might potentially become displaced by the POIDP program to apply for assistance through the Housing Commission.**

McAlear/Vidales 11-3-0 Gebreselassie, Codraro, Pyles oppose).

1. Gebreselassie: Plan doesn't cover affordable housing
2. Codraro: Is in favor of before modifications; worked for 8 years and shouldn't be rushed to approve conditionally
3. Pyles: doesn't believe NPPC will get requested modifications if approved

V. **Adjourn: 9:40 pm**

Minutes submitted by Sarah McAlear